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CHAPTER I

ORIENTATION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Appraisal, evaluation, and change have become key words in our society today. The traditional view of the school placidly perpetuating the historical status quo has become a source of increasing social conflict. The rapidly increasing complexity of technology and the related training-needs have focused public attention and demands upon formal educational training. Demands have been made especially upon the public schools and upon the capabilities and competencies of school administrators who are responsible for the development of those programs.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA), in addressing themselves to the challenges of the times to education and to the need for the development of specialized programs of study for school administrators, stated:

The fact that education is so fiercely debated should cause a feeling of elation rather than of pessimism. It shows that education is regarded as significant and powerful. This recognition of the power of education should be a challenge to all those who believe in universal public education—school executives, schools of education, school boards, and citizens in general—to develop the procedures and facilities whereby those who enter the arduous field of educational administration may be fully prepared. (4, p. 389)
Specialized preparation programs for educational administrators are a relatively recent development. There seems to be general agreement in the literature that there were no universities or colleges offering such programs prior to 1900. The increasing interest shown by boards of education in obtaining more highly trained professional school administrators, and the constant raising of standards for state certification have not only dictated that preparation programs be developed, but in many cases have even spelled out specific graduate course area requirements. (56)

Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, authors of the textbook, *Introduction to Educational Administration*, emphasize the dramatic development of interest in the professional preparation programs in this area since 1947 and the prominent roles played in this development by four organizations: the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA), The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA). (15, pp. 80-82)

Late in the 1940's and early 1950's, the national professional organization of the school administrators, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), began a concerted drive to raise the professional status of its membership by an intensely directed effort toward upgrading the formal educational preparation level of its members. Studies which illustrated the
rapidly increasing demands for academic preparation of the nation's school administrators provided the background for the organization's 1952 and 1960 yearbooks, *The American School Superintendency and Professional Administrators for America's Schools*. The culmination of studies and efforts by the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration led to a constitutional amendment. A requirement for Association membership, which was recommended in 1958 and adopted at the annual convention in 1959, provided that by January 1, 1964 all prospective new members must have completed two years of planned university graduate study. (31, p. 5)

Two year programs of planned graduate study had been advocated by many professionals prior to 1958; however, this formal AASA recommendation marked the shift toward program development in many institutions. A study by CASA in 1964, *The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools*, supplemented and compared the 1952 and 1960 yearbook studies of preparation programs on a national basis. The study results verified the proliferation of programs that were in progress, with 35 of the 114 two-year programs having been initiated in the interim between the 1958-59 study and the 1963-64 study. (36, p. 36) Within these 114 programs reported, many variations were evident, ranging from the basic definition of the program and admission requirements to course patterns required.
Ohio State University's Two-Year Specialist Program in Educational Administration

The Ohio State University School-Community Development Study, which in 1956 was succeeded by the Center for Educational Administration, initiated planning for a two-year graduate program for the preparation of school administrators leading toward a Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration as early as 1952. According to existing reports and the minutes of meetings of the Committee on Educational Administration (41) and the Center for Educational Administration Staff Meetings (19), on June 1, 1954, the Committee suggested for immediate implementation a total program for the preparation of school administrators, which included the two-year level program along with the master's and doctoral levels. This two-year program was intended for people who did not contemplate a doctoral program. Changes in needs and changes in the program content evolved even as the newly-devised program moved through the various levels of University hierarchy on its way to formal approval and acceptance. This formal acceptance and permission to issue the first Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration finally came in 1962, ten years after the initiation of the program's proposal.

Program objectives at The Ohio State University

In order to appraise an instructional program, it is necessary to define the criteria by which it shall be judged. Specifically, in this study it was necessary to determine the objectives which
had been established for the specialist program in educational administration at this University. While each course within the program may have its own rationale and objectives, there were statements which specified the objectives of the preparation program overall.

The basic objectives of the Ohio State University preparation programs for school administrators were initially set forth in the First Annual Report of the CPEA:

1. Reconstructing the program of preparation of educational administrators in the light of new needs and demands being made upon them.

2. Providing an adequate program for continuing the professional growth and improving the competence of administrators in service.

3. Developing a two-way flow of ideas and problems from university to field and vice versa, to the end that a continuous program of study and research in educational administration may become the mutual responsibility of the universities and the administrators of the schools.

4. Finding the means whereby the various divisions of the University can relate their several competencies and functions in a common attack upon broad community and life problems.

5. Helping educational administrators and citizens of communities find new working relationships and ways of using available know-how for tackling their own problems. (27)

These objectives served for several years, but as demands and needs changed in the field, the program objectives were written and stated as a "pattern of competencies needed by educational administrators" in order to gain clarity and specificity. The
latest revision of these major competency areas, made in 1958, is as follows:

1. Possession in reasonable degree of appropriate personal attributes and of a disposition to improve them

2. Understanding, attitudes, and skills resulting from an adequate general education (including skill in written English)

3. An understanding of the role of the school in the social order

4. An ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action and a disposition to use this ability

5. An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development

6. Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration

7. Understandings and skills in the administrative process

8. An ability to apply sound problem-solving procedures to school concerns and a disposition to use this ability

9. An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgements

10. An ability to understand one's own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people and a disposition to use this ability

11. An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others and a disposition to use these abilities (29, Exhibit 1, p. 3)

At the time of this writing, it has been over five years since the first Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration was actually awarded in 1962, and approximately eighteen years
since the first steps toward program initiation were taken. Certainly, the tasks and needs of the school administrators have undergone some changes in this time span. As the professional tasks and needs of the practitioners in the field change, as relative problems and issues are identified, the programs which are to prepare these administrators should reflect these changing needs and competency areas in their emphases.

Problems, issues, and questions

As the two-year school administrator preparation programs have increased in number over the nation and have become a more critical concern of the professionals in the field, many problems, issues, and questions have been raised about them. Program critics such as Callahan, Culbertson, and Goldhammer can be identified, and the relevant publications of AASA and CASA can be isolated. However, it is not such an easy task to delineate the specific problem, but basic threads or contentions seem to run through many of them. The general areas of issue concerning the two-year programs seemed to focus on concepts of quality of programs, evaluation of institutions and programs, program content, and recruitment and selection of program candidates. A further exploration of these concepts in the literature provided additional illumination relative to these problems.

Many factors enter into the total issue of quality of program as expressed by these sources. The growing number of institutions offering such programs has caused concern. Questions
of control and accreditation have been raised. Potential and actual impositions of standards by various agencies, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), AASA, and many departments of education posed problems.

Continuing evaluation and program revision seem to comprise another general area of contention. Initial accreditation and evaluation are not considered adequate by many of those concerned. The problem of determining and revising program objectives in relation to changes in the field is another area of issue. Who is to assess the program? How is it to be assessed? Is it being assessed?

One of the most prominent problem areas related to the two-year preparation programs concerns the content of the program. Increasing emphasis is being placed upon the value of the social sciences and humanities as an area of study to be included in such programs. Is full-time residence of one-quarter adequate in the program? The issue of formal course work versus informal aspects of the preparation program is often raised. What types of courses are of most value to the student? Does the two-year program really offer as prestigious and unique segment of the program as the master's and doctoral levels do? What implications exist in the relationships between the existing administrator preparation programs and the changing teacher education programs? How does this specialist program really differ from the other preparation levels and does it offer adequate preparation for the school administrator?
Perhaps the most frequently identified problem is that of the recruitment and selection of candidates for the program and the application of the "quality yardstick" to these candidates. Aspects of this problem include the attachment of varying emphases to personal characteristics and background. Earlier identification of candidates for preparation programs is at one end of a concern continuum with a need for follow-up of program graduates at the opposite end. Finally, the need for a critical decision has been raised as to the relative importance, in both the selection process and in program content of stressing "knowledge" on one hand, and stressing performance and/or behavior within a setting on the other.

Conversations and interviews with staff members of the Center for Educational Administration appeared to indicate a need for an appraisal of the two-year specialist program, especially with the charges of "obsolescence" being leveled at it. (43, p. 58)

Feedback from the field and follow-up studies of graduates of programs can provide valuable insights toward program planning and needs. A study of one major phase of the Ohio State University preparation programs was made by Yarnell in 1965. (87) Yarnell asked those graduates who had completed the doctoral program in educational administration during the years from 1955 to 1965 to appraise the preparation program. Recommendations were made for consideration in future revisions of the doctoral program based upon the graduates' perceptions. Efforts of this writer's proposed research were of complementary nature and were related
to such preceding research in that they were directed toward an intensive investigation of another of the three major prongs (the master's, specialist, and doctoral levels) of the educational administration preparation program at The Ohio State University, specifically the two-year specialist program leading toward the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration.

Statement of Problem

It was the primary purpose of this proposed study to provide an appraisal of the major strengths and weaknesses of the two-year preparation program which leads to the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, as they are perceived by the graduates of the program. In addition, an intensive review of the literature was utilized in identifying pertinent historical data, defining objectives of the program, and in developing criteria to aid in the appraisal study.

Purposes

The major purposes of this study were:

1. To trace the historical development of the two-year graduate programs for preparing specialists in school administration, both nationally and, but more specifically, at The Ohio State University.

2. To examine major forces, problems, and issues related to the program development as identified in the literature
and as perceived by the graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University.

3. To identify commonalities and differences in candidates' personal characteristics, experience background, motivations for entering the Specialist Program, program experiences, and post-program experiences, in so far as these data may be available.

4. To make an appraisal of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, including its major strengths and weaknesses, as perceived by the graduates of the program.

**Design of Study**

An historical descriptive method of research was utilized in the development of this study. It was a non-experimental investigation which was developed through the use of a combination of the following methods of data collection:

1. A survey of written materials from the literature and from the minutes of pertinent Ohio State University groups and committees was made. Data relating to both the national and the local Ohio State University program development were of interest to this review of the literature. Information relative to the following concerns has been presented:
   a. the historical development of the specialist program
   b. the influence of changing certification patterns on program development
c. the influence of professional and governmental groups and organizations
d. purposes and objectives of specialist program on national levels
e. evidence of specialist program growth on the national level
f. influences of AASA action on certification patterns
g. problems and issues related to the specialist program

Of special interest were materials related to The Ohio State University Specialist in Educational Administration Program, such as:

a. specific specialist program objectives and requirements
b. commonalities and differences in preparation programs in educational administration beyond the master's degree
c. problems and issues of The Ohio State University specialist program.

Criteria for use in the appraisal of the program in question were developed from the review of the literature.

A special body of resource material was available to the researcher for limited use in this study. One of the current staff members of the Center for Educational Administration was
involved as a consultant to CASA. This person and documents in his possession offered a unique source of historical background related to the problem; however, illness somewhat curtailed optimal utilization of this source.

2. A list of graduates who have been awarded the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration from The Ohio State University was compiled from official records in the Graduate Studies in Education Office and in the Center for Educational Administration. A total of twenty-two persons were identified who had completed the program at the time of the study. Current addresses of those persons were traced. All but one were geographically located in Ohio, as shown in Figure 1. An introductory letter, shown in Appendix A, was sent to each graduate describing the study and requesting his participation. A subsequent contact was made by telephone to arrange a time for the interview.

3. An interview instrument was developed to gather data on the perceptions of the graduates about their preparation programs. A modification of an opinionnaire used by Yarnell in appraising the doctoral program was utilized. (55) A partial survey of the literature indicated that many of the concerns of preparation programs at the doctoral and specialist levels were similar. A more intensive survey of the literature and the review of graduate records led directly to issues and problems which aided in the development of the interview instrument. It was felt that the use of this adapted interview instrument led to more reliability and consistency in the type of data obtained and in
Fig. 1.--Location of twenty-one specialist graduates in Ohio
the treatment and analysis of the data since comparisons between doctoral and specialist program appraisals could be made. Many of the questions were open-ended since a checklist type of instrument would have limited the responses of the interviewees and thereby not have permitted a full exploration of their perceptions.

4. To complement the interview instrument, an analysis of the graduate records of these graduates was utilized in determining personal characteristics, academic background, course patterns, and professional experiences in education. Such an analysis provided a more comprehensive picture than the interview alone because of the time factor involved, as well as the graduates' inability to recall specifics in question during the interview.

5. A second interview instrument was developed to gather data on the perceptions of professors about the preparation program. The instrument assumed a somewhat similar form to that used with the graduates, because of the concerns stated above. However, the open-ended questions considered other elements since these respondents had a different perspective toward the program from that of the former students.

6. The proposed interview instruments were tested through the use of a jury system involving seventeen advanced graduate students in educational administration at The Ohio State University and six professors. The instruments were revised in consideration of relevant jury comments. The graduate interview
instrument was field-tested in a trial interview with an advanced graduate student who had once considered entering the specialist program to ascertain any final adjustments needed.

7. Personal interviews were held with the graduates and with the professors at their individual offices. Their responses were recorded on individual interview schedules. At the conclusion of the interview, each graduate was given a self-addressed envelope and was asked to send any additional comments to this writer. This provision was included to allow the respondents to supplement their perceptions expressed during the interview if they were strongly motivated to do so by some thought stirred up by the interview. However, none of the interviewees responded and additional information was not gathered in this manner.

8. An effort was made to compare selected findings of the proposed study on the specialist program with selected findings on a previous study of the doctoral program. (87)

Population

Since the major purpose of the proposed study was to appraise the two-year specialist preparation program of The Center for Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, the sample for the study was one which was directly related to that program and to that Center.

The study population was composed of all those persons who have graduated from the two-year preparation program in educational administration at The Ohio State University with the
Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration through the Spring Quarter, 1968, with the exception of one who was currently in Nigeria. Excluding the graduate in Nigeria, twenty-one graduates were identified. Allowance was made for additions to the sample for persons who qualified by completing the program during the study period.

**Treatment of the data**

The questions posed by the study provided the basic framework for the analysis and treatment of the data collected. Since a combination of data-gathering methods was used, the data were presented in such narrative, tabular, or graphic form as was dictated by the data encountered in order to most appropriately depict the findings. The data were analyzed to provide impersonal, objective, anonymous responses related to questions posed in this appraisal study.

**Questions to be Considered**

The aforementioned problems and issues, raised by a partial survey of the literature, led to an initial set of questions which was applied to the proposed study of the appraisal of The Ohio State University Specialist Program in Educational Administration. Those items were developed into an instrument which was used in interviewing the graduates of the program. It was hoped that the graduates, acting as "practitioner-experts" could provide valuable information feedback relative to the program,
a sort of "hind-sight" perspective. Further investigation of the literature resulted in the addition of selected concerns and the deletion of others.

One area that was probed related to quality of program:

1. What were the objectives which had been developed by the Center for Educational Administration, specifically for the specialist program? As the graduates viewed the program in retrospect, did they give evidence that the objectives had been achieved?

2. To what extent did the specialist preparation program provide the student with adequate competencies for the task areas that were required of them in their first position after graduation? To what extent did the program provide sufficient competencies for the numerous responsibilities that followed as experience supplemented the academic preparation?

3. In the opinion of the graduates, what professional status was accorded the specialist program? Was it viewed as a legitimate preparation program by practitioners, boards of education, and professors of educational administration?

A second question area, essential to an appraisal of the program, revolved around the student, his personal characteristics and background, and his program content:

1. What was the pattern of the interviewee's experience before entering the specialist program? Did it include administrative experience? If so, in what capacity? What was the primary reason for entering this program of study? How long did
it take to complete the program? Had any further university training been undertaken since the completion of this program? If so, why, and what was its nature? Was any future program contemplated?

2. What was the pattern of courses included in the respondent's program? Was there a difference in the pattern related to the individual interests?

3. Did the nature of the respondent's specialization while in the program influence the area of interest chosen for the project topic?

4. Was there a value difference or relationship perceived by the graduates between the required aspects of the program and some of the more informal experiences, such as: the practicum series, the interdisciplinary seminars, and simulation workshops?

Another area was of a more general nature and involved questions of concern in relation to the appraisal of the total program:

1. What was the nature of the range of positions which the graduates held and what have been the intervening positions between graduation and the present? How were the positions obtained? What was the effectiveness of the Center and/or the Institution in placing graduates of the specialist program in the initial and subsequent positions following graduation?

2. In the opinions of the students, what were the major strengths of the program? What were its weaknesses? How
could the program be strengthened, in relation to the changes which have occurred both within the profession, and also in the external forces that impinge upon it? What was the specific value of the program to the student, in retrospect?

Selected professors in the Center for Educational Administration were asked for their perceptions applying to the general nature of the specialist program. These perceptions provided valuable insight data related to the overall preparation effort of the Center. Examples of the type of questions asked were:

1. Do you feel that the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at Ohio State University is uniquely advancing the competency of the students in the areas posed by the program objectives? What are the strong areas? The weak areas?

2. Are there perceived differences in recruitment, selection, and program-determination procedures and criteria for students in the specialist program as compared to the master's and doctoral programs? If so, what are they, and why do they exist? For what kind of student do you feel the specialist program is designed?

3. In the opinion of the professor, are the requirements of the program adequate and reasonable? Is the program obsolete? Should it continue to exist at Ohio State University?

4. How might the program be strengthened, in relation to the changes which have occurred both within the profession, and also in the external forces which impinge upon it?
Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined operationally as used in this study:

1. **Appraisal and/or evaluation** - the assessment of the value or quality of the program and/or experiences based upon: (1) value judgments and opinions as perceived by the graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration and (2) criteria and program objectives as developed from the review of the literature.

2. **Educational Administrator** - includes the titles of positions which are commonly thought of as having administrative functions in the public schools. Some examples would be: superintendent, assistant superintendent, local superintendent, supervising principal, principal, and business manager.

3. **Literature** - includes not only published works in the normal context of the word, but will also include minutes of meetings, reports, letters, and other pertinent documentary materials.

4. **Preparation Programs** - defined in its broadest terms, preparation program includes all of the academic and applied experiences which are made available to the students for the purpose of preparing or readying themselves for work in the field of educational administration.
5. **Specialist Program in Educational Administration**—

the two-year preparation program in educational administration at the graduate level, which may or may not culminate in the awarding of a degree or certificate. This program is also sometimes referred to as the Sixth-Year Program.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. The very nature of such a study as this was its first limitation. The scope of the study was limited to the two-year program which has culminated in the awarding of the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration. There are many other preparation programs offered by the Center for Educational Administration, such as: initial certification, the Ph. D. minor, and the Ph. D. major; but this study was not an attempt to investigate the appraisal of these other aspects of the total program.

2. The sample was limited to the graduates of the Specialist in Educational Administration Program at The Ohio State University who have received certificates following successful completion of the program. This program has been in formal existence since 1962. While there may be similarities to other programs of the same type in this or other institutions, they could not be assumed from the data and findings of this study. It was the purpose of this study to gain an appraisal of the program at this University, not the programs of other institutions.
3. A comprehensive survey of the related literature was utilized in conjunction with verbal communications with students and professors in designing the construct of the study and the interview instrument. It may be apparent that some things have been subjectively included or excluded from the study because of a judgment of relative importance. Other things have been omitted because of incomplete records pertaining to the program being studied, or because of a change in personnel over a time span.

4. In utilizing the interview as a vehicle to gather data, such factors as interviewer-interviewee rapport, accurate interpretation and reporting of the interviewees' comments, and the respondents' ability to discern and report accurately, willingly, and objectively of past situations may have provided some limitation. Course numbers and course content varied somewhat because of time and changes in teaching personnel to further affect the reporting of data. However, this study was aimed at gaining the perceptions of the graduates and the personal contact situation of the interview may have compensated by offering a more comprehensive data return.

5. In this study the terms, appraisal and/or evaluation, were used in the definition context of value judgments and opinions on a level of perception. The graduates were asked to make an appraisal of the program based on their opinions and values as they, the practitioner-experts in the field, viewed it after having completed the program.
Significance of the Study

The emphasis on education and upon the administrators of educational programs is constantly becoming more intense and increasing in complexity of function. Problems and issues are being raised concerning administrator preparation programs. In view of the changing nature of the major concerns in the field, regular periodic appraisal of preparation programs leading to professional positions in the field is necessary. As individuals are unique, the programs of each institution are also unique, and should be assessed in terms of its own institutional criteria as well as against universal criteria as set forth in the literature.

Program evaluation is many times conducted within the confines of the institution without consultation with those most directly affected, the students of the program. Opportunity may be available through such a study as this to provide some unique opinions about the measurement of skills and competencies gained through the students' specialist programs in relation to the demands of their professional positions in the field.

This study may have significance for several professional groups: (1) the graduates, now practitioners in the field; (2) staff members who have a direct responsibility for the development and revision of the preparation programs in the Center for Educational Administration at The Ohio State University; (3) staff members of other areas of The Ohio State University who may be contemplating the establishment of a specialist
program; (4) those persons in other universities who have similar responsibilities for program development; and (5) the members of the educational profession who are contemplating entrance into a preparation program.

For the first group, the graduates, the study may provide an overview of the state of the professional preparation programs and the direction in which they are moving. They may also receive a feeling of satisfaction from having contributed a professional service in the initiation of program changes through the opinions given.

For the Center staff members, the findings may provide a concrete basis for revision of the existing program, with systematic direction for the addition or deletion of program requirements in a meaningful way. The study will provide a fund of knowledge about this program which has not been available.

Staff members of other areas of The Ohio State University who are contemplating the addition of a specialist preparation program in their area may be able to utilize some of the general findings of this study in their own program planning.

Other university staffs may find implications for an assessment of personnel programs at their institutions and stimulate similar investigations of their own programs.

For the final group, potential program revisions may provide potential students with a detailed background of the program to aid in their selection of an institution. In addition,
the information gained may lead to an updating of the program and requirements so as to provide an increasingly functional preparation background for their future professional experiences.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

Examination of the literature and research which deals with the sixth-year graduate preparation programs in educational administration indicates that the formal development of this type of program is in a relatively early stage. As such, much of the information pertaining to this program had to be gleaned from the studies and the literature which deal with total programs of preparation, since relatively little research and writing effort has been directed specifically toward the sixth-year program.

The meagerness of available research on this specific program was further substantiated when, in an effort to identify significant information relative to the development of the sixth-year program and its present status, this researcher wrote a letter of inquiry to an Associate Executive Secretary of AASA. (Appendix A) His letter of reply indicated that he had been "unable to discover the whereabouts of studies which might be of value." (59) He did, however, send copies of The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools, a national study done by CASA, and a form, "Application For Membership" in AASA which refers to the sixth-year program in its requirements. (Appendix A)
It is, therefore, the purpose of this chapter to: (1) trace the historical development of the sixth-year preparation program in educational administration both nationally and locally, at The Ohio State University; and (2) to identify the problems and issues related to this program as found in the literature. In tracing the program's development, special attention was given to:

a. Factors establishing need for preparation appraisal and revision
b. Influence of changing certification patterns
c. Influences of professional organizations and governmental agencies
d. Purposes and objectives of the program
e. Influences of AASA actions on certification patterns
f. Evidence of two-year program growth

While many of the above concerns are related in both national and local scope, of special interest are those additional materials related directly to The Ohio State University Specialist Program in Educational Administration; namely:

a. Two-year program criteria and requirements
b. Commonalities and differences in preparation programs in educational administration at the various degree and intermediate program levels
Development of the Two-Year Program at the National Level

In an interview with a current staff member of the Ohio State University Center for Educational Administration who had served as a consultant to CASA, the historical impact of the development of the two-year graduate program for preparing educational administrators, sometimes called the specialist program, was emphasized. In order to capture the phases through which this program development has advanced, it was necessary to examine some causal factors leading to the intensification of interest in these programs, and the development of the various professional organizations in a chronological fashion, as well as the respective organizational roles in relation to developing programs for preparing school administrators.

It has already been stated in Chapter I that prior to 1900 no colleges or universities were offering programs designed primarily for the preparation of school administrators. The development of these preparational programs was gradual and received relatively little attention until the mid-1940's.

Causal factors

There are several prominent factors that can be isolated as ones which have contributed strongly to the surge of interest leveled at the professional preparation programs for school administrators in this time period. The factor that tended to initiate this interest, and to permeate other factors, was the demand
from the broader field of education for increased "professionalization" in the specialized area of school administration. A report of the Planning Committee of the American Association of School Administrators in 1947 reflected this demand in the statement, "The initiation of studies and programs looking toward further professionalization of the superintendency through improved training programs, refined standards of selection by boards of education, and fuller and wider participation in the activities of the profession (should be made a part of the AASA program at once)." (66, p. 2) In writing of this report, Moore points to this "professionalization clause" as a major part of the brief report and describes it as "another milestone in the movement which later gave reality to the dream of a large-scale study of public school administration." (66, p. 2)

The growing demand for the professionalization of school administrators can also be seen in a statement contained in a report of the first three years of progress of the CPEA:

Realization of the vital role of which the public schools can and must play in building a securely free America stronger and more freedom-loving than ever before, has focused the educational spotlight in the years since World War II on the leadership responsible for directing our schools. The need for professionally trained leadership, competent to deal with the growing complexities of running our public school systems, has moved administration to the forefront among education's key problems. (8, p. 5)

A second factor contributing to the increased interest during this period is one relating to numbers, the problem of supply and demand of competently-trained people to fill specialized positions
in school administration. Daniel Griffiths, in writing about the development of school administration preparation programs, points out that ferment rose within the ranks of professional school administrators in the 1940's because of several problems. One problem was that the number of school districts had decreased by more than 100,000 immediately after World War II to 37,153 in 1961. This then caused an increase in the number of relatively larger school districts and increased the demand for well-trained administrators. Secondly, the ranks of school superintendents had been heavily depleted by war and many of the older men who had been drawn into service during this period of time were ready to retire. The supply of qualified replacements was too small to meet the demand. Finally, the national professional organization, AASA, had recognized the need for a new thrust and a new direction in the preparation programs to prepare competent administrators to meet increasingly complex demands being placed upon our educational systems. (52, p. 35).

The importance of the time period beginning with the end of World War II is also alluded to in the AASA publication, *The Education of the School Superintendent*, as one in which technical demands grew very rapidly, and one in which the professional preparation programs attempted to move rapidly to meet these demands. The uniqueness of the publication lies in the statement:

*But only since World War II as there been almost universal agreement that the superintendent of schools should have breadth and depth of knowledge, supplemented by many technical skills, deep convictions, and a sense of mission to be performed through the institution of public education. No narrow*
preparation can suffice. The professional superintendent needs, demands and must have preparation that is truly professional. (5, p. 5)

It is further pointed out that this was one of the first eras in which this universal agreement appeared to have taken place. In almost every other era there was a mingling and overlapping of types of superintendents with various dispositions for preparation.

A final factor which seems to have added to the concern for advancing the professional training level of the school administrator is the continuously increasing demand for evidence of more and more formal academic training in order to qualify under state certification patterns for administrative positions. This trend toward higher qualifications for administrative certificates can be seen in a report by H. Thomas James in 1955. (56) James cites research which shows that as late as 1925 very few states were concerned with administrator certification. By 1939 forty states required the chief school administrator to hold a bachelor's degree, but only nineteen states required the completion of graduate courses. A rapid progression in professional requirements for administrative personnel was in evidence by 1955, when all states required at least a bachelor's degree and forty-one states required the completion of graduate courses. Twenty-six of the forty-one states requiring graduate courses required a master's degree and two required study beyond that level.
Impact of professional organizations

National professional organizations began to respond to the increased demands for more competent, more highly-trained professional school administrators. Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer (15, pp. 80-82), Moore (66), and Ramseyer (72) generally agree in identifying the organizations which were most closely involved with the improvement of preparation programs for school administrators. Those organizations were:

1. National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA)
2. Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA)
3. University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)
4. American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
5. Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA)

The historical significance of the roles played by these national organizations can be shown first, as they led toward increased professionalization, as reflected in the preparation programs of the institutions attempting to train school administrators; and, second, as they attempted to meet standards of required academic training as the standards were being raised.
In 1947 the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration was formed. This organization had its primary impact through the exchange of information by professors of educational administration during their annual meetings. The professors became acquainted, and encouraged an examination of what was known and what was not known in the field. (15, p. 80)

The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) which was developed in 1950 under a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation took its active form through eight regional centers. Emphasis was placed upon the improved practice of educational administration rather than on its study. Initially, however, theory and research in educational administration emerged as important concerns of the eight centers. The major professional developments related to CPEA as reported in 3 Years of Progress in CPEA were:

1. New standards and criteria for recruiting, selecting, and training persons for positions of administrative responsibility in schools were developed.

2. The pre-service preparation programs were revamped with a shift in emphasis toward field studies, internship programs, and seminar type conferences with an interdisciplinary approach.

3. Increased attention was being given to in-service education and training as "continuing professional development."
4. Real problems were being confronted through the development of "action research."

5. Research was being developed as a tool as co-operative working relationships between practicing administrators, universities, state departments of education, school boards, and professional organizations increased.

6. The area of human relations was emerging as a major factor. (8, pp. 29-32)

Jenson and Clark have proclaimed that the CPEA had become a permanent fixture in educational administration by the end of the 1950's through the establishment of the University Council for Educational Administration. (58, p. 88) The UCEA was an organization which was devoted to the improvement of preparation programs in school administration and to the conducting of research in the field by means of inter-university cooperation. Three major purposes have been stated for this organization:

1. To improve the pre-service and in-service training of school administrators

2. To stimulate and produce research in educational administration

3. To disseminate materials growing out of research and training practices. (15, p. 81)

The fact that UCEA has been active in its role is attested to by its growth record, which shows an increase from the original
thirty-three member institutions to a present membership of over fifty institutions.

Perhaps the organization which has played the most prominent role in the development of the two-year preparation program is the American Association of School Administrators. AASA, along with its appointed sub-unit CASA, has assumed a leadership role in advancing the professionalization of the preparation of school administrators. Even though this six-year preparation program for school administrators is a single program which leads to the specialist certificate in educational administration, there is perhaps more information available in the way of research and literature relating to this program than to any other six-year program available for study.

With the advent of the increased interest in the professionalization of the school administrator, AASA instituted a more active role in the study of advancing this status. In 1949, AASA undertook a nationwide study of the leadership role of the school superintendent with emphasis upon looking at what was needed in the way of preparation programs to enhance the competency of people assuming this position. (5, pp. 5-15) As a result of this nationwide study and of the increased pressure to meet the complex demands revolving around the superintendent's position, AASA's executive committee appointed a special commission, the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, (CASA) in 1955.
The Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, even though it was functioning as an arm of AASA, is recognized as the specific organization primarily responsible for the development of two-year graduate programs by institutions preparing school administrators. As the publication, *CASA, A Program of Professional Development*, points out:

Many school administrators tend to identify CASA with the two-year requirement of professional preparation for active membership in AASA. While CASA did in and of itself not accomplish any of these ends, these have been the pathways through which it has proceeded in stimulating people in all walks of the profession to cooperate and work together in a nationwide effort toward higher professional standards in school administration. (31, p. 5)

Ramseyer, in speaking to the state administrator association presidents in 1962, stated that the overall purpose of CASA was "to coordinate the findings of CPEA and to make recommendations for action implied by them."

An early effort of CASA to establish its direction in working toward this goal is the book, *Studies in School Administration*, published by the Committee and the AASA in 1957. The preface of the publication cites it as one contribution toward offering research findings which would "be meaningful to people in whose hands rests the improvement of school administration in the years ahead." (66, p. iii) The major accomplishments of CPEA were cited and an annotated bibliography of all important CPEA publications was provided. It actually, then, provided a base from which to begin further efforts.
One of the most significant publications of CASA, and
the one most frequently referred to by professors of educational
administration as an important factor in the recent efforts to
advance the professionalization of school administration through
the programs of preparation, is *Something To Steer By*. Griffiths
points to this publication as a notable accomplishment. He proposes
that it is meaningful because it contains a platform of thirty-five
goals or criteria, set as a guide to formulate standards for:
preparation programs of in-service education, school board pro-
cedures for selecting superintendents, and other research sug-
gestions. (52, p. 39)

The Committee, itself, proposes that *Something To Steer
By* was developed because it felt that too many institutions were
trying to, and claiming to, prepare school administrators and
were leading toward unsatisfactory preparation programs and
an unsatisfactory quality of school administrators. The thirty-
five proposals made by CASA in the publication were meant to
show what they had hoped would be, and felt should be, on the
horizon in the selection and training of school administrators.
Four major areas of concern were expressed:

1. The process of selecting able administrators
   for further training

2. The characteristics of a program of preparation
   for superintendents

3. The continued education of administrators in
   service
4. The resources necessary to do the job (34)

In summarizing the document, Finis E. Engleman, Executive Secretary of AASA, stated: "Thus a sound and flexible blue-print (for preparation programs) emerged from the profession itself." (49, p. 5)

The result of deliberations by CASA came to a focus at the 1958 AASA National Convention when CASA proposed a constitutional amendment which would require two years of planned graduate study for membership in AASA. On February 18, 1959 at the National Convention of AASA the new membership requirement was adopted into the constitution and by-laws of the organization. The text of the membership requirement as listed in Article III, Section 2 has a direct relationship to the program being appraised in this study; it reads:

   Beginning on January 1, 1964, all new members of the American Association of School Administrators shall submit evidence of successful completion of two (2) years of graduate study in university programs designed to prepare school administrators and approved by an accreditation body endorsed by the Executive Committee of AASA. (10, p. 239)

The vote to adopt that membership amendment to the constitution at the National Convention in February 1959, was 946 for, to 387 against. A significance of the vote is in the fact that the organization is composed of thousands of people, yet only 1333 voted on the constitutional amendment. (2, p. 277)
Purpose of Two-Year Programs

The general purpose for the creation of two-year programs of preparation for school administrators may be found, perhaps best stated, in the 1960 AASA Yearbook in the statement of the rationale and intent behind the 1964 membership requirement that applicants must complete at least six years of formal study beyond their secondary schooling:

Strong institutions with first-rate doctoral programs already established, it is assumed, will plan programs for a special group of practicing superintendents who wish to bring themselves up to the AASA standard. While these programs are to be organized with the current problems of these practitioners in mind, the central purpose is one of filling in gaps --- providing those components of a core of essential studies found to be lacking in the preparation programs of the participants. Such a program might well be taken in a series of summer sessions, but a planned sequence would be required. (2, p. 248)

A statement on the adoption of the resolution in the 1960 AASA Yearbook proclaimed that the American Association of School Administrators had become on that February, 1959 date the first national professional organization in education to attack the graduate study qualification for membership. The Committee for the Advancement of School Administration called it "the next big step" in the field. The press hailed this action on the following day as "the most significant act in the Association's 94-year history." The statement issued by the Committee relating to the membership requirement is as follows:

As a committee we have urged colleges and universities to experiment with new techniques in the training of school administrators. At the same time we have urged changes to be made in state certification
regulations for administrators. We drafted a guide for the accreditation of colleges which prepare school administrators, and this guide was adopted by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. We have urged school boards to adopt policies limiting the selection of local administrators to graduates of approved institutions only.

This proposal for membership criteria based on completion of graduate study represents our hope that AASA members will endorse and promote in the most logical way possible the same devotion to higher standards for school administrators we are asking other people to support . . . (2, p. 277)

A statement of the NCATE standards for superintendent programs is contained in the publication, Commitment to Excellence. The standards are:

a. No graduate programs of less than two years duration will be accredited.

b. No institution will be accredited that does not have a strong graduate program in fields closely related to professional education, i.e.: economics, sociology, political science, anthropology, and public administration.

c. There must be a diversified faculty in educational administration.

d. There must be a clear-cut policy with regard to standards for admission to the program.

e. There must be a requirement that students in the two-year program spend a semester, or a quarter, of the school year in full-time study on campus where all resources of the institution are available. This
requirement is to insure opportunity for extended
use of library, participation in field studies,
and/or closer contact with fellow students and
faculty, not available in part-time attendance.

(31, pp. 25-26)

A major concern of the AASA and its powerful committee, The Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, was the fear that the action which required two years of planned graduate study in an approved institution for membership in the AASA would cause an epidemic of new two-year graduate programs in school administration. Action was taken quickly by AASA and NCATE to ward off this eventuality when the two groups announced jointly in the summer of 1959 that all institutions, including those who were already on the approved list, had to submit descriptions of the preparation programs for approval of a special panel appointed by NCATE. As in the case of many self-study opportunities, where any part of the program appears doubtful, visits would be made to the institutions and a closer examination of the preparation program would be undertaken. (2, p. 278) The emphasis on the preparation program was placed at the quality level rather than quantity. In relation to this, AASA points out "it is doubtful, however, that such programs could or should be provided in more than 20 per cent of the institutions now attempting to do the job. The human and material resources that are, or will likely be, available for the education of prospective school administrators could well be
concentrated in a small number of centers where the chances of success are high enough to justify the cost." (2, p. 19)

Following the adoption of the new membership requirement and the establishment of the NCATE as the accrediting agency, CASA was directed by the AASA Executive Committee to work closely with state administrator associations, state departments of education, and state school board associations in four major task areas:

1. To obtain endorsement of the AASA membership resolution by the state associations.
2. To up-grade state certification requirements for school administrators to meet the two-year requirement.
3. To seek the cooperation of school boards in employing only those persons who were adequately prepared.
4. To work toward a higher degree of cooperation between schools and universities in preparing school administrators. (72)

Influences of professional organizations and governmental actions

Primary evidence of the influences of the action taken by AASA in its new constitutional amendment and subsequent action by state governmental agencies can be found in the progress reports of CASA as it worked with state administrator associations, state departments of education, state school board associations, and colleges and universities who were preparing school administrators.
On December 7, 1961, We Are On Our Way reported that twelve state departments of education out of fifty required academic preparation beyond the master's level for certification as superintendents, or had set deadlines to do so. Of the twelve, four states, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, and New York, were requiring at least two years of graduate work, and four others had established dates after which two or more years of graduate credit would be required. This report added that a number of state school board associations, six, had gone on record in support of the program for the improvement of superintendents and that more were considering such action. Thirty-five of the fifty chief state school officers indicated that one or more colleges or universities in their states were offering, or planned to offer two-year graduate programs for preparing superintendents. (37)

In April 1962, it was reported that by the end of 1962, 75 per cent of the state associations for school administrators would have considered the adoption of the two-year graduate program as a minimum for membership. Seven state school boards reportedly had gone on record as approving the two-year requirement of graduate work. State departments of education in fifteen states were requiring preparation beyond the master's level for the superintendent's certificate, and, of the fifty states, thirty-five had either taken action to up-grade certificate requirements or were considering such action. (72)

J. C. Wright reported further progress in Visions are Becoming Realities on February 1, 1963. Of the fifty state
departments of education, nineteen were requiring preparation beyond the master's level for superintendent certification. Six states were requiring two years of graduate work, nine additional states had set dates for initiating such a requirement, and one state, Pennsylvania, was requiring a doctor's degree. Fifteen state school board associations had endorsed the two-year preparation of graduate study. Only five state administrator associations had not given consideration to the two-year membership requirement. Five states, Indiana, Maryland, Arizona, Colorado, and New York, had already invoked the requirement, eleven states were to adopt the requirement along with AASA after January 1, 1964; and five additional states had set later adoption dates. Forty of the chief state school officers if the fifty states reported that one or more colleges were offering, or planned to offer two-year graduate preparation programs for superintendents. (86)

**Sixth-year certification requirements**

The potential impact of the new AASA membership requirement upon the states' teacher training and certification patterns was reflected by Armstrong and Stinnett, in their 1959 edition of *A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States*. They mentioned it as "a significant development pointing to higher standards for teaching, which may ultimately have considerable impact upon teacher education and certification." (11, p. 2)
The realization of this prediction of impact was recognized by T. M. Stinnett in the 1967 edition of the Manual. He wrote:

The most dramatic upgrading of certification since the issuance of the 1964 edition of the Manual occurred in the administrative field, i.e., for elementary and secondary school principals and for school superintendents. (78, p. 17)

... Of the minimum requirements among the three administrative fields, those for school superintendents jumped most drastically since 1964. In 1967, 50 states require the master's degree (or equivalent) or higher preparation (two of these do not issue such a certificate), with the number of states requiring six years of preparation jumping from 10 to 18. (West Virginia will move to the six-year requirement in 1968.) (78, p. 19)

Figure 2 pictures graphically a consolidation of data from the Manual editions from 1951 to 1967. This graph shows the drastic increase in the number of states requiring a minimum of six years of academic preparation for administrative certification, following the AASA membership requirement adoption in 1959.

Although Indiana, initially in 1951, followed by California, and by Washington, had already imposed a minimum of a six-year academic preparation requirement for certification prior to the 1959 AASA action, the greatest increase in requirements came after that date.

Not only did the number of states with such a requirement increase, but the number of separate-name certificates in the category requiring advanced minimal preparation of a six-year program multiplied more than three times, from twelve in 1959 to thirty-eight in 1967 as seen in Table 1. This category also
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* By required minimum levels of preparation in given years

Summary of number of preparing-PGNACE CERTIFICATIONS IN STATES

TABLE 1
shows a greater increase in the number of certificates requiring this level of preparation than did the "master's plus" or the "doctor's" levels.

Evidence of program growth

In the spring of 1962 the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration authorized the executive secretary of CASA to make a status study of the nation's programs for the preparation of superintendents for the school year 1962-1963. The results of the study were published in 1964 in booklet form as The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools. In the 1964 study comparisons of programs were made with a somewhat similar study conducted by AASA for the thirty-eighth yearbook during the school year 1958-1959 which are of direct interest to this researcher's study.

The 1958-59 study indicated that 302 colleges and universities had programs for preparing school administrators. In 1962 officials reported 289 such institutions, a decrease of 13 over the four-year period. It was further pointed out that program titles were somewhat misleading since only about 260 of the institutions reported programs in educational administration in 1958, and only 212 of the 289 queried in 1962 indicated preparation programs for chief school administrators. (36, p. 31)

While the number of institutions reporting in 1962 showed a decrease over-all, one of the highest ranking changes indicated in their preparation programs showed a substantial increase in
the number of two-year graduate programs initiated since the 1958-59 study. Thirty-five new two-year programs had been added to the ranks of the institutions preparing administrators, increasing the number of existing two-year programs from 79 to 114. A considerable variation in structure existed among the 114 two-year programs, however. Eighty-six institutions were offering both the two-year program and the doctorate, and in fifty-two of these the two-year program was a terminal one. Twenty-eight other institutions restricted their programs to the two-year level. (36, pp. 32-34)

Later studies, conducted in 1967, seem to indicate that there is some reluctance on the part of institutions to recognize the two-year program in educational administration. A study of two-year programs in UCEA institutions in the spring of 1967 by William Monahan received a response from only seventeen of the fifty-four member-institutions. Of the seventeen only five institutions indicated that they had a "degree" program, seven reported a "certificate" program and the remaining five had no two-year graduate program at all. (64) Goldhammer et al. interviewed faculties from thirty-four colleges and universities spread geographically over the United States in 1967. It was reported that programs beyond the master's degree, but less than the doctorate, were available at most institutions. The interviewees indicated, however, that the "educational specialist" programs were not popular and that students in the program tended to drop
out as soon as they completed certification requirements, and did not complete the program. (50, pp. 101-102)

Development of the Two-Year Specialist Program at The Ohio State University

Chronological development

The course of events one discovers when tracing the historical progression of the two-year graduate program in educational administration, from its inception to its final approval through the University hierarchy, covers approximately an eight-year time span. A brief summary of its development and final resolution is reported in the Ninth Annual Report of the Center for Educational Administration:

Although a proposal for a two-year graduate program in education was approved by the Department of Education and the Curriculum Committee of the College of Education in 1956, the Council on Instruction had certain reservations which kept a decision pending until this year. Considerable time of two staff members was spent in analyzing these reservations and writing a new proposal which would meet the requirements of the American Association of School Administrators, the standards of the Center staff and the Department of Education, and those of the University as a whole.

Relationships between the present master's degree and doctoral programs were the major items needing clarification. Two staff members took the responsibility of meeting with departmental, college and university decision-making groups and developed a one-year program to be synchronized with the present master's degree program (also one-year). The resulting two-year program was approved by all faculty groups and the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University during the Spring, 1960. (25, p. 4)
Actually, the two-year program was initiated prior to the date indicated in the above report. The impelling force was provided by the School-Community Development Study, one of the eight regional centers of CPEA which was located at The Ohio State University, as a phase of its interest in improving preparation programs for school administrators. The reports of the meetings of two Ohio State University groups, the Committee on Educational Administration (41) and the area staff of the Center for Educational Administration (19) provide the primary sources used in tracing the program's development.

The first written record that indicated an interest, specifically, in a two-year program was found in the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Educational Administration held on March 27, 1952. At that time only a general discussion was reported. A proposed program for the two-year sequence was introduced to the Committee in April, 1954, which included a suggested "practicum" approach to research. On June 1, 1954, "Suggested Programs in Educational Administration" was approved by the Committee. This effort emphasized the need for a two-year program, and was based on two primary assumptions: (1) that adequate preparation for a school administrator necessitates two years of preparation; and (2) the completion of a two-year sequence should be recognized by a certificate award.

After a year of little action relative to the two-year program at its July 1955 meeting, the Committee recommended that University approval be sought for the two-year sequence and that
an "appropriate diploma" be awarded at its completion. "The development of a planned program for the second year of graduate work with emphasis on the development of a terminal program above the master's level, but short of the doctoral level" was reported at a meeting of the Committee and the Field and Campus Advisory Panels on December 1, 1955. This group of practicing school administrators and University people expressed favor, and urged the advancement of such a program.

The year of 1956 was consumed in writing and revising the proposal for the two-year program, and in gaining approval by the Department of Education, which finally was given on December 4, 1956. During this year the School-Community Development Study had ceased to exist and was replaced by the Center for Educational Administration on June 30, 1956. (28, p. 1)

Work continued on gaining University approval of the program throughout 1957 without much evidence of advancement. However, the records for the year 1958 showed increased activity by both the Committee on Educational Administration and the staff of the Center for Educational Administration. Early in the year the Center staff developed a sequential preparation pattern for the two-year program related to its statement of "Competencies Needed By School Administrators," as reported in Chapter I,
which would also meet certification requirements. Courses recommended in this pattern on April 21, 1958 were:

- Education 872 Pupil Personnel
- Education 873 Staff Personnel
- Education 876 Business Management
- Education 836-838 Sequence
- Education 871 City Superintendents
- Education 878 Intergovernmental Relations in Education

Concern was mounting because of the "no-action" status of the program at the University level. In a "Report of the Committee on Educational Administration to the Department of Education, August, 1958" it was stated: "The sixth-year program was described in detail two years ago and has been approved by the Committee on Curriculum and Staff, the Department of Education, and the College of Education Curriculum Committee. This proposal has become completely enmeshed in high-level 'red-tape.'" A recommendation was made to reaffirm approval of this program and to seek University-level approval again.

Professional organization influence

At a meeting of the Committee on Educational Administration and the Field Advisory Panel held on April 27, 1959, implications of the new regulations on membership in the American Association of School Administrators for preparation programs were discussed in regard to the two-year program and University accreditation to prepare school administrators. Changes in the
Ohio State University program because of the addition to the membership article of the AASA constitution as presented were:

a. An increase in the enrollment figures for the preparation of school administrators
b. The necessity to devise and put into operation a program to meet this requirement, this device to be the six-year program
c. The deletion of the master's degree as a prerequisite to the program (41)

In light of the above factor, a revised copy of a "Proposed Two-Year Program in Educational Administration" was sent through channels again. A rationale for the program was prepared by the Center staff and appears in the minutes of October 5, 1959 as "Some Introductory Remarks Relative to Our Proposal for the 6th Year Program." The problem was seen as related to two groups of students at the post-master's level in educational administration. One group, larger by far, consisted of school personnel who were eligible to seek administrative and supervisory positions. Because of certification requirements in Ohio and AASA membership requirements, a minimum of two years of graduate study was becoming a professional requirement, but a doctorate was not seen as a necessity or a reality for all. These people needed a well-rounded preparation program. A smaller group, pursuing a different course toward positions of educational leadership were thought of as primarily interested in the doctorate. It was proposed that a distinction be made between the two groups of graduate
students by means of a program of two-year graduate study for
the persons seeking planned advanced study and state certification.
A certificate designated--"Specialist in Educational Administra-
tion" was proposed to signify completion of the program. "Advan-
tages" and "disadvantages" of such a program were stated:

Advantages

1. Such a plan eliminates the possibility
that professional accrediting bodies and agencies
engaged in developing certification standards will
also interfere with the university's prerogative of
determining its own degree requirements.

2. This plan also permits the university to
provide a program of preparation which meets certi-
fication standards and, in addition, recognizes the
fact that a university must create its own design for
meeting these and any other standards which it deems
desirable.

Disadvantages

We can see none except the slight inconvenience that may be encountered in keeping separate
records and issuing the certificates. (19)

According to a report submitted to the National Council
for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the agency
appointed by AASA to accredit institutions for the preparation of
school administrators in January, 1960, the two-year graduate
program in educational administration was "operating," with the
"decision on certificate pending approval of the Council on Instruc-
tions." (29, Exhibit II) Faculty Council approval of the program
at the University level was announced to the Center staff on March 14,
1960 as indicated in the minutes of the meeting. Even though such
approval had been given, it was not until January 15, 1962 that
the Center staff was notified that details had finally been completed and that the first Specialist Certificates would be issued in the Winter Quarter, 1962. Two Specialist Certificates in Educational Administration were awarded at the end of that quarter.

There has been evidence in the review of the events in the meetings of both the Committee for Educational Administration and the staff of the Center for Educational Administration since 1962 that the specialist program has received the periodic attention of these groups. Some of the more prominent actions include: the agreements reached on March 22, 1964 regarding the Specialist Certificate Programs; the proposal for a Specialist Program in School Business Administration in April 1965 and the report of a need for evaluation of the two-year program on September 22, 1965.

Essentially, the agreements reached in March 1964 provided for Educational Administrative Specialist Certificates in differentiated areas: (1) Instructional Service, (2) Educational Research, (3) Educational Staff Personnel Administration, (4) Pupil Personnel Administration, and (5) School-Community Relations. It was stressed that the Ohio State University minimum programs should exceed State Department of Education minimums for certification. Agreement was also reached that proposals for specialist certificates by other areas in the Department of Education should be considered uniquely and not lost or subsumed in the approved program leading to the Certificate in Educational Administration. (41)
As an outgrowth of the presentation of the specialist materials on April 9 and 12, 1964, a review of the program was proposed for the next "Area Retreat." The educational specialist program was afterwards considered as a project for area staff consideration during the 1965-1966 school year. The problem area was listed and assigned on September 22, 1965, but no reporting date was set. (19) To-date, no report has been presented or recorded, in so far as this researcher has been able to ascertain.

Program purpose and objectives

The purpose of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University appears to have remained essentially the same as originally proposed. Graduate Studies in Education summarizes this purpose in its description of "degrees offered."

The Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration is a 45 hour program designed for practicing administrators who have completed the Master's degree and wish to pursue an organized program of graduate work beyond the Master's level, but who do not contemplate entering a doctoral program. (51, p. 2)

The objectives for the specialist program were developed by the Committee on Educational Administration in November, 1958 and presented in the form of a publication, "Areas in Which Educational Administrators Need to Develop a Pattern of Competence." These eleven major competency areas, previously stated in Chapter I, were specifically included in the NCATE Report of January 21, 1960 as the objectives of the preparation programs.
in educational administration at The Ohio State University.

(29, Exhibit I)

Requirements for admission

The Ohio State University Bulletin: Graduate School lists the following requirements for admission to the specialist's program.

For admission to this program, the candidate must:

1. Be enrolled in the Graduate School.

2. Have a Master's degree from an approved college or university.

3. Have completed the requirements for administrative certification in Ohio or other states having comparable standards.

4. Have credentials and test date requested by a departmental selection committee.

5. Have the recommendations of two professors on the departmental selection committee indicating that the applicant should be admitted to the program. (80, p. 31)

The fifth requirement, as stated above, is the real "selection device," or the key to admission to the program, since this two-professor screening committee makes the recommendations for approval or disapproval. In the Area Staff Meeting on May 22, 1961, the "Criteria for Selection of Students for Two-Year Programs" were considered. It was decided that the criteria would be evaluated as a total pattern rather than as individual elements. The primary elements to be considered included:

1. Experience.

2. A point-hour ratio above 3.1 on graduate work.
3. Avowed aspirations.

4. 60 percentile in general on the test battery
   (as used in Education 727).

5. Personal recommendations.

6. Adjudged potential. (19)

Program requirements

In order to complete the program and receive the certificate, Specialist in Educational Administration, the student must satisfactorily complete a planned sequence of work and study.

The requirements, as stated in The Ohio State University Bulletin: Graduate School are:

A minimum of 45 quarter hours of post-Master's graduate work is required in addition to field experience. This work shall include 21 hours in educational administration, including the 12-hour practicum; 6 hours in research, including a research project and a 3-hour research course; 6 hours in courses selected in departments other than the School of Education; 12 hours in professional education courses outside the area of educational administration; and field experience. One quarter of full-time residence or equivalent will be required. The completion of the program requirements may not be extended beyond seven years from date of initiation.

Other requirements include demonstrated professional competence through two years or more of successful educational administrative experience, one year of which may be directed internship and a written report of an approved research project.

The student will take a two-hour written examination in educational administration prepared and read by the student's adviser and one other professor appointed by the Committee on Graduate Studies in Education; and a one-hour oral examination on the student's written research report conducted by the adviser and a professor appointed by the Committee on Graduate Studies in Education. (80, pp. 31-32)
Although the final requirement is so written in the Graduate School Bulletin, a decision was reported in the "Area Minutes" of January 22, 1968, that the specialist's written project should be read by two professors, and that the oral examination should be allowed to cover both the project and the preparation program.

Another of the requirements which has not been formally changed, but which has "functionally-changed," is the inclusion of the 12-hour practicum series within the 21-hour block of courses in educational administration. In past years, the "practicum" has been scheduled to meet during the evening; this evening class arrangement allowed for participation by the specialist-students. During the 1967-68 school year the scheduled meeting time for this course-sequence was changed to morning and early-afternoon meeting times, which, in effect, excluded the specialist, who was working at his school position during the day, from meeting this requirement. Some specialist students are currently completing their programs, and the screening committees are continuing to admit students to the program while this program requirement has not, and cannot be met by these students, under the present arrangements. Therefore, the requirement is evidently in a process of change or modification.

Certificate awarded

At the completion of the requirements, the student is awarded a certificate, Specialist in Educational Administration.
This certificate is offered by the School of Education (now the College of Education). (80, p. 31) The student does not, however, attend the commencement exercise, although his name is listed in the Commencement Bulletin.

A survey of the literature, which included the records of the Center for Educational Administration and of the Graduate Studies in Education Office, indicated that during the entire existence of the program twenty-two Specialist in Educational Administration Certificates had been issued through the Spring Quarter 1968. There were no records available to indicate the total number of persons who had been admitted to the program.

Problems and Issues

In the development of any new program, whether it be directed toward preparing educational administrators or toward the establishment of kindergarten program, problems and issues arise which must be considered by the persons responsible for such programs. The two-year graduate program has had its most rapid period of growth in a relatively recent, short period of time. In the process of reviewing the literature certain problems and issues pertaining to this specific program were examined. The prominent concerns will be presented at this time.

Program identification and understanding

An initial problem area appears to lie in developing a common identification of the program and a general understanding
of what is entailed in it, such as has been achieved by the master's degree and the doctorate. Examples of some of the confusion surrounding this "new" two-year graduate level are prominent in the literature.

"At the annual meeting of graduate school deans in Washington, Graduate Dean Stephen H. Spur of the University of Michigan predicted a national trend toward the establishment of intermediate degrees between the master's and the doctorate." Dean Spur suggested that the term "Master of Philosophy" be adopted to designate completion of this program. (75, p. 1) Goldhammer, et al. reported in 1967 that: "Programs beyond the Master's Degree but less than the doctorate are available at most institutions. These programs lead to educational specialists' certificates or degrees (going by various names), normally requiring the completion of two years of graduate study..." (50, p. 102)

The nationwide study conducted by CASA in 1964 reports its data pertaining to the two-year graduate programs in four categories of institutions:

A. Institutions offering a two-year program as their highest level of preparation.

B. Institutions offering a terminal two-year program which is not the highest level of preparation.

C. Institutions offering a nonterminal two-year program.

D. Institutions offering a two-year program which may or may not be terminal.
It was further reported that 85 of these institutions have developed a number of special titles and awards for their programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total Number of Institutions Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Advanced Study</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma for Advanced Graduate Study</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator's Certificate</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Educational Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate for Advanced Graduate Study</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(36, p. 57)

Not only is there a considerable degree of confusion regarding the nomenclature or titles given to the programs by the universities, but the actual intent proposed for the programs by the institutions has a wide latitude. According to Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, "these programs are sometimes seen as alternatives to a doctoral program, and sometimes as steps in a graduate program leading ultimately to work for the doctor's degree." (15, p. 382) Brubaker found in his 1960 study of the eight CPEA centers that although there was frequently no required number of hours listed for the master's program, "the six-year and doctoral programs often listed identical numbers of required hours, which were usually greater than for the master's program." (13, p. 133)
In summary, there seems to be a lack of general agreement as to what purpose the program should fulfill, as well as to how the successful completion of the program should be designated and recognized.

Quality vs. obsolescence

Goldhammer states:

In all of the major professions, preparatory programs are accredited upon the basis of professional standards of preparation to insure that programs contain the range of content and skill-building experiences necessary for competent practices in the field, that teachers in the programs are fully qualified for the responsibilities in the preparation programs, and that universities allocate sufficient resources to maintain the quality of the program. (50, pp. 156-157)

It is subsequently pointed out that although professional standards have been developed by NCATE accreditation of certification programs is not required by most states. UCEA has also devised standards for membership, but no continuing evaluation is required. The problem thus becomes one of not only establishing the quality of the program, but also that of maintaining it.

A warning of impending "obsolescence" in the programs for preparing school administrators has been raised in relation to maintaining the quality of such programs at a functional, professional level. One writer advances the idea that today administration involves the application of knowledge through technical skills, and suggests that a knowledge core and learned technology, as well as administrators can readily become obsolete because of changes. He advocates the projection and forecasting of the
developments in the field and society as a key to the retardation of obsolescence. (50, p. 156) Haskew offered support to this concept when he charged that typical university and college practice lag far behind proposed up-dated programs; "totally redesigned university programs in 1963 hardly number ten, and two score institutions would account for all the loci of really significant innovations." (53, p. 345)

Jack Culbertson, Executive Director of UCEA, in writing of the historic AASA 1964 membership requirement of two years of planned graduate study terms it a paradox, because, he says, "the requirement is already obsolescent." Culbertson says that school administrators heading the districts housing the majority of students today have doctoral degrees; and that as the number of school districts decrease the two-year preparation will become "increasingly obsolescent" as the three-year standard becomes recognized as the appropriate standard for superintendents. (43, p. 58)

CASA also recognized the need for working toward preparation programs of greater quality for school administrators, and proposed a set of alternatives for dealing with the problem. One solution was to restrict preparation to qualified institutions. The other was to establish cooperative working relationships between institutions to provide the experiences necessary for a quality program. (36, p. 46) The problem of maintaining quality in the preparation programs for school administrators will not be one easily solved because of its many ramifications.
Program content

The problem of what should constitute a "quality program" for the preparation of school administrators is cited by a number of writers in the literature. According to one study, there is a need for the development of an adequate theoretical base in order to take stock of "why we are doing what we are doing." (43, p. 46)

Support is given to the prominence of this problem area by reports made by superintendents, ranging in age from the mid-thirties to mid-sixties, in a 1967 nationwide study. They indicated "to a man, they felt that both their preparatory programs and the in-service educational opportunities which they have had since entry into administrative posts were far from adequate for preparing them to resolve the problems which daily confront them." The same study reported that an analysis of preparatory programs over the nation according to Katz's three levels, the technical level, the human level, and the conceptual level, showed that "programs tend either to emphasize one area to the exclusion of the others or to present a smattering of experiences in all areas without careful analysis of what goals are being served." (50, p. 154)

AASA proposed that an issue exists, related to program content, which might be called "preparation versus in-service education." The organization claims that two curriculum problems are inherent in this issue--(1) the university must develop curricula designed to provide a minimum pre-service preparation floor as a prerequisite to practice, and (2) following graduation with the
basic credentials, the pressure on the administrator to study shifts
toward keeping up to date and to improving in service. The 1964
membership ruling that requires two years of planned graduate study
which AASA claims is intended to "fill in the gaps"—"providing
those components of a core of essential studies found to be lacking in
the preparation programs of the participants." (2, pp. 247-248)
This really offers only a prod, not a solution to the problem.

New techniques and methods of instruction have initiated
many problems related to the revision of programs to utilize the
new concepts. Goldhammer (50, p. 155) and Culbertson (45, p. 329)
speak to the increasing emphasis being placed on the value of social
and behavioral sciences and the humanities in their urging for
inclusion of these areas in preparation programs for school admin­
istrators. Culbertson suggests that "such concepts as case studies,
simulated materials, lectures, independent study, field study,
and the internship have interrelated implications for preparation
programs." (45, p. 329) He has also proposed that residence
requirements for programs may change toward two full years be­
cause of the complexity and content involved. (43, p. 59)

Griffiths, in The School Superintendent, cites similar con­
cerns for program:

Generally speaking schools of education and depart­
ments of school administration have not formed ways
of bringing their students into contact with professors
from other disciplines; they have not made use of the
public schools as laboratories; and they have not revised
preparation programs to include cases, role-playing,
field study, simulation, or any other of a multitude
of techniques. (52, p. 55)
Some evidence of the adoption of some of the new teaching methods by the CPEA centers was found by Brubaker in his study. He found that the case study method, the interdisciplinary approach, and the non-directive approach were being utilized along with new course structures that were taking form around block-of-time sequences and field experiences. (13, pp. 240-250)

It seems, however, that many of the problems related to the development of programs aimed at preparing school administrators are a function of the dynamic nature of the situation and it may not be possible to totally resolve them. As the 1964 CASA study reports, "the problem raised by the shifting nature and function of the administrative staff of the school as school districts change adds a new dimension to the problem." (36, p. 46)

Recruitment and selection

The problem of the recruitment and selection of candidates for programs in school administration has been raised as a persistent problem. It seems apparent that if the quality of the preparation program is to be advanced so that the finished product, the graduated administrator, reflects the change, the recruitment and selection of the best potential candidates is imperative. "Both the increasingly complex demands of educational administration and the new content in administration have erected requirements for a higher quality of candidate for preparatory programs than ever before." (45, p. 330)

The task of quality selection is further complicated by the formidable problem of isolating criteria of success in school
administration which can be used as a pattern to select the students with the most promising potential.

An attempt has been made to aid in the candidate selection process at The Ohio State University Center for Educational Administration by establishing a screening process through which applicants must pass. The items considered in the screening of applicants for the two-year graduate program were established, according to the minutes of the area meeting, on May 22, 1961 and have already been reported in the section of this chapter that describes the development of the program at this University. (19) However, according to CASA's report a number of testing and screening devices are employed by various universities, the test data thus far used are no longer considered valid for prediction of administrative potential as was once thought. (36, p. 45) The problem persists, and is made even more urgent when a need for the earlier identification of candidates for administrative and supervisory positions arises. (43, p. 59)

Residence requirements

The concept of an on-campus full-time residence requirement has become a concern related to preparation programs in educational administration at some institutions, according to the literature. A study of fifteen school administrators who became "students-in-residence at the doctoral level was reported in
The Case For On-Campus Residence. (35) Their perceptions of the value of such an experience were quite clearly reported:

... that rigorous graduate study in university residence is a prerequisite for a competent administrator. The intellectual challenge and stimulation provided in a university environment encourage the full-time student to explore beyond the parochial limits of his community origins. Only in such an atmosphere can students obtain broad perspectives, theoretical understandings, and the self-confidence required to meet the future challenges that will result from their higher expectations. (35, p. 26)

Similar support for a full-time residence in the preparation program was found in Yarnell's study of The Ohio State University doctoral program graduates. (87, p. 142) Yarnell concluded that the full-time residence and the value of work on campus while in residence "seemed to be universally agreed upon as one of the most valuable aspects of the program."

An interesting contrast was noted in the reports of University Council of Educational Administration member-institution residence requirements for the two-year preparation program, as studied by Monahan in 1967. Thirteen institutions replied that they offered a two-year graduate program. Their residence requirements ranged from a minimum of thirty semester hours taken at the main campus, to no residence requirement at all. None of the institutions reported that they required the student to obtain a job-release in order to pursue full-time on-campus study. The spokesmen for one large institution reported that the program had been initiated with a residence requirement of one semester, but that the requirement had since been dropped because "too many good
administrators . . . were passing up our program to go to other institutions in __________ with more liberal policies." (64)

Program evaluation

Evaluation has become a key factor in the development of programs in education at all levels. The problem is not whether or not to evaluate; it is rather, "what to evaluate," and "how to evaluate." It has already been pointed out that initial evaluation of programs is undertaken many times to achieve accreditation, and it has also been pointed out that if the quality of a program is to be maintained and/or up-graded, evaluation must be a continuous process.

Program evaluation at Ohio State University

The Ninth Annual Report of the Center for Educational Administration was entitled Planning Program Assessment in Educational Administration. The major developmental activities of the Center were described, many of which were evaluative in nature. Program assessment is stated to be "an activity in which the staff is engaged year after year," with certain aspects being selected for specific study at the beginning of each year. (25)

Research efforts of Ohio State University graduate students have contributed to the evaluation of the preparation programs in school administration. Two of the more recent efforts dealt with studies involving a number of institutions. Brubaker studied the preparation programs for educational administrators at the eight
CPEA centers in 1960. (13) Doseck focused in on the Ohio scene and studied the CPEA in Ohio in 1961. (48)

Other studies have dealt specifically with the appraisal of the preparation programs in educational administration at the Ohio State University. In 1956, Staub played the role of an observer of a recently-developed ten-hour sequence in cases and concepts in educational administration and reported an appraisal of the sequence in the form of a dissertation. (77) The most recently completed research was done by Yarnell in 1965. Yarnell's study, "An Appraisal of the Doctoral Program in Educational Administration at the Ohio State University as Perceived by its Graduates," was an effort to utilize a follow-up study of the graduates of a specific program level to get feedback which could be utilized in revisions of the program if desired by the staff.

Campbell and De Good stated in a School-Community Development Study in 1956 that "no clearly defined set of criteria for preparation programs for educational administrators was found in the literature." It was claimed, however, that "characteristics" could be identified. (16, pp. 5-7) In the evaluation of any program, however, it would seem that some guides must be established, no matter what they are called.

Brubaker listed the criteria used in the evaluation of preparation programs by the CPEA Centers as:

- Student opinions
- Administrative competencies
- Opinions of practitioners
- Preparation program philosophy
- Preparation program objectives
Written course rationales
Trends and developments reported in the literature.

He reported that every institution in his study used four or more of the criteria, but none used all of them. (13, p. 187)

Yarnell found that a concise set of objectives had not been developed for the doctoral program per se. He developed a list of objectives "by implication," and asked the graduates to assess the program as "practitioner-experts." The major areas covered in his criteria were the recruitment and selection processes, the achievement in stated competency areas, services extended to the graduate by the staff, and the achievement of the graduate as indicated by a follow-up of his professional activities following graduation. (87, pp. 46-49)

Summary

The materials presented in this review of literature and related research have traced the development of the two-year graduate program in educational administration. This program development at both the national level and at the Ohio State University has been significantly affected by the efforts of professional organizations, and by the actions of state departments of education in regard to up-grading administrative certification requirements.

The move toward advancing the professionalization of school administrators has resulted in research studies that have considered, primarily, total preparation programs in educational administration at the graduate level. Isolation of information regarding the two-year graduate programs has been presented in only a few instances.
Problems and issues pertaining to these preparation programs have been stated and a need for constant program assessment in light of developments within the field has been identified.

A number of the activities of the staff in educational administration at the Ohio State University clearly indicate that there has been a strong interest in preparation program evaluation and up-dating. Programs and courses receive periodic study and assessment. A follow-up study of the graduates of the doctoral program at this university has been completed, but the need for such a study of the other advanced graduate preparation program, the specialist program, seems imperative, not only because of the criticism found in the literature, but also because the program has been functioning for some time without such evaluation.

Criteria

A primary purpose for reviewing the literature pertaining to two-year graduate preparation programs in educational administration was to establish criteria to be used as bases for the development of two specialist program instruments; one to be used in obtaining an appraisal by the specialist program graduates and the other to be used in obtaining an appraisal by the faculty advisers of those graduates. The general criterion for evaluating any program is "Is it accomplishing what it was supposed to accomplish?" The criteria which were identified in the literature and were used
in developing the instruments to ascertain a program appraisal are listed below:

1. The purpose of the specialist program at The Ohio State University - as one designed to provide an organized, planned graduate program beyond the master's degree level for practicing administrators who did not contemplate entering a doctoral program.

2. The objectives of the program stated in the 1960 National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Report prepared by the College of Education, The Ohio State University - as the advancement of students in areas of professional competence.

3. Major two-year preparation program trends and problem areas - as identified in the literature and reported in this chapter.

The evaluative perceptions of the program graduates and of the faculty advisers of those graduates, as obtained through personal interviews and reported by this investigator, are presented in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

A primary purpose of this study was to present an appraisal of the major strengths and weaknesses of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University as they were perceived by the program graduates. An interview schedule was prepared in which the graduates, acting as "practitioner-experts," were asked to evaluate areas of their individual specialist preparation programs, in retrospect, to express their perceptions of the program's major strengths and weaknesses, and to react to questions relating to various phases of the Ohio State University program which have been identified in the literature as major areas of general concern in regard to this type of preparation program. Professors who had served as advisers to these graduates were also interviewed and were asked to react to similar types of questions.

Findings presented in this chapter were gathered from three sources: (1) data from interviews with graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, (2) data from interviews with staff members who have served as advisers to the students who have graduated from
this program, and (3) data from the literature and from the records of the Graduate Studies in Education Office and of the Center for Educational Administration. Questions posed in the interview schedules provide the basic framework for the presentation of the data. Findings are presented in such tabular, graphic, and narrative form as was judged best to depict them.

Neither the participants in the study nor their schools were identified, with the exception that the professors who were interviewed were all from The Ohio State University. Career patterns of the individuals were traced by using numbers rather than names. At all other times the data were discussed as a collective unit in order to preserve the anonymity pledged to the participants. The order for presentation of data follows the sequence of the sources outlined in the paragraph above.

Data From Specialist Graduates

An initial item on the Graduate Interview Schedule, as shown in Appendix B, confirmed the graduate's name, the year in which he was awarded the Specialist Certificate, and, if it had not already been ascertained, his age at the date of the award. Table 2 shows the total number of the program graduates, the number participating in this study, and the year of their graduation. Although the table shows that twenty-one graduates out of a total of twenty-two participated in the study, this twenty-one actually represents 100 per cent of the sample selected for the study. One graduate was out of the country during the time in which the study
was conducted and was excluded from the study sample in the study design, since he could not practically be reached by the researcher for an interview.

**TABLE 2**

NUMBER OF GRADUATES PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY AND YEAR OF THEIR GRADUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Graduates</th>
<th>Number Participating</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N = 22  22  21  95.5

The ages of the graduates at the time that they completed the specialist program and were awarded the certificate was of interest to the writer. The graduate's age was asked in the interview when it was not shown on the records available to the researcher. The ages at graduation ranged from thirty-five through sixty-eight with a median age of thirty-nine. Table 3 shows the age distribution of the graduates at the time of the award.

Although the sex of the graduates was not originally considered as a significant item, it was interesting to note that only one of the twenty-two specialist graduates was a woman.
TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF AGES AT TIME OF COMPLETION OF PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N - 21  Median age - 39
The questions asked in the series, Items Number la, b, c, and d of the Graduate Interview Schedule, as shown in Appendix B, were intended to provide a picture of the career progression of the graduates. These career progressions are shown in Table 4. The initial question asked for the position prior to entering the specialist program, the employing district or business, enrollment, and salary. In the subsequent items of the series, graduates were asked how they obtained the position; that is through their own initiative, through the Educational Placement Office, through professor recommendation, or whatever. By examining data presented in Table 4, one can see the types of changes in position and the accompanying initial salary differentials in the positions, if such exist. In the interviews, only one person indicated that he felt that the specialist program had specifically aided him in obtaining a position over the other applicants and then only after he had explained the program to the hiring board in an interview. Only one of the twenty-one graduates interviewed indicated that he had received a salary increase directly because he had completed the specialist program and then only within the past year. Only two people reported that they had changed positions more than once since completing the program; and eight of the twenty-one were in the same positions at the time of the interview that they had been in prior to entering the program.
### TABLE 4
CAREER PROGRESSION, INITIAL SALARIES, MEANS OF OBTAINING POSITIONS, AND NUMBER OF POSITION CHANGES SINCE SPECIALIST COMPLETION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Position Pre-Specialist</th>
<th>Initial Salary</th>
<th>Position Post-Specialist</th>
<th>Initial Salary</th>
<th>How Obtained Position</th>
<th>Present Initial Salary</th>
<th>How Obtained</th>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>P. O.</td>
<td>E. P. $12,000</td>
<td>T.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>P. O. Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>8,224</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>11,339</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S. P.</td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S. P.</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>S. P.</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>P. O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>P. O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>O. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>O. I. Prof. G. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N - 21

Key to abbreviations:
- S. S. - Superintendent of Schools
- E. P. - Elementary Principal
- P. O. - Placement Office
- T. - Transfer
- C. O. - Central Office
- S. D. E. - State Department
- O. I. - Own Initiative
- S. P. - Secondary Principal
- G. S. - Graduate Student
- Prof. - Professor
Although Items Number 1a and 1c are part of the series shown above, these data are presented separately in Table 5 to show a comparison between the kinds of positions presently occupied by the graduates and the kinds of positions they held before entering the program. Actually six of the people involved account for all the shifts in kinds of positions.

**TABLE 5**

**KINDS AND NUMBERS OF PRESENT AND PRE-SPECIALIST POSITIONS HELD BY INTERVIEWEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number Present Time</th>
<th>Number Pre-Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total N - 21**

2. What were your areas of study outside of education? How would you evaluate these on a scale: (1) Very valuable, (2) Useful, but not vital, (3) Little value?

This question was posed to gain an assessment of the graduate's feeling of the value of the courses taken to fulfill the six-hour requirement outside of education. Most of the graduates reacted positively to this requirement of an "outside area;" only three areas were rated as being of "little value." The most frequently elected outside area was the area of Psychology, elected by thirteen
graduates, as shown in Table 6. Seven of the interviewees commented that, in some cases, the instructors in the most frequently elected areas did not relate well to the needs of educators, and that care should be exercised in the counseling of educational administration students into the courses that have a more direct relationship to educational concerns.

**TABLE 6**

**AREAS OUTSIDE OF EDUCATION AND GRADUATES' EVALUATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No. Graduates Responding</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N - 21</strong></td>
<td><strong>Totals 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Why did you enter the Specialist Program in Educational Administration rather than some other preparation program offered?

All persons responding to this question, but two, immediately interjected a comparison with the doctoral program and its requirements. The two most frequently mentioned reasons for entering this program were: (1) the one-year residence period for the doctoral program and (2) the financial problem involved with doing a Ph. D. Often these two problems were directly stated as complementary ones by the respondents; however, even when it was not stated, the connection between the residence period and giving up a year's salary was implied. A summary of the reasons given for the selection of this program and the number of times they were given follows:

- Residence for Ph. D. too long 11
- Finances 8
- Self-improvement—continuing education 7
- Practitioner levels emphasized 7
- Offered planned program and a goal 6
- Thought program would grow and mean something 4
- Intermediate step toward Ph. D. 4
- Certification 2
- Open future doors 2
- Foreign language requirement for Ph. D. 2
- No interest in research or college teaching 1
- Age 1

4a. How did you do your period of residence?

More of a variation in response to this question was received than had been anticipated. Most of the graduates, seventeen of them, indicated that they had done their residence period while employed by a school district. A variety of responses was given by the remaining four. One was working as a research assistant at
the University, one was employed by a private business firm, and the other three completed the one-quarter requirement while full-time students without indicated outside employment. All but one reported fulfilling the requirement during a summer quarter.

b. What is your reaction to the one quarter of required residence?

The general reaction of the participants was that such a requirement really was not a necessary one, although a range of agreement and disagreement was evident. Eleven of the graduates pointed out that taking a full-quarter's load during the summer while trying to perform the duties of their school positions really created quite a burden and hardship for them. Some indicated that if the program was to be for the practitioner primarily, the requirement should be modified and individualized through a flexible interpretation of "residence." Only two of the graduates said the requirement was "good." Six called it "O.K." A summary of the statements regarding the residence requirement and the number of times mentioned follows. The six positive comments are presented first, the negative comments follow:

Positive:

1. If there is no full-time residence, you can't get time for library work and you lose part of the program.

2. Gives the opportunity for appraisal of ability under a full-load

3. Helps to add prestige and status to the program through sacrifice

4. Would have been there anyway


O. K. if no other previous residence period on campus in other work, if so then wasted

If can get away from the job

Negative:

Conflict - full time administrators can't devote time to job and to full-quarter residence too

Only as good as a person makes it - program should fit needs

Would offer opportunity to more people to do program if no residence or if flexible - Would be program of professional improvement then

Doesn't prove what it is supposed to prove - physical registration required only, "may be at Larry's instead of library."

Commuting makes it difficult, makes it more available to people in the area than to others

Forces taking courses that fit time schedules rather than needs

More value in classes than in residence

Only poses a hurdle as does the foreign language

Waste of time, no more learned than any other quarter

5. What do you feel were the major strengths of your preparation program?

The graduates were asked what they felt the major strengths of their specialist program were. Their responses are summarized below in order of frequency mentioned:

- The "practicum" series and its field studies 13
- Contacts with other professional administrators 11
The professional staff, the professors at Ohio State University
Theory-to-practice relationships established 8
Cooperative efforts were a learning experience 6
Offered a planned program and goal 4
Forces one into courses outside of education 3
Provided background for basic research 2
Inservice education opportunity and offered chance for professional advancement 2
Offered and required a variety of courses 1
Provided "nuts-and-bolts" courses 1
Oral examination - good experience 1
Simulation workshop 1

As one can see, the "practicum" was indicated as a major strength by a majority of the twenty-one graduates interviewed. When asked "why?" the graduates indicated that the informal, cooperative method of working at a practical field-related problem over the three quarters impressed them. Some said that it gave them a chance to contribute to the group effort as a "professional." In commenting on the strength, contact with other professional administrators, graduates said they liked the opportunities: to make friendships, to gain insights and ideas from others and to make comparisons and contrasts with other school systems.

The professorial staff in administration was often cited as a strength because of the practical field-related approach taken by most and because of the "human" relationship between the professors and the students.

6. What do you feel were its major weaknesses?

In order to gain a contrasting view of the program, the graduates were asked what they perceived to be its major weaknesses. Less general agreement on weaknesses was expressed.
The most frequently perceived weakness was related to the task area courses in school administration, specifically school law and school finance. It was felt that the courses were taught "too generally," and that they should be more specifically related to the Ohio situation. A need for more guidance in relation to the "outside area" courses was expressed, both in counseling students toward need-related courses and in letting "outside area professors" know what educational needs are. Another weakness mentioned by several cited a lack of specialized program structure and a need for earlier program planning. A lack of program recognition and low status was evident and presented even more later in the interview. Although the preceding weaknesses were mentioned most often, graduates' perceived weaknesses should be listed:

| Task area courses too general, relate more to Ohio situation          | 5 |
| More guidance into outside areas and relation to educational needs  | 4 |
| More structure to program, programs for specialization and earlier planning | 4 |
| Lack of specialist program recognition - low, non-degree status     | 3 |
| Need more depth in school plant planning, finance and law courses  | 2 |
| Certificate "label," connotes second-rate program                  | 2 |
| Too many short-term courses                                        | 1 |
| Courses for courses sake                                           | 1 |
| Not enough emphasis on public relations                            | 1 |
| Need to stress "nuts and bolts" of working with state department and federal programs | 1 |
| Visiting professors                                                 | 1 |
| Students have too narrow a view, not enough theory-base             | 1 |
| Professors need to get out into the field                          | 1 |
| Practicum overrated, repetition of job, too far for commuters       | 1 |
| Need educational administration placement officer for graduates    | 1 |
One person mentioned no weakness, and said that "the program is O.K. as it is."

7. How long a period of time did it require to complete your specialist program?

The period of time covering the past-master's program, following the student's enrollment in the specialist program, is reported in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year plus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N - 22
Median time - 3 years

8. What kind of an experience background do you feel is desirable for a student beginning a specialist program in educational administration?

All the interviewees but two agreed that a student should have some sort of administrative experience prior to entering the specialist program in educational administration; however, there was no agreement on the amount of experience needed or on the type of experience needed. "Some" administrative experience
was advocated by twelve persons. "Two-to-three years" and "three years" of administrative experience was cited by three persons each. One person stressed the nature of the individual as the criterion and another said five years in education was needed.

Different types of experiences were cited. The most common requirement was "general administrative experience," mentioned by eleven graduates. Specific qualifying positions were named by some, such as superintendent or assistant superintendent, principal, supervisor, guidance counselor and intern.

9a. Did your experience before entrance into the program include administrative responsibilities?  
   Yes  No
   Yes  21
   No    0

b. If so, at what level and for how long?

As might be expected, many of the respondents had held more than one type of administrative position prior to their entrance into the specialist program. The most common position held was that of secondary school principal, followed by the position of superintendent of schools. The least common position background was that of county superintendent, held by only one person. The number of different kinds of positions held by one person ranged from one to five. The kinds of positions and their frequencies are shown in Table 8. An even wider range in the number of years of administrative experience prior to entering the program was reported. This range extended from one to twenty-six years with a
mean experience background of eight years, and a median experience of five years.

**TABLE 8**

**ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE UPON ENTERING SPECIALIST PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N - 21

10a. How do you feel about the entrance requirements and screening of applicants? Were they unduly restrictive, or should they be more selective?

Nineteen of the graduates indicated that they felt the entrance requirements and screening procedures were either "about right" or "no problem." One responded that he felt that the selection procedures and devices were too selective and that if one was accepted into the Graduate School, he should be able to select the program he wanted. Another graduate felt that the process was not restrictive enough. Most of the comments related to these requirements and procedures were positive in nature: "appreciated test score results and the knowledge of my weaknesses gained in the screening," "pleased that it was selective," "appreciated the human interest," and "gives status to the program."
In addition to the one negative criticism about the procedure, some concern was indicated by two graduates about the way the test scores were used. One suggested that testing does not tell the total story and that the test results could be misleading if used as the only measure in the screening process. Another graduate reported that he felt that the professors used the test results to emphasize his "shortcomings." He further suggested that the screening committee not "ride the students" about their test scores after the screening conference.

10b. What suggestions for change would you offer to increase their effectiveness?

The following suggestions for increasing the effectiveness of the selection procedures were made by the graduates:

- Get the program built up first, then get more selective.
- May be too much related to writing skill, not enough on job performance.
- Screening committee should be more knowledgable of background of applicant, not just filling a one-hour commitment.
- Should be more selective - match the job with the person.
- Might have been a little less personal and more objective.
- Eliminate the "academic snobbiness," should be more objective rather than a subjective value of two people based on a one hour oral.
- Eliminate the game faculty play in assassinating one's personality in front of his own eyes.
- Should be a positive atmosphere.
- Applicants should be screened well enough so that "no-fail" is assured.
- More attention should be paid to past administrative experience and performance.
- Follow-up conference to the screening session should be provided for guidance purposes.
11a. What was the topic of your specialist written project?

b. What value do you see in it, in terms of your subsequent professional responsibilities?

An analysis of the topics of the written projects as reported showed that all had been field-oriented and directly related to problems that the students were working with in their administrative positions. The topics of the specialist graduates' written projects as reported are listed below:

A study of the orientation of the elementary principal and the procedures in assuming a leadership role
A follow-up study of the graduates of a vocational school
The planning and organization of a joint vocational school district
A review of the elementary reading program
A study of reading programs in the elementary schools
A comparison study of various methods of scheduling, including costs, staff, and building needs
The development of written board of education policies
The development of a written board of education policy statement
The development of curriculum guidelines for the school district
A study of staff morale
A study of the problems of beginning teachers
A study of the problems of beginning teachers in Columbus
The development of a guide for the use and understanding of a school budget
A comparative study of the public relations programs in a district with a full-time public relations man and in a district with no public relations man
A study of consolidation based on the county unit
A study of the administrative process involved in implementing a language arts program
A study of the establishment of an under-achiever class in the fifth grade
A study of grouping programs in the local school
A survey of handwriting in elementary schools
A study of school district history and a projection of future needs
A proposed attitudinal study of supervision in the secondary schools of the three consolidated local school districts in a selected county school system
All of the graduates indicated that the project had, in some way, been valuable to them. Twenty of them expressed the feeling that they liked the "on-the-job action research" or "on-the-job-doing" which was typical of the types of problem topics they were working with. Ten saw value in the opportunity to "apply theory to practice." A number of graduates, eight, saw an advantage in the fact that the project results "helped other people to understand" the problem areas better. It was indicated by the majority of the respondents that their study results were used directly on their jobs, some of the studies are still being used and added to in the same districts, and still other studies have been adapted for use in subsequent positions by the respondents and by other districts as well. Several felt that they "learned about their own situations" through their studies and that "concrete evidence of good practice" was provided. In one case the results of the written project led to a publication, and another person reported that he has hopes to further develop his project into a programmed text.

12a. Were there aspects of the program, while informal in nature, and not required, which had value? Examples of these may be the Men's Round-up, inter-disciplinary seminars, study groups, and simulation workshops. ___Yes ___No

Yes 16

No 5
12b. Which, if any, had particular value to you? (The above list is not intended to be exhaustive.)

The answers to this question were varied and many. Informal aspects related to the practicum series were the items most frequently mentioned. The committee work, the opportunity to compare and contrast ideas informally, the friendships and social contacts developed, and the continuing discussions while eating supper together were all cited as valuable ramifications of the practicum experience. The Men's Round-up was the next most frequently identified aspect of the "extra-program" values. Graduates said that the Round-up brought students and professors together informally for golf and the exchange of ideas. These experiences were cited as valuable because they helped to build rapport so that students could approach the professors at other times, and because they contributed to building better mental health through a more relaxed atmosphere. The small group discussions and bull sessions that accompanied the simulation workshop were also mentioned. Other related informal, non-required program aspects were cited, but were merely named, such as: the Book Fair, the Phi Delta Kappa luncheons, the "Brown Bag" luncheons, the Bode Conferences, School Management Institute Conferences, and Ohio Association of School Administrator Conventions, and coffee breaks.

Several of the people interviewed indicated that they were commuting during the summer quarter and working at their jobs in the schools, so they were unable to attend this type of function.
13a. What kind of relationship did you have with your adviser?

Excellent 8
Good 13

b. Do you feel that enough opportunities were given, formally and informally, for conferences with him?  Yes No

Yes 18
No 3

All of the advisees stated that they had a "good" or better relationship with their adviser, even though three indicated that they did not feel they had had enough opportunity for conferences with him. This adviser-advisee relationship was singled out by the majority of the graduates as one of the strongest positive features of their preparation program at The Ohio State University. The human attitudes of "warmth and understanding" as perceived by the students was stressed. One person stated, "I have had more personal contact with my adviser at OSU than at any other institution I have attended." In numerous interviews the comments were made that the adviser had "made himself available," and that a conference had been arranged "anytime that I needed it." There was some indication that the advisees "felt somewhat pressed because of the adviser's other commitments" and the idea was expressed that the professor's overload should be held down to allow more time for the counseling and guidance of students. In several cases it was mentioned that a relationship between the adviser and the advisee had been established that was very friendly and lasting.
14a. Some of the more recent developments in preparing administrators are listed below. Give your opinion of their value as follows: (1) Very promising practice. Should be incorporated as a requirement. (2) Valuable. Should be encouraged as an optional experience. (3) Valuable, but not equally valuable to all programs. (4) Little value.

An analysis of the graduates' perceptions of the value of these recent developments in the preparation programs for school administrators, as reported to this writer in the interviews, are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Administrative internships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Field studies of total educational programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Exploration of newer administrative technologies, e.g., data processing and modular scheduling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Simulated problems, such as the &quot;in-basket materials&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Interdisciplinary seminar experiences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Wider use of practicing administrators as guest professors, lecturers, and resource people</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N - 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the opinions given by the graduates in the ratings shows that, by far, the majority of the ratings indicate that the developments should either be incorporated as a requirement or should be encouraged as an optional experience. Some interesting differences in the graduates' ratings of the value of these recent developments were noted by the writer when their responses were sub-tabulated into two categories; one category composed of the seven graduates occupying positions as superintendents, the other composed of the eleven graduates occupying other types of line positions in schools. The most pronounced variations in ratings were observed in relation to the developments cited as: "field studies of total educational programs" and "exploration of newer administrative technologies." One hundred per cent of the superintendents indicated that they felt that "field studies of total educational programs" should be made a requirement, as contrasted to the views of graduates in other line positions of whom only 36 per cent indicated that "field studies" should be required. A greater percentage (71 per cent) of the superintendent graduates also indicated that they felt that the "exploration of new administrative technologies" should be required than did the other line personnel graduates (27 per cent). A somewhat larger percentage of the principals and other line personnel, 55 per cent, felt that "simulated problems" should be required than did those in the superintendents' group, of whom only 14 per cent would require such experiences.
b. Are there others you would suggest which might be considered?

Few of the respondents had suggestions for addition to the above list of developments; however, some offered extensions of the developments already listed. Two people proposed a revisitaton to the school districts studied in the practicum by the original group of students in order to evaluate the results of the study. Another suggested that an area in "proposal writing" for federal projects be required. Still another felt that since the area of vocational and technical education was receiving so much attention and financial consideration, some study requirement should be advanced in this area.

15. Listed below are courses often included as part of the program in educational administration for specialist students and others. They are in random order. Indicate your opinion of the value of these courses in light of the professional responsibilities which you have encountered.

In responding to this evaluation of courses, the graduates were asked to evaluate only those courses which were taken during the portion of their specialist program beyond the master's level. Those evaluations were summarized and are presented in Table 10. An examination of these responses provides considerable insight into the feelings of the graduates concerning the course work phase of their programs. It is interesting to note that (k) Practicum Series received not only the greatest number of indicated evaluations, but also received the greatest number of ratings at the #1 level, "very valuable, should be retained as it is." Several limitations and cautions should be interjected at this point, however,
regarding the use of the course evaluations as shown in Table 10: (1) the graduates were rating only those courses taken beyond their master's work; (2) the individuality of the judgment probably reflected differences in perceptions of need, experience, and personality; (3) certainly some variance may have existed in the graduates' interpretations of the designated rating scale and in their utilization of the scale in evaluating the courses; and (4) the courses rated by the graduates were taken over a period of years, some as many as thirteen years ago, and those courses may have changed in many ways during the intervening years. The scale used in rating the courses was: (1) Very valuable, should be retained as it is; (2) Very valuable, should be strengthened or updated; (3) Valuable, should be retained; (4) Questionable value as it is offered, should be examined; and (5) Little value, should be dropped.

There were very few additional responses to the open-ended portion of the rating sheet. Some of the respondents indicated that the "outside area" courses might be listed in the space, but many indicated that they were included in the categories of courses listed on the form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Rating Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Introduction to Administration</td>
<td>1 3 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Introduction to Principalship</td>
<td>1 3 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Elementary Principalship</td>
<td>0 3 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Secondary Principalship</td>
<td>0 3 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Administrative Theory</td>
<td>2 4 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Seminars-Problems-Trends</td>
<td>7 5 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Superintendency</td>
<td>3 2 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. City School Administration</td>
<td>1 3 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Pupil Personnel Administration</td>
<td>3 4 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Introduction to Guidance</td>
<td>0 4 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Practicum Series</td>
<td>13 3 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. School Plant Planning</td>
<td>4 2 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. School Finance</td>
<td>4 8 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. School Business Management</td>
<td>1 3 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. School Law</td>
<td>5 6 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. School-Community Relations</td>
<td>7 6 0 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Staff Personnel Administration</td>
<td>5 2 1 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Simulation Workshops</td>
<td>4 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. General Curriculum</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Elementary Curriculum</td>
<td>3 2 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Secondary Curriculum</td>
<td>0 4 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Curriculum for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>2 1 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Elementary Supervision</td>
<td>4 1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Secondary Supervision</td>
<td>0 2 1 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Social Foundations</td>
<td>0 2 0 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. Educational Psychology</td>
<td>2 2 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa. History of Education</td>
<td>0 3 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb. Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>3 3 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc. Child Psychology</td>
<td>2 5 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd. Comparative Psychology</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee. Research Methods and Design</td>
<td>1 3 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. Research Projects or Theses</td>
<td>8 3 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gg. Tests and Measurements</td>
<td>2 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh. Statistics</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Educational Experimentation</td>
<td>1 2 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jj. Field Experience Study Project</td>
<td>7 2 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kk. Internship</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll. Surveys</td>
<td>5 1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N = 21
16a. The objectives of the preparation programs in educational administration at OSU have been stated as "competencies needed by educational administrators." Do you feel that your specialist program advanced your professional competency in these areas? Please indicate your opinion for each.

Yes  No

b. In which competency areas do you feel your specialist program aided you most?

c. In which competency areas do you feel your specialist program aided you least?

The responses to Items Number 16a, b, and c are shown in summary form in Table 11. Out of the twenty-one graduates participating in the study, five indicated that they felt that their professional competency was advanced in all the competency areas by their specialist program; two persons stated that they felt that they were assisted in only two areas each. The competency area that received the recognition as being perceived as "most valuable" was area four, which pertained to cooperative planning and the evaluation of situations. The area perceived to have been least valuable according to the responses of the graduates was concerned with the advancement of their understandings of the instructional program and curriculum development skill. In explaining why they said that this competency area was not advanced by their specialist program, or why they rated it as "least valuable," many of the former students said they felt that they either had the competency before they entered the program or that the program did not really help, or change, their competency. In some cases their specialist program had not included many courses in subject areas designed to advance these competencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Graduates' Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Possession in reasonable degree of appropriate personal attributes and of a disposition to improve them.</td>
<td>18 3 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understandings, attitudes, and skills resulting from an adequate general education (including skill in written English).</td>
<td>17 4 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An understanding of the role of the school in the social order.</td>
<td>10 11 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action and a disposition to use this ability.</td>
<td>20 1 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development.</td>
<td>11 10 4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration.</td>
<td>19 2 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Understandings and skills in the administrative process.</td>
<td>19 2 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An ability to apply sound problem-solving procedures to school concerns and a disposition to use this ability.</td>
<td>17 4 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Area</td>
<td>Graduates' Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgments.</td>
<td>15 6 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. An ability to understand one's own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people and a disposition to use this ability.</td>
<td>14 7 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others and a disposition to use these abilities.</td>
<td>17 4 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N - 21
17. If you were talking with a person who has a master's degree and is considering the specialist program, what would you suggest as the values of this program?

This question was intended to gain insight into what the graduate felt were the values of the specialist program through the projection method, since he would be speaking from his own set of values and experiences in giving his perceptions. A wide variety of responses was obtained. Forty-one of the values stated were of a positive nature; however, two of the people replied that they saw no value in the specialist program whatsoever. Their advice was to "take off from the job for a year and get the doctorate." They said that in the specialist program you lose a lot of time and money for nothing.

The positive values proposed for the program and the frequency with which they were mentioned are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education and self-improvement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement of administrative skills and theory application</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases association with other professionals and professors - more contacts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadens and gives depth of knowledge in the field of educational administration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers a planned program with a goal to work toward</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is geared for the practitioner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases one's understanding of task area processes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers a possible advantage in job competition 3

It forces you out of your major area - you get new ideas from the other areas 2

Helps to sharpen your focus 1

Confirms your judgments - makes you feel more secure 1

It depends on the goals of the individual 1

Certification for the superintendent position 1

An interesting comment was made by one of the graduates in commenting about the program's value in the job competition relationship. He said that "as it gains status, it may give you a leg up; with it you have more than a master's."

18. Would you have any criticisms and/or recommendations that we haven't discussed which would help improve the program and better prepare this person for his professional tasks?

An attempt was made in asking the above question to provide the opportunity for the graduates to offer any other criticisms and recommendations for improvement that had not been included in the interview instrument. Only three of the respondents did not offer some additional suggestions when they were given this opportunity; however, most of the suggestions made were repetitious of formerly stated items, apparently made to emphasize those particular views of the graduates. The most frequently-cited criticisms were: "people don't know what the program is, even in the profession itself," and "the program has low status,
little value, and it isn't even recognized by the University by allowing the graduates to participate in Commencement." The graduates' criticisms are listed below with the most frequently mentioned items listed first.

People don't know what it is, even in the profession itself.

The specialist program has low status, low value, and is not accepted by the University - no graduation - with a certificate awarded instead of a diploma.

If the program is for the practitioner, it should deal with Ohio specifically in courses like school law and school finance, not generally and theoretically.

Professors aren't relating to the practical field.

There is little motivation to enter the program.

It shouldn't be a terminal program. People should be allowed to go on to the Ph. D. program if they are able and if they want to.

There seems to be a lack of understanding of the purpose of the program.

The Practicum took too much time, too much travel, and there was too much credit concentrated into one type of experience.

The remaining comments were positive in nature and, in many cases, were added by the same person who had made a criticism of the program in an attempt to offer a possible way of combating the criticism. A summary of these recommendations in the order of the frequency mentioned is shown below, as compiled by the interviewer.

Change the name of the program - give it degree status and allow for participation in the University Commencement.
"Advertise" the program and communicate its purpose more widely.

Give the program a recognition of its own.

More work should be required in the "outside areas," especially in the behavioral sciences.

The residence requirement should be done away with.

Specialized programs should be developed for the various technical areas within the realm of school administration.

A professor should be required to have actual experience in the area he is teaching, and provision should be made for professor internships in the field on a periodic basis.

The program should not be as restrictive nor as demanding as the Ph. D. program.

The program should be coordinated to meet certification requirements.

19. Have you taken further university training since completing the specialist program?   Yes    No  If YES, why did you take the training?

Nineteen of the graduates indicated that they had taken no further formal university training since the completion of this program. Several did mention, however, that they had attended School Management Institute Conferences on various topics. Two of the respondents had taken additional training and have enrolled in Ph. D. programs for the self-expressed purposes of further self-improvement. One additional person mentioned that he would still consider the Ph. D., but money remained a problem and he was not willing to take the year off to meet the residency requirement.
20. In your opinion, what professional status is accorded the specialist program by these groups: (a) Practicing administrators; (b) Boards of education; (c) Professors of educational administration?

The graduates were asked to rate the professional status level which they felt selected groups accorded this program. These groups were selected because they are the ones that should have some knowledge of the program, and because they are groups with which the graduates have had contact in professional discussions, in employment situations, and in evaluation and consulting situations. The rating scale used in reporting the status level in Table 12 was: (1) Very high, (2) High, (3) Average, (4) Low, and (5) Very low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATES' RATING OF PERCEIVED STATUS ACCORDED SPECIALIST PROGRAM BY OTHER GROUPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N - 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the prominent features of the above table is that the general status level accorded the specialist program was rated as "average" or above by the majority of the graduates. Some conflict with the above rating was perceived by the writer when the question regarding the status of the program was asked specifically in this item. Eighteen of the people interviewed commented that "people do not know what it is." One graduate related that at a job interview, members of a board of education questioned him about the specialist program he had just completed, because they did not know about it. After he had explained to them what it was, and what was involved, he got the job; and was selected from a group of applicants that included a Ph. D. graduate.

21. Are you a member of AASA? OASA?

A final question was asked to determine if the graduates were members of the state and national administrator organizations, since imposed membership requirements in these organizations have been identified in the literature as primary forces in the development of this two-year graduate program. Nine of the twenty-one graduates interviewed indicated that they were currently members of AASA. Only one of the seven who occupied positions of superintendent was not a member of this organization. All seven superintendents reported that they were currently members of the Ohio Association of School Administrators (OASA). Ten of the remaining fourteen graduates who reported that they were not members of the two organizations in question said that they were, however,
members of state and national professional organizations more closely related to their job areas as principals and central office personnel. The additional professional organizations mentioned were the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Department of Elementary School Principals, the Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the Ohio School Business Officials Association.

Data From Professors

The various segments of Item Number 1 in the Professor Interview Schedule were intended to provide data pertaining to the faculty adviser's background in relationship to the specialist program. The professor's name, years in the area of educational administration at The Ohio State University, and the number of specialist advisees graduated were asked. In addition, each professor was asked to estimate the percentage of enrollees who complete the specialist program and "graduate," and if he felt that he had had an adequate amount of time for advisee conferences with these students. A summary of these data is shown in Table 13.

All but one of the professors indicated that they had been in educational administration areas at this University for at least six years or more, or approximately the time-span covered since the first students completed the specialist program and graduated. It was interesting to note that the person who had served the
greatest number of years in this area and who had had the greatest number of the advisees, also indicated the highest estimated percentage of enrollee completions, "a little less than 75 per cent," as based upon the completion rate of his personal advisees. He said he felt that his estimate might have been higher than that of other professors because most of his advisees were active in the program during its early years of development at the University, and that the program interest was much higher then than in later years. His hunch proved to be correct. The mean estimated percentage of enrollees graduating was approximately 50 per cent as computed from the estimates given by all responding advisers; his estimate was "less than 75 per cent."

Only one of the professors stated that he did not feel that he had an adequate amount of time for conferences with his student-advisees. He commented that the minimal residence period, usually done in the summer, was a contributing negative factor, since the summer quarter is a very busy and crowded time for both professors and students.


### TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR-PROGRAM BACKGROUND DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Educ. Admin. - OSU</th>
<th>No. of Specialist Grads. Advised</th>
<th>Estimate of Enrollees Completing</th>
<th>Conferences - Enough?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75 % -</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66 %</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Estimate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N - 6

2a. The objectives of the preparation programs in educational administration at OSU have been stated as "Competencies Needed by Educational Administrators." Do you feel that the specialist program at OSU uniquely advances the competency of the students in these areas? Please indicate your opinion for each.

There was unanimous agreement among the professors that they felt that the students' competency was being advanced in three of the eleven areas:

6. Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration.

8. An ability to apply sound problem-solving procedures to school concerns and a disposition to use this ability.

11. An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others and a disposition to use these abilities.
All but one staff member reported that they did not feel that the student's understandings, attitudes, and skills in the general education competency area were being advanced by his specialist program experiences. Three professors qualified their ratings in answering this question. They indicated that they felt there was some student advancement in competence in the specified areas, but that there were differences in the relative degree of advancement and that their responses of "yes" or "no" would indicate these perceptions. A summary of the faculty advisers' responses to Item Number 2a is shown in Table 14.

b. In which competency areas do you feel the specialist program is providing the most value to the student?

The advisers indicated through their responses to this question that they felt that the program provided "most value" to the student in the competency areas that were concerned with the development of understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration and in the administrative process areas, as shown in Table 14.

c. In which competency areas do you feel the specialist program is providing the least value to the student?

Table 14 also summarizes the responses of the advisers to this question. More than half of the advisers reported that they felt that the area which related to the advancement of the student's ability to understand himself, his motivations, and his actions was least affected by his specialist program requirements and course content.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Professors' Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Possession in reasonable degree of appropriate personal attributes and of a disposition to improve them.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understandings, attitudes, and skills resulting from an adequate general education (including skill in written English).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An understanding of the role of the school in the social order.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action and disposition to use this ability.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Understandings and skills in the administrative process.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Professors' Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An ability to apply sound problem-solving procedures to school concerns and a disposition to use this ability.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgments.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. An ability to understand one's own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people and a disposition to use this ability.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others and a disposition to use these abilities.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N = 6
3a. Are there differences in the recruitment, selection, preparation, and program determination procedures for the specialist from the Ph.D. program?  

Yes  6  
No   0

b. If YES, what do you feel some of the differences are, and why do they exist?

The prominent differences in the above procedures were indicated by the professors to be in the areas of recruitment and selection. One person pointed out that many of the courses are the same for the two programs, with an exception being the differences between the doctoral dissertation and the specialist research project. Three advisers stated that most of the specialist students "self-select" themselves into the program because of the goals they have, or because of self-perceived obstacles in the doctoral program, such as the residence and/or foreign language requirement. It was further stated that many of the specialist applicants tend to be "walk-ins" rather than to be "recruited."

A second area of difference in selection procedures, according to four staff members, was concerned with the basic orientation prescribed for the program. The candidate for the specialist program was perceived by these advisers as "practitioner-oriented," and as an "action-man," who was already in the field serving with some success, and who was fulfilling a need for continuing education. The needs of the specialist student were seen to be of a relatively narrow nature, focused primarily on experiences designed to improve his performance on the job, as
contrasted to the broader needs of the doctoral student who may be preparing for a variety of professional endeavors. Three of the advisers stated that they were less concerned with the "theoretical orientation" of the specialist student, and more concerned that he be "action" and "operationally-oriented." In line with this, one adviser pointed out that he felt that there was somewhat less concern for the specialist's ability to communicate than there was for the doctoral student. It was indicated by another professor that the area "has never been able to prove to some people that the specialist certificate program is other than second prize," and that "you go into this program if you can't get into the Ph. D."

It was further pointed out by that staff member that the staff may unconsciously believe this as well, and that the program may be felt by them to be for those "not able to handle the Ph. D. work."

4. For what kind of students is the specialist program designed, in your opinion?

The responses of the professors to this question, which was intended to define the type of person for whom they felt the specialist program was intended, followed nearly the same reasoning as stated in answering the previous question. There was total agreement among the advisers interviewed that in their view the specialist program was designed for the person already in the field, the practitioner. It was called a "Doer's Certificate" by one who further explained that it was "not for the scholars."

There was also agreement among all interviewed that the program was intended to offer a planned program for the practitioner who
wants to continue his education for self-improvement beyond the master's level, who wants to advance his professional competency, but does not contemplate a Ph. D. program. One professor stated that, in addition to previously-stated intentions, the specialist program was also designed to fulfill the needs of those administrators who wanted to meet the 1964 American Association of School Administrators membership requirement.

5. Is the specialist program a terminal program? _____Yes _____No

                     Should it be?

                     Yes  4

                     No   2

The specialist program in some institutions has been designated as a terminal program, in others it has been an intermediate step in the progression toward a Ph. D. Two of the professors, in responding to the question, stated that they did not feel that the program was a terminal one. Four of the interviewees answered "yes," that it was terminal; however, two of those answering "yes" indicated that there should be some flexibility in assessing this terminal nature based upon such criteria as "demonstrated ability," "maturity," and "changes in professional goals." One person stated that the program should be terminal and that the person should never attempt a Ph. D. because different kinds of people are recruited for the Ph. D. program.
6. **What is your reaction to the one quarter of required residence for the specialist program?**

None of the advisers interviewed felt that the one quarter of residency, as required, provided a meaningful experience for the student. The majority of them questioned the significance of the residence primarily because the requirement is fulfilled by most of the students during the summer quarter, while commuting, and the full experience of a residence period was not felt to be provided as such. The concept of a meaningful residence was advocated by some of the professors because of the value received by the students through their associations and contacts with other students and professors, but it was felt that one quarter was not an adequate period of time. Ideas pertaining to the residence requirement ranged from abandoning the requirement entirely to requiring a full year of residence. A sort of middle position was also proposed which would require seminars and multi-quarter sequences instead of a full-load during one quarter. It was suggested that such a requirement would make a more flexible program possible, and that such an experience would be more meaningful to the practitioner.

7. **In your opinion, what professional status is accorded the specialist preparation program by the following groups: (1) Very high (2) High (3) Average (4) Low (5) Very Low**

(a) Practicing Administrators  
(b) Boards of Education  
(c) Specialist Graduates  
(d) Professors of Educational Administration

Item Number 7 was intended to determine the feelings of the respondents concerning the amount of professional status
accorded the specialist program by selected professional groups which tend to be most closely concerned with the preparation of school administrators. The responses were generally average or above, except that the advisers rated their perceptions of the status accorded the specialist program by professors of educational administration lower than they rated their perceptions of the status accorded the program by the other three groups. There were no extremes of either "Very high" or "Very low" indicated as shown in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

PROFESSORS' RATINGS OF PERCEIVED STATUS ACCORDED SPECIALIST PROGRAM BY SELECTED GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Frequency of Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Administrators</td>
<td>0 1 4 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards of Education</td>
<td>0 4 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Educational Admin</td>
<td>0 0 3 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Graduates</td>
<td>0 3 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N - 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a. It is my understanding that the practicum is no longer a requirement for the specialist program. How do you feel about this?

It was pointed out by one adviser that the original practicum series was developed for the specialist program and not for the
Ph. D. program. The original practicum series was described as an invitational situation in which an attempt was made to get a range of personnel expertise for the purpose of simulating the staff of a school. The purpose was to provide an opportunity for the people to think together on problems and also to provide a means of judging a person's competence as an administrator in a "working situation." There was a consensus, however, among this adviser and the other five interviewed that the practicum, as now being offered, was not intended for the specialist student and that it would not be of the same value to them as the original series was. It was also expressed that it was "wise to separate out the Ph. D.'s." Two people indicated that they felt that if the number of specialist students were greater, some other kind of practicum should be offered.

b. Should the practicum be rescheduled so as to be available to these students?

Since the class meeting time for the practicum series had been shifted to afternoon and morning hours during the 1967-1968 school year, the advisers were asked if they felt the time schedule should be adjusted so as to make this course available to the specialist students who were working in their school positions during the regular daytime hours. Three of the six persons interviewed replied a definite "no." One said that the course was "not appropriate." The remaining two advisers pointed out that it was not appropriate to mix the Ph. D. students and the specialist students because of different goals, purposes, and expectations; and that
if the numbers of specialist students increased to an adequate level and the course were returned to a type similar to the original, it would be possible. Therefore, general agreement was indicated that the practicum, as it is now offered, should not be re-scheduled.

c. Should something be required in its place?

Three professors indicated that something should be required in its place. One proposed a "seminar kind of experience." A second suggested a "core of studies required of all students in educational administration." A third person proposed a "problem-oriented approach in the areas of general education, values, and human relations - not in a school situation in which expertise was to be used in studying another school system." This approach, as expressed, would be an inter-disciplinary approach "with some attention devoted to the development of research skills and utilization." Two advisers indicated "maybe" something should be required in its place. One of the two suggested that he would "like to see the original type, plus the theoretical as it is now." The other person proposed that instead of a three quarter sequence, perhaps one quarter per year would be better. The sixth adviser indicated that there should be nothing required in the place of the practicum because it was "not a practical idea to assume that the numbers of students can be obtained" to offer such a course sequence. He said that such a requirement was "not realistic."
9. A charge of obsolescence has been leveled at the two-year "specialist" program in the literature. To what degree do you feel this is a fair charge?

It was generally agreed by the professors interviewed that the charge of obsolescence was a fair charge. All of them supplemented or qualified their agreement with additional comments. One said "yes" that the charge was "fair across the country" and added that "changes in our program have reflected this obsolescence." Another agreed and added that "the program needs to be re-assessed." It was suggested by two advisers that since the greater number of advanced graduate students were enrolled in the Ph.D. program and so few in the specialist, most of the development effort had gone toward the Ph.D. program and that there had been no real commitment to the specialist program. It was also indicated that there was more concern for the development of the master's program than for the specialist. The point was made by three interviewees that the manner in which the program developed had contributed to the obsolescence charge, and that the charge would continue to stand unless the program was "loosened-up." The question of whether or not an intermediate program between the Ph.D. and the master's levels was necessary was also raised.

Some of the other factors that were expressed as contributing to the obsolescence charge were: "to a certain degree none of the schools using it really hold to the same standards - the people are just as capable, but go in different directions;"
"second-class people have been allowed in, if they can't make the Ph. D., then specialist;" and "systematization brings obsolescence."

10. **What are some unique values of the specialist program?**

   It was interesting to note that one interviewee cited no unique values pertaining to the specialist program. Other professors suggested the following unique values for the program:

   - It provides for an upward extension of formal education when the master's is not totally adequate. Continuing education is becoming more and more a must for achieving opportunity in education.

   - The research project could be unique, but not only the specialist can do it this way.

   - The program is for those people who have exercised leadership and have experience, not all theoretical. These are people who have special competence in schools, who are not just miniature Ph. D.'s.

   - It should provide the opportunity for updating in the areas of administrative skills, processes, and task areas.

11. **Should the specialist program in educational administration continue to be an active program in this University as it now exists?**

    Yes 0

    No 6

   Advisers of specialist graduates agreed unanimously that the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University should not continue to be an active program as it now exists. As one professor put it, "we haven't really confronted the problem of the specialist program. We need to spend
time on the evaluation of it." Another stated, "It should be con-
tinually changing and re-designed." A completely different direc-
tion was advocated by still another adviser, "We should get out
of the business. Somebody should have the program, but not Ohio
State."

12. Do you have further specific criticisms or recommendations
not embodied in the preceding questions which would help to
improve the program, and/or better prepare its "graduates"
for their professional tasks?

An attempt was made in this question to obtain additional
criticisms and recommendations that had not been made in rela-
tion to the preceding questions. An analysis of the professors'
responses shows both criticisms and recommendations. Their
criticisms of the program are listed below:

1. The biggest criticism of the program is that it
   is a "course-segmented" program - if we glue
   enough courses together we have a program.

2. There has been no commitment to it on anybody's
   part in the Center. We don't even talk about it.
   It is unfair because it becomes just a bunch of
   courses, not a program.

3. Reaction from the field has been stated "if you
   have to take forty-five hours, add fifteen more
   and go for the Ph. D."

4. The specialist program is not recognized in
   most salary schedule adoptions and is not well
   known.

5. A weakness is the visibility of the program itself
   among administrators; there has been no systematic
   effort to build it up.
6. A problem of "certificate" programs exists at the University. A multitude are awarded, some within the Graduate School and some outside. This depreciates our certificate program.

In proposing suggestions for strengthening or improving the specialist program, a number of the advisers prefaced their recommendations with a statement similar to, "if the specialist program is to continue, then. . . ." Several of the recommendations were concerned with common areas, namely those of revising residence requirements, program evaluation and updating, and individualization of the program. Since the suggestions were given verbally, and since some of their intent might be lost in trying to synthesize them; a summary of each suggestion for improving the program, in the opinion of the faculty advisers who have worked with program graduates, is presented below:

1. We probably should get out of it (the program).

2. More realistic criteria for selection should be developed after thinking through:
   - What is the purpose of the program?
   - How academic should the specialist program be?
   - What should the written project involve?

3. An invitational, selectional recruitment is better than a "cafeteria-like, if-interested, come-and-get it" approach.

4. A residency program should be developed. Financing should be made more readily available for a one-year's residence. The student should become more involved in the continuing education program and the program ventures should not be "stuck in-between." We have to get away from the "transient basis."

5. There should be a more meaningful residence, maybe for the same period of time, but we should get the person out of the job for that period. He should be "on-campus."
6. There is a need for program development with goals and objectives related to the experiences needed by the student. Participation as an observer-student of selected field experiences, where the newest ventures and problem areas can be observed.

7. If the University is to offer the program, all of its resources should be utilized.

8. The outside-area requirement should be continued, but not so much as a specific course operation. It should be in broad-field offerings through seminar situations.

9. Greater depth is needed in the area of research.

10. Would like to keep it, but it needs evaluation and replanning. We must be completely open in revision, not just changing within the given structure.

11. If it is to continue, the program has to be more individualized. Special programs for special positions have to be developed into much more of a planned-program.

12. The program should be developed for certain "target audiences" with an emphasis on continuing education and in-service education. Program needs should be individualized, and tailored to the needs of the people in the field.

13. The profession should "put the heat on" if they want the program, and practitioners should assist in planning the program.

14. A "team-adviser" concept might be developed to replace the "one-to-one adviser-advisee" relationship. Flexibility could be provided through one "key-coordinator" with the advising shifting to meet the student needs.

15. The program should not continue as a program for the top administrator. He is the Ph.D. The "generalist concept" is not applicable to this program. This program is by name a specialist's program and should be used to provide people with special competencies for specialized jobs.
16. If the program is to continue, it is not a job for Educational Administration alone. It should be re-thought with other Departments - the curriculum people, the communications people, data-processing and other specialists and technicians.

Data From Literature and From Graduates' Records

In order to more objectively interpret the graduates' responses concerning the course work they had taken during their specialist program, an examination of the official records in the Graduate Studies in Education Office and of the University Bulletins was undertaken. This examination was deemed necessary for two reasons: first, because of the time lapse since some of the interviewees had taken the various courses in their programs; and second, because a number of course titles and catalogue numbers were known to have been changed over the years.

Course offerings

An examination of the University Bulletins from 1955 to 1967 provided the following list of courses with titles which related to educational administration which were deemed as pertinent to this study. (79) A major revision in the University's course numbering system was made in 1967. In order to maintain continuity in presentation, the 1967 course numbers are shown in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1967 (1967)</td>
<td>Individual Studies in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600M (693.44)</td>
<td>Administration of the Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Introduction to School Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 (946)</td>
<td>Administrative Problems of Rural and Village Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of School Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>Administration of School Retirement and Pension Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>Internship in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799M (692.44)</td>
<td>On-Campus Workshop in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800M (925.44)</td>
<td>Seminar in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 (968)</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823 (952)</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of School Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825 (948)</td>
<td>Elementary School Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>Elementary School Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>Supervision in the Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835M (993.44)</td>
<td>Advanced Studies in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836 (959)</td>
<td>Practicum in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837 (960)</td>
<td>Practicum in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838 (961)</td>
<td>Practicum in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844 (949)</td>
<td>Administrative Problems of High School Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853 (953)</td>
<td>School Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1967</td>
<td>Administrative Problems of Beginning Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Administrative Problems of the City Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>Administration of Pupil Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>Staff Personnel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>School Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>Business Administration of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>School Plant Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899M</td>
<td>Interdepartmental Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950M</td>
<td>Research in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The years in which the courses were offered are shown in Table 16. The deletion of some courses, the addition of others, and the shifts in course titles serves to give some indication of the shifting nature of concerns in the field, since the course titles are generally descriptive of intended course content. An examination of the years in which courses were offered was also deemed to be important because this would be reflected in the graduates' program content. These course offerings would have dictated what could have been scheduled at a given time in a given quarter.

It was interesting to note that the offerings of courses has tended to get more comprehensive and more stable during the more recent years. This should provide for greater flexibility in the student's planning of his program, as well as to allow him to project his plans into future quarters.
### TABLE 16

**COURSES OFFERED IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1955-1967**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950M</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialist and Ph. D. programs

The study of the graduates of the doctoral program in educational administration at The Ohio State University by Yarnell (87) in 1965 provided the basis for comparison with the graduates of the specialist program as reported in this study. The data from the studies led to a number of interesting differences and similarities regarding the graduates themselves and their experiences. Some of the most significant comparisons appeared to be related to age, post-program professional experiences, residence perception, and the written project requirement.

The specialist program graduate tended to be generally older than the graduate of the doctoral program. The findings of this study indicate that the ages of the specialist graduates ranged from thirty-five years to sixty-eight years at the time of program completion, with a median age of thirty-nine. Not only were the ages of the doctoral graduates younger over-all, but the median age was also younger. It was reported that the age range of the doctoral graduates was from twenty-eight to fifty years, with a median age of thirty-two. (87, p. 63)

Investigation of the data regarding the post-program professional experiences of the two groups of graduates provided another area of general difference. The graduates of the specialist program tended to return to administrative positions in the public schools, as superintendents, central office staff, and principals. Only two persons did not continue in public school system positions.
One took a position with the State Department of Education and the other went to a consultant's position in industry. A quite different pattern of professional positions were taken by the doctoral program graduates over-all. According to Yarnell's study (87, p. 63), 60 per cent of the doctoral graduates were in college positions, either as professors or as administrators. The remaining 40 per cent were either superintendents or central office staff.

The graduates of the two programs reported prominently different perceptions of two program requirements, the residence and the written project and dissertation requirements. The general reactions reported by the specialist graduates concerning the residence requirement indicated that they felt it was an unnecessary requirement and not generally valuable. A primary concern of the majority of the graduates, eleven, was that taking a full-load of course work while trying to commute and to work in their local administrative positions created a conflict. They indicated that such a requirement imposed a hardship and a burden on them. The doctoral graduates reported quite a different perception of their residence period. Experiences gained from the work experience as a graduate student in residence was the second most-frequently mentioned major strength of their preparation programs as perceived by the doctoral graduates. (87, p. 69) A final conclusion of the study pointed specifically to the doctoral students' perceived value of the residence experience:

A valid conclusion can be made regarding full-time residence, and the value of work on the
campus while in residence. This seemed to be universally agreed upon as one of the most valuable aspects of the program. (87, p. 142)

There was an apparent difference not only in the perceptions of the graduates of the two programs regarding their written project requirements, but also in the very nature of the project itself. Yarnell (87, p. 77) reported that the topics of the doctoral dissertations were all directly related to major areas of interest, or to minor areas of study. Nine of the doctoral graduates reported that they perceived little value in the dissertation except for the processes of research and writing. Eight graduates perceived it as being very valuable. Fifteen ratings were given as valuable and eight as having some value. An analysis of the topics of the specialist written projects, as reported in this study, indicated that all were field-oriented and directly related to problems of concern to the specialist students in their positions as school administrators. One hundred per cent of the specialist graduates reported that they perceived their project to be a valuable program experience because of its practical, problem-oriented nature. The tendency for the specialist student to rate the value of the written project higher than the doctoral student may have been due to the nature of the project. The specialist was reportedly able to make direct utilization of the efforts and results of his study; perhaps the doctoral students were not able to make such direct utilization.

A comparison of the courses taken by specialist graduates with the courses taken by the Ph. D. majors, as studied by Yarnell (87, P. 125), was made to satisfy a curiosity of this writer. This
curiosity was aroused because of all of the obvious comparisons between the programs encountered in the literature pertaining to the two-year graduate programs in educational administration, and in the interviews with both graduates and their faculty advisers. Table 17 shows a comparison of the courses in educational administration taken by the graduates of these two programs. It was felt by this writer that a comparison could best be shown by using a percentage of total program graduates investigated in the studies since the numbers of graduates of the two programs was quite dissimilar. In six cases, the graduate's master's work had been taken at another institution, and these records were not available to the writer. However, all of the graduate level records of the specialist graduates that were available were examined with the above exceptions. These data were then compared with the findings related to the doctoral program majors as presented by Yarnell. (87, p. 125) A major deviation in course completion seems to be in the individual study courses, Education 800M and 835M, but this may have been due to the adviser programming and usage since these were individual courses and the content cannot be readily determined. Another area which reflects a difference is the Practicum Series, Education 836, 837, and 838; with the percentage of specialists showing a greater enrollment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Frequency Specialist</th>
<th>Per Cent Specialist</th>
<th>Frequency Ph. D.</th>
<th>Per Cent Ph. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600M (693.44)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 (946)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 742</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799M (692.44)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800M (925.44)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 (968)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 823 (952)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825 (948)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835M (993.44)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836 (959)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837 (960)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838 (961)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844 (949)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853 (953)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870 (950)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871 (951)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872 (954)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873 (955)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875 (956)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876 (957)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880 (958)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899M (899.44)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Specialist N - 22  
Total Ph. D. N - 42

+ - same course
In general, the course selection in educational administration course areas by the graduates of the two programs appears to be quite similar. It is interesting to note the variation in the percentages of graduates who enrolled in the courses as shown in Table 17. This would appear to indicate that all courses were not considered as being of equal value by the students. It was noted that some of the courses have an equally high percentage of enrollees from both groups of graduates, while some have equally low percentages. It was also interesting to find that the percentage of doctoral students who enrolled in the task area courses, Education 823, 853, 872, 873, 875, and 880, was somewhat higher in four of the six courses than the percentage of the specialist students, who are generally considered to be practitioners and task-oriented.

Graduates and Professors - Areas of Common Concern

Areas of common concern have been identified in the analysis of the data contained in the responses of the two interview groups, the specialist program graduates and the faculty advisers of those graduates. It has been the experience of this writer that more has been accomplished in educational program development when there has been agreement in identifying areas of common concern between those people who were to be affected by a program, and those people who were to be responsible for the development and the implementation of the program. Such common areas can be presented in some detail.
Program purpose

The general purpose of the program was confirmed by the professors in their responses to Items 3 and 4 on the interview schedule, regarding their perceived differences in recruitment, selection, and program determination procedures for students and in their identification of the kind of student for which the program was designed. They indicated that the specialist program was for the practitioner who had already experienced some success in the field and who desired additional continuing education; and that the recruitment, selection, and program determination procedures should be geared to this type of person.

The graduates' responses to Items 1, 8, and 9 also confirmed the fact that they felt that the "practitioner-type" student was being trained in the specialist program. Only two of the graduates have gone one to work at the formal Ph. D. level since completing the specialist program. The fact that most of the program graduates proposed a prerequisite of some administrative experience as a background to entering the program further confirms their feeling that a practitioner is to be trained in this program. Several of the graduates also expressed a concern that if the specialist program was to be for the practitioner, the task area courses of school law and school finance should be geared more specifically to Ohio law and Ohio finance with the purpose of advancement of the practitioner's competence in working with these areas in his job, rather than a general national and theoretical treatment.
Residence requirement

Eleven of the twenty-two program graduates stated that the one quarter residence requirement was meaningless and was a real burden and hardship to the practitioner who was on an extended-time contract. They expressed a concern that they may not have done as well as they might have in the course work had they not been required to take such a heavy course load. Only two of the practitioners called the requirement "good." One graduate made the point that if the program was to be for the practitioner, its requirements should be such as to encourage him to improve professionally, not to discourage him.

The faculty advisers concurred unanimously in the feeling that the residence requirement, as now established, is meaningless, because the students who are working on-the-job and taking courses to fulfill the residence requirement during the summer quarter are really not receiving the benefits of residency. Some of the professors, as did a number of the graduates, advocated abolishing the requirement with the idea of making the program more individualized and more meaningful for the student. Other professors proposed the elimination of the one quarter residence requirement in favor of a full year requirement with provision made for financial assistance to the student.

Program identification

A common area of concern among both program graduates and professors revolved around the problem of program identification.
Four of the eight most frequently-mentioned criticisms lodged at the preparation program by its graduates were related to matters of a lack of program recognition, low program status and a lack of University recognition, and a lack of understanding of program purpose. The three most frequently-proposed recommendations for improving the program were aimed at: (1) changing the name of the program to give it status, (2) advertising and communicating the purpose of the program, and (3) giving the program a recognition of its own. Criticisms of the professors pointed out that: (1) the program has not been recognized in most salary schedule adoptions and is not well known, (2) the visibility of the program itself among administrators has been poor and there has been no systematic effort to build it up, and (3) the problem of the "certificate label" has hurt the value of the program.

Program values

Another area of agreement indicated by the data from the interviews with the graduates and the professors was related to the unique values stated to be available in the specialist program. Professors indicated that the values of this program were in providing for continuing in-service formal educational opportunity for the practitioner and in providing for the opportunity of updating in the areas of administrative skills, processes, and task area competencies. The most frequently-cited values named by the program graduates in answering Item Number 17 were: that it provided an opportunity for continuing education and self-improvement
and that it offered an opportunity for further refinement of administrative skills and of their theoretical background which they could then apply in practice.

Summary

It has been the purpose of this chapter to present the findings of the responses given by the graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University and by the faculty advisers of those graduates to questions asked during the interview periods; as well as to present data found in the official records and the literature. The following chapter utilizes these findings in summarizing data, in forming conclusions, in formulating recommendations, and in suggesting possible significance relevant to the purpose of this study.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the purpose of this chapter to provide a summary of the study, to present conclusions related to the four major purposes of this study, to make recommendations for consideration in future preparation program revision, and to suggest implications for further study as perceived by this writer.

Summary of the Study

Purpose

It was the primary purpose of this study to make an appraisal of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, including its major strengths and weaknesses, as perceived by the program graduates. The major purposes of this study were categorized into four areas:

1. To trace the historical development of the two-year graduate programs for preparing specialists in school administration, both nationally and at The Ohio State University.

2. To examine major forces, problems and issues related to the program development as identified in the literature and as perceived by the graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University.
3. To identify commonalities and differences in candidates' personal characteristics, experience background, motivations for entering the specialist program, program experiences, and post-program experiences.

4. To make an appraisal of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, including its major strengths and weaknesses, as perceived by the graduates of the program.

Procedure

The historical development of the two-year graduate preparation program in educational administration was traced primarily through a review of related literature and research, and supplemented by an interview with an Ohio State University staff member who had served as a special consultant to the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration of AASA. Major forces, problems, and issues related to the program development were also identified. The records of committee and staff meetings and of other pertinent University groups were utilized in further documentation of this development.

An interview instrument was developed to gain data relevant to the graduates of the program at The Ohio State University and their appraisals of the program, including its major strengths and weaknesses. The interview schedule was reviewed by a jury of experts selected from advanced graduate students and Ohio State University professors, and revised. Many of the questions
were open-ended in order to provide for maximum exploration of the graduates' perceptions. A trial interview was held with an advanced graduate student who had formerly contemplated entrance into this program in order to ascertain any final adjustments. A second interview instrument was utilized to gather data on the perceptions of the faculty advisers of the graduates.

Twenty-one of the twenty-two persons who had completed the program for the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University since its formal approval in 1962 through Spring Quarter 1968 participated in the study, as well as six faculty advisers at the University. Personal interviews were held with the graduates and with the professors at their individual offices.

Finally, an effort was made to compare selected findings of the study of the specialist program with selected findings of a previous study of the doctoral program.

Conclusions Related to Four Major Purposes of the Study

Historical development of the two-year graduate programs for preparing specialists in school administration, both nationally and at The Ohio State University

Data revealed in the review of literature and interviews with selected personnel have led this writer to the following
conclusions related to the first stated purpose of this study:

1. Two-year graduate programs in educational administration remain in the developmental stage, both nationally and at The Ohio State University. According to the literature, programs designed specifically for preparing school administrators experienced only a gradual development from the time of their inception after 1900 until the mid-1940's. Evidence of the development of two-year graduate programs was not isolated from other programs until the early 1950's. Writers in the professional literature generally attributed the subsequent program growth to the efforts of the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration created in 1955 by its parent professional organization, the American Association of School Administrators; and to its recommendation of requiring evidence of two years of a planned program of graduate study in an accredited institution for membership in AASA effective January 1, 1964. Following this recommendation and its adoption in 1959, research shows that although the number of institutions preparing school administrators decreased from 302 in 1958, to 289 in 1962, thirty-five new two-year graduate programs in educational administration were added nationally. A growth was shown from 79 to 114 such programs in that four year period.

Interest in the development of a two-year graduate program in educational administration at The Ohio State University was first indicated early in 1952; however, initial College-level approval was not given until 1956 and final University approval was attained in 1960. It was not until Winter Quarter of 1962
that the first two persons completed the program and were awarded
the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration. According
to the literature, relationships between the master's degree and
the doctoral program were cited as major items impeding accep-
tance and needing clarification in the development of the two-year
program. The resultant program was actually a one-year pro-
gram synchronized with the established one-year master's degree
program. Periodic attention has been given to the development
of the specialist program by the staff of the Center for Educational
Administration. A proposal for a Specialist Program in School
Business Administration was submitted in April, 1965, following
an agreement of the Committee on Educational Administration in
1964 that specialist certificates should be differentiated into spe-
cialized areas of study. Twenty-two students have completed the
specialist program through Spring Quarter 1968. No formal re-
view of the program has been made since its approval in 1960,
although such a study was suggested in 1965.

2. There is an extremely limited amount of literature
available that reports on the development and evaluation of two-
year graduate programs in educational administration. Examina-
tion of research and literature in the field revealed little data that
were concerned specifically with the two-year preparation program
in educational administration. Much of the data presented in this
study had to be gleaned from literature and studies that treated
total preparation programs. In an effort to identify specific in-
formation relative to the development of the two-year program,
a letter of inquiry was sent to an Associate Executive-Secretary of AASA. (Appendix A) His reply indicated that he had been "unable to discover the whereabouts of studies which might be of value." An unpublished study of residence requirements in UCEA member-institutions by William Monahan (64) was identified with the aid of a staff member in the Center for Educational Administration at The Ohio State University.

Primary data presented in Chapter II relative to the development and evaluation of two-year programs in educational administration were found in two national studies of the status of total preparation programs. Those studies were reported in the 1960 AASA yearbook, *Professional Administrators for America's Schools*, and the 1964 CASA publication, *The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools*. In the latter document, a detailed analysis of the two-year program was included in an appendix because of the rapid emergence of the program. (36, pp. 57-59)

Although writers in the professional literature concern themselves with the concept of the two-year program in educational administration, they indicate little evidence of actual research of such programs. They appear to draw conclusions regarding the two-year programs from studies conducted with other more-established programs.

3. The purposes advanced for the national two-year preparation program in educational administration and those advanced for The Ohio State University Specialist Program in Educational Administration are basically one and the same. According to
the literature, the objective proposed by the national professional organization for the two-year program was to increase the professionalization of school administrators by offering the opportunity to the practicing administrator to "fill in gaps" in his professional preparation program through planned programs of post-master's study. The program leading to the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration at this University was described as one designed for the practitioner in the field who wished to pursue an organized program of graduate study beyond the master's level, but did not contemplate a doctoral program. (51, p. 2) Both purposes, it appears, are aimed at the concept of providing a program of continuing education beyond the master's level for the practitioner, emphasizing the values of increasing the professional competence of that practitioner.

Data gathered at the interviews with the faculty advisers of the specialist graduates provided evidence of agreement with the above purpose. All six professors generally agreed that the specialist program was intended to offer a planned program for the practitioner who wanted to continue his education for self-improvement beyond the master's level, who wanted to advance his professional competency, but who did not contemplate a doctoral program.

4. The concern for the professionalization of practicing school administrators is increasing. The fact that the number of colleges and universities offering two-year graduate preparation
programs designed primarily for practitioners in school administration increased from 79 in 1958 to 114 in 1962 provides evidence of this concern. The membership requirement of two years of planned graduate study imposed by the AASA, its subsequent adoption by approximately 90 per cent of the state affiliates, and its endorsement by state departments of education and state school board associations as described in Chapter II attests to this concern. Finally, increased state certification requirements for administrative positions, as described in Figure 2, and the creation of programs designed primarily to increase the professional competence of the practicing administrator by institutions such as The Ohio State University give further evidence of this growing concern.

Major forces, problems, and issues related to the program development as identified in the literature and as perceived by the graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University

The following conclusions have been developed by this writer during the examination of major forces, problems and issues related to the development of the two-year graduate programs in educational administration:

1. The major force permeating the entire development of the two-year graduate preparation program in educational administration was the increasing demand for the professionalization of school administrators. Writers in the literature cited factors contributing to this demand as: (1) the problem of supply and
demand caused by World War II and by the consolidation of school districts into larger, more complex units, and (2) the continuously increasing demand for evidence of more and more formal academic training to qualify for administrative certification by state departments of education. Perhaps the most significant action identified in the literature as having an impact on the movements to advance the professionalization of school administrators was the action taken by AASA in 1959 in its adoption of the new membership requirement, as proposed by CASA. The impact of the requirement was greatly augmented by the subsequent adoption of the membership requirement by approximately 90 per cent of the state administrator associations and by the endorsement of state school board associations and state departments of education. The necessity to meet this requirement was cited as a reason for making changes in the Ohio State University program in a meeting of the Committee on Educational Administration and the Field Advisory Panel in 1959.

This demand for increased professionalization was recognized by both the graduates of the specialist program and their advisers when they cited motivations for selecting the specialist program, strengths of the program, and values of the program. Seven of the graduates indicated that they selected the program for reasons of self-improvement and continuing education. Six said that it offered a planned program of study with a goal. Five graduates reported that the value of the program was in the opportunity for the refinement of administrative skills and the application
of theory to practice. Faculty advisers suggested that the unique values of the program were to be found in providing an opportunity for the extension of formal education when the master's was not completely adequate because of the demand for more and more continuing education. They also said the program had value because it provided the student an opportunity to update his knowledge of administrative skills and processes and in the task area developments.

Commonalities and differences in candidates' personal characteristics, experience background motivations for entering the specialist program, program experiences, and post-program experiences

Conclusions related to the above study purposes can be made on the basis of support by data from the interviews, graduates' records, and the literature; and through the implications of these data.

1. Students who have gone through the program are overwhelmingly oriented toward public school administration, are interested in cooperating to strengthen and improve the preparation program for future students, and are generally interested in advancing the professionalization of school administration. Data included in Table 4 obtained from interviews with the former students, show that nineteen of the twenty-one graduates interviewed continued in practitioner positions in the field of public education following the completion of their specialist program. One of the remaining two graduates took a position in the State Department
of Education; the other took a position outside the field of education. The graduates' continuing interest both in improving the program and in advancing the professionalization of school administration is supported by two factors. One definite supporting factor is inherent in the fact that 100 per cent of the persons contacted participated in the study during a very busy season of the school year. Further evidence of this professionalism was evident in the positive and constructive nature of the respondents' reactions to the questions posed in the personal interviews.

2. The interdisciplinary approach in preparing school administrators, as advocated by writers in the professional literature, was perceived as a valuable part of the program by the graduates. Most of the graduates reacted positively to the "outside area" requirement of the specialist program. The criticisms that they had of the experiences in those areas were directed at the instructors rather than at the courses themselves. The experiences were generally rated as very valuable or useful. One graduate said it was valuable because "it forces one outside of education." Others commented favorably of the courses they had taken in the behavioral and social sciences as they rated the value of "interdisciplinary seminar experiences" on the Graduate Interview Schedule. (Appendix B) One adviser suggested that the outside area requirement should be retained, but that it should be a broad field seminar approach rather than the typical course work approach.
3. The primary appeal of the specialist program to the graduates prior to entrance into the program was two-fold. An appeal was seen in the opportunity for continuing education with a visible goal in the form of a certificate. A second appeal of the program was that it provided an alternative for persons who wanted additional formal training, but who wanted to avoid certain specific requirements of the doctoral program. Examination of the data regarding the graduates' stated motivations for selecting the specialist program shows that the majority of the graduates selected this program rather than the doctoral program primarily because they did not want to fulfill the full-year residence requirement. The financial problem cited by eight additional graduates appeared to be directly related to leaving the practitioner position to complete the year-long residence. The foreign language requirement was not as imposing as was anticipated by the writer, since it was cited as a factor by only two graduates.

4. Generally, the specialist graduates did not do an on-campus residence; they merely took a required number of courses during a given quarter. An on-campus residence requirement is generally considered to involve a period of time during which a student devotes full-time to study without concurrent extra-university employment. Interviews with the specialist graduates indicated, however, that only four of the twenty-one respondents had completed the residence as a full-time student on campus, while not working at another job. Seventeen were working in their district administrative positions and one was employed by a private business firm.
All but one of the graduates fulfilled their residence requirement during a summer quarter. The fact that the majority of the graduates were employed and commuting at the same time they were fulfilling the residence may account for the fact that they generally indicated that the requirement was not necessary and that it was a burden and a hardship for them. Comparative data from this study and that of Yarnell (87, p. 71) would appear to indicate that the two groups had very different kinds of residence experiences.

Evidence provided in the data from the interviews with the faculty advisers appears to substantiate this conclusion. All six advisers indicated that they felt the specialist's residence, as currently established was meaningless. It was pointed out that the associations and contacts with other students and professors, which really constitute the values of a residence period, could not be provided in a summer quarter while the student was working on the job and commuting.

5. There were many varied informal aspects of the program, not required, which had a considerable value according to the graduates. Although several of the interviewees said they did not have the opportunity to participate in many of the informal activities because they were commuting and working on the job in the school, the greatest majority said that they felt they had received value from informal activities. The most frequently-mentioned informal aspects were related to the practicum series. Such things as committee work, the opportunity to compare and contrast ideas informally, friendships and social contacts developed,
and the informal discussions during dinner were cited frequently as very beneficial. It was this type of informal association and contact with other students and professors that was cited by the faculty advisers as the major value of a residence period. These data would appear to support the concept that the practicum series was fulfilling a kind of residence experience for the specialists by providing for and fostering these informal relationships.

6. There is little evidence to indicate that there are recommended individualized programs of courses for specialization within the areas of educational administration in the specialist program at The Ohio State University. Examination of the data presented in Table 10, which is the tabulation of the courses taken by the graduates during both their master's and specialist programs according to available records, indicates that there were apparently no recommended or required specialized programs for these students in view of the kinds of positions they took. Apparently the courses were scheduled according to availability of courses as listed in a time schedule and according to the perceived needs of the students, individually, as was indicated by several of the graduates during the interviews.

A comparison of data regarding courses in educational administration taken by the specialist and doctoral graduates, as shown in Table 17, seems to indicate little apparent difference in specialization from one program to the other.

Data reported in the interviews with the graduates and their advisers supported this conclusion. The need for more
program structure, for programs of specialization within areas of educational administration, and for earlier planning of programs was one of the most frequently-mentioned areas of major weakness in the specialist program reported by the graduates. They recommended that specialized programs be developed for the various technical areas within the realm of school administration. Faculty advisers criticized the program as being "just a bunch of courses, not a program" and "course-segmented, if we glue enough courses together we have a program." Four of their sixteen recommendations (25 per cent) for improving the program included proposals directly related to this concern. It was suggested that special programs for special positions should be developed. Another recommendation proposed that programs be developed for certain "target-audiences." A third recommendation was that the program should be used to provide people with special competencies for specialized jobs. Finally, it was proposed that the program should be rethought with other specialized departments of the College of Education.

This generally-perceived weakness of the lack of specialized preparation programs, when coupled with the trend in our society for professionalization and specialization, cannot be avoided. It suggests a definite need for revision of the program and the development of specialized programs within the area of school administration, in conjunction with specialized areas of the College of Education.
7. Although there is an apparent need for constant evaluation of course offerings in the area of educational administration in order to maintain a meaningful relationship to the dynamic nature of this professional field, the course evaluations made by the graduates of the specialist program are useful only as general guides toward central tendency. It is especially apparent to the writer because of his position as Graduate Research Associate in the Center for Educational Administration that there is a constant staff concern for program evaluation. Student opinions of course value may be useful in program evaluation; however, their rating of a course on any given scale may reflect a number of factors which should be considered. The individual's background and experience and his motives for taking a course may affect his rating of its value. The length of time elapsed between the time of the rating and the time when the student took the course may alter his perceptions of it. The course titles and content may have changed considerably since the student took the course, so that his rating would not be applicable to the current situation. Personality differences between instructors and students, as well as the effect of visiting professors, were mentioned by the graduates as having an effect on their ratings. In light of this multiplicity of influencing factors, the student course evaluations reported in Table 10 should be used only as a screening device in measuring central tendency. It was also felt by the writer that this evaluation sample was generally not large enough, nor the ratings specific enough, to be used otherwise.
A notable exception might be the evaluation of the practicum series, which was rated as "very valuable" by sixteen of the eighteen students who took the course. It should also be noted that this practicum is not presently offered to students enrolled in the specialist program.

8. The practicum series and its concomitant experiences tended to be recognized as one of the most valuable phases of the program by the graduates. The practicum series and its related field studies were mentioned by thirteen graduates as a major strength of the program. In the graduates' evaluations of courses taken in the program, the rating of the practicum was impressively higher than that of the other courses. Thirteen students indicated that it was very valuable and should be retained as it was. Three more rated it as very valuable, should be strengthened or updated.

Evidence has shown that the practicum series is no longer available to the specialist student and that the content and intent of the current offering have changed from that of the original course. Although the advisers generally agreed that the current practicum should not be available to the specialist student, only one of the six indicated that no similar type of experience should be required for the program. He felt that such a requirement was not realistic because of the limited number of specialist students in the program.

9. The Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University has tended to be a terminal formal educational program for those who have completed it. Nineteen
of the graduates indicated that they have taken no additional university course work since completing their specialist program, although several indicated that they had attended School Management Institute Conferences. Only two have continued on to work toward the doctorate. Although the people involved in this study did continue their formal professional education beyond the master's level, the fact that only two have taken additional university work seems to suggest a need for a different kind of orientation for the continuing education efforts of colleges and universities, as related to professional school administrators, than the traditional credit-course concept. The informal workshop and conference may provide both the academic and the informal experiences needed to advance their professional competency.

10. Compared to the doctoral graduate at The Ohio State University, the specialist student is different. He is generally older and occupies an administrative position in a public school system. He also tends to have somewhat different perceptions of the residence and of the written project requirements than did the Ph. D. graduate. The study of the doctoral program by Yarnell (87) provided the basis for comparison of the doctoral graduate with the specialist graduate. The age range of the specialist graduate was from 35 to 68 with a median of 39, while the ages of the doctoral graduates ranged from 28 to 50 with a median age of 35. (87, p. 63) The positions occupied by 90 per cent of the specialist graduates after graduation were in the public schools, 60 per cent of the doctoral graduates were in college positions at the time
The most prominent examples of the varying opinions of the graduates of the two preparation programs regarding requirements were found in their reactions to the residence requirement and to the written project and dissertation requirement. Over half of the graduates interviewed indicated that their one-quarter of residence was a hardship and a burden to them. The general reaction of the specialist graduates was that such a requirement was not necessary. Yarnell (87, p. 142) concluded that it seemed to be universally agreed by the doctoral graduates that the full-time residence was one of the most valuable aspects of the program.

Differences were apparent in the reported perceptions of the graduates regarding the specialist written project requirement and the doctoral dissertation. An analysis of the topics of the specialist projects showed that all had been field-oriented and directly related to problems the graduates were working with in their administrative positions. One hundred per cent of the specialist graduates indicated that they felt the written project had been a valuable experience because of its practical, problem-oriented nature. Many of them indicated that the results of their project efforts had been of continuing value to them and to their school districts. Yarnell (87, p. 77) reported some variation in the perceptions of the doctoral students regarding the value of the dissertation project. Nine of the doctoral graduates reported little value in the project except for the process of research and writing. Eight perceived some value in it. Fifteen ratings were
given as valuable and eight as very valuable. The topics of the
dissertations were reported to be directly related to major areas
of interest, or to the minor areas of study. The very nature of
the topics of the projects may partially explain the generally higher
rating given the written project by the specialist as compared to
the rating by the doctoral graduate. The specialist was actually
relating his project to his job and making direct utilization of its
results in most cases. The doctoral students were studying major
and minor areas of interest and concern, but apparently were not
able to make direct application of their study results to an active
situation.

Appraisal of the Specialist Program in
Educational Administration at The Ohio
State University; including its major
strengths and weaknesses, as perceived
by the graduates of the program

1. The Specialist Program in Educational Administration
at The Ohio State University is basically serving its stated purpose
of providing an opportunity for practicing administrators who do
not plan to continue on for the doctorate to pursue an organized
program of study beyond the master's degree. According to the
data gathered in this study, all but two of the graduates interviewed
have been practitioners in public schools, and have continued in
similar positions following completion of the program. Only two
graduates have continued to work for the doctorate. The faculty
advisers expressed a concern that the basic purpose of this program
was intended to aid the practitioner. They were explicit in stating that the selection procedures of the program were undertaken with this purpose in mind.

2. Generally, the study indicates that the objectives of the program are being achieved as perceived and rated by the graduates and their advisers. The data presented in Tables 11 and 14 provide evidence to support this conclusion. The majority of the graduates indicated that they felt their competency had been advanced in all prescribed areas except one by the specialist program experiences. Half or more of the faculty advisers interviewed reported that they perceived advancement in all but three competency areas while the student was in the specialist program. At least one or more of the advisers felt that competencies had been advanced in all areas.

The professional competency areas were not advanced equally by the program as indicated by the graduates and their advisers. Differences in the individual experience background, training, self-perception, and course patterns taken during the program may account for some of these differences. Both graduates and their advisers reported that it was difficult to divorce the influences of the program experiences from the concurrent job-oriented experiences and other unknowns in their evaluation of the perceived advancement and relative value due to the program.

3. The title, Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration, may be a contributing factor to the lack of program identification and recognition reported by the graduates and their
advisers. According to the literature and to the perceptions of the specialist graduates and their advisers, program identification and recognition has been one of the major problem areas in the development of the two-year graduate program. Factors that contribute to this problem have been reported in Chapter II. The fact that eight different titles have been used to designate these programs in eighty-five institutions was felt to have added to the confusion surrounding the issue. The problem has been further compounded by the fact that state departments of education have markedly increased the number of separate-named certificates in recent years as shown in Table 1. According to one faculty adviser, a problem exists at this University related to certificate programs. He reported that he felt that the number of different certificates awarded, some within the Graduate School and some outside of it, depreciated Ohio State's specialist certificate. The claim was made by the majority of the specialist graduates that people did not know what the program was or what it involved. This lack of recognition and identification was cited as a major weakness of the program by the graduates.

4. An investigation of the criticisms, recommendations, values, strengths and weaknesses as cited by program graduates and by their faculty advisers led to the conclusion that much of the criticism of the program is not directed at the intent of the program, rather that it is directed at the institutionalized form of the program; and that a reassessment of form and procedures of the program is drastically needed. Little argument can be
found that there is not a need for a program of continuing inservice education for practicing school administrators. Both advisers and graduates indicated the values of programs of continuing education beyond the master's level for practitioners in school administration because of demands for increased professionalization and self-improvement.

Criticisms of the program were directed primarily toward a lack of program structure, a lack of recognition, and the content of certain task area courses by the graduates. During the interviews, advisers of specialist graduates agreed unanimously that the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University should not continue to be an active program as it currently exists. They suggested that evaluation of the program was needed and that the program "should be continually changing and redesigned." Recommendations of the advisers included suggestions for revising: (1) the recruitment and selection procedures, (2) the residency requirements, (3) the program goals and objectives, (4) the structure of the program, and (5) the adviser-advisee relationship concept.

Perhaps questions should be raised as to: what institutions should provide such programs; what structure and what form should the programs take; and who should be involved in the planning and implementation of such programs.
Recommendations

Although the sample considered in the study was relatively small, it was composed of those persons who have been most closely associated with the development of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University. It was composed of the "practitioner-expert" program graduates and the faculty members who advised them through their preparation programs. On the basis of the findings of this study a number of recommendations are suggested by the writer for consideration by those persons who have the responsibility for future preparation program revisions in pertinent areas of study.

1. It is recommended that a formal faculty evaluation of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration be made. Primary consideration should be given to the question of whether or not The Ohio State University should continue to offer a two-year graduate program leading to the Specialist Certificate in Educational Administration.

2. It is recommended that opportunities for the continuing inservice education of practicing school administrators beyond the master's degree level be provided through the University, with or without a specialist program.

3. It is recommended that additional thought be given to the requirement of six hours in courses outside the area of education. The full resources of the University should be made available and utilized in the implementation of this interdisciplinary approach to continuing inservice education.
4. It is recommended that a revision of the existing one-quarter residence requirement, as it is now interpreted, be considered. A full-time experience that would require an on-campus residence and a release from extra-university job responsibilities during the residence period should be considered. This would provide a total educational experience including the informal associations and contacts with other students and professors that many students missed when they commuted to a job from school.

5. It is recommended that the concept of the specialist program be reconsidered in conjunction with other specialised areas of the College and the University. Emphasis could thus be given to preparing people with specialized competencies for specialized jobs. Some suggested special areas for consideration might be: curriculum, data processing, evaluation, pupil personnel, and business organization. A specialized program should also be considered by the Academic Faculty of Educational Administration for the continuing inservice education of the generalist superintendent of schools at a level beyond the master's degree, but less than the doctorate.

6. It is recommended that consideration be given to further individualization of program requirements in order that the program could be tailor-made to fit the needs of the individual student within his intended area of specialization.

7. It is recommended that consideration be given to the re-establishment of a multi-quarter practicum-type experience for the two-year program student. The object of this seminar.
type experience would be to utilize a problem-oriented approach with little structure, in which the emphasis would be on a cooperative method of problem-investigation and problem-solving. The opportunity would thus be provided for the student to apply theory to practical situations in a coordinated and controlled environment.

8. It is recommended that consideration be given to the examination and possible revision or deletion of courses which the graduates have reported as being of questionable or little value.

9. It is suggested that no change be made in the policy regarding the written project requirement, and that it continue to have its emphasis on field-oriented topics that are directly related to problems the students are working with in their administrative positions.

10. It is recommended that consideration be given to altering the current titles of the program and of the certificate. The possibility of a coordinated identification of the two-year graduate program in educational administration at this University and other institutions, at least within this state, should be explored. The opportunity may thus be enhanced for the program to garner an identification, recognition, and status of its own.

11. It is recommended that consideration be given to establishing further coordination of the requirements of the University programs and the requirements of the State Department of Education for certification in the specialized areas of preparation. Such coordination would aid in reducing some of the confusion surrounding the mass of certificates issued by the State and by
the University, and would aid in establishing the identity and rec-
ognition of the program.

12. It is recommended that some consideration be given to the re-establishment of a field-advisory panel composed of practicing school administrators. Such a panel could be used both as a sounding-board for program development and evaluation, and as a communications liaison agent between the University faculty and other practitioners in the field.

13. It is recommended that consideration be given to the utilization of the professional school administrator associations as two-way communications agents: (1) to disseminate information regarding the two-year program to members of the profession, (2) to advertise the purposes and objectives of the program, and (3) to provide an impersonal information feedback mechanism from the professional field to the University officials who have the responsibility for developing, evaluating, and updating the professional preparation program.

14. It is recommended that consideration be given to establishing periodic follow-up studies of the graduates of the preparation programs in educational administration at The Ohio State University to aid in program evaluation and revision.

Implications for Further Study

On the basis of the findings of this study the following suggestions are made for further research.
1. The sample of this study was limited to the two-year graduate preparation program in educational administration at The Ohio State University. A study of similar preparation programs being offered by other colleges and universities in Ohio might be undertaken.

2. A study of the two-year programs in educational administration in UCEA member-institutions might be performed. Such a study on the broader national base of these prominent institutions in the field of school administration would be a valuable contribution to the fund of knowledge regarding these programs.

3. A status study of preparation programs for the superintendency was made nationally in 1962-1963. The replication of such a study might be conducted to aid in determining progress, changes, and needs of such programs.

4. A study of the status and role of planned two-year graduate preparation programs in educational administration as perceived by members of the state administrator associations might yield useful professional insight into changing professional needs and concerns.

5. A study of the perceptions of school board members relative to two-year preparation programs in educational administration might be valuable.

6. A study might be conducted to identify areas in which there is a need for specialized preparation programs in educational administration beyond the master's level. Practitioners in school administration at various administrative levels might be involved.
7. Additional study might be utilized in further development and refinement of methods of predicting success in school administration for use in the recruitment and selection procedures of participating institutions.

8. Differences in the perception of the value of recent developments in preparing school administrators were reported by the graduates in this study. A number of these developments, such as the use of simulated problems, field studies of total educational programs, and interdisciplinary seminar experiences, have been incorporated into the program at The Ohio State University. Studies of those that have been utilized could be undertaken to determine their relative effectiveness and utility as perceived by the students and/or the faculty.

9. Faculty advisers and graduates reported that the problem of program identification and recognition was compounded by the number of certificates issued by the University and by the State Department of Education. A study might be performed to identify those certificate programs, the program requirement similarities and differences, and the degree of coordination that exists between the Institutions and the State regarding apparently similar programs.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

STUDY CORRESPONDENCE
Letter to Graduates

The Ohio State University Center for Educational Administration has operated a program for the preparation of Educational Specialists for approximately ten years. An important phase of the operation of any professional preparation program is its periodic evaluation and up-dating in respect to the changing needs of the students and the demands of the profession. The graduates of the program are especially well-suited to make an important contribution to such an effort. Having completed the program, and having experienced professional demands in the field, you and other graduates are able to look back objectively and point out strengths and weaknesses in your preparation.

The staff in the Center for Educational Administration has expressed a sincere interest in such an appraisal. The graduates of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration from 1962 to date are being asked to participate in the study.

Within the week I will be contacting you to request a personal interview in which you will be asked for your frank opinions or reactions to the Specialist Program, and your suggestions for improving it.

The group of graduates is not large, and I sincerely ask your cooperation in this evaluation. The results of the study will be reported in the form of a dissertation directed by Dr. Roy A. Larmee. Your responses will be held in strict confidence, and the participants will not be identified in any way.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Beidler
Research Associate

REB:jd
January 12, 1968

Dr. William Monahan  
College of Education  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dear Dr. Monahan:

Dr. Fred Staub here in the Center for Educational Administration has suggested that I write to you. He said that he recalls talking with you about the need for an evaluation of the Specialist in Educational Administration programs which have arisen in many institutions because of the AASA membership requirements.

I am currently the research associate in the Center and am investigating, because of a Center staff and personal interest in a potential dissertation topic, this area which centers upon this 6th year planned-program, with special emphasis upon our program here.

If you have information regarding the recent evaluation of such a program, either in written or in bibliographical form, or both; I would be very appreciative if you would send it to me.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Beidler  
Research Associate  
Center for Educational Administration  
29 W. Woodruff Ave.  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Robert E. Beidler, Research Associate
Center for Educational Administration
29 W. Woodruff Avenue
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Beidler:

I am most apologetic for not responding to your letter of January 12 before this; as you well know, however, this being the "meeting" season many of us are a bit behind in our correspondence:

I do remember talking with Dr. Staub about the need for an assessment of the specialist programs but we are not currently engaged in any such evaluation nor am I aware of any similar assessments that are now being conducted. I will be speaking with a number of people during the meetings of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, and the American Association of School Administrators annual meeting in Atlantic City and if I hear of any such work in progress I will make notes of it and forward them to you.

Again, I am sorry for the delay in responding and more so for the fact that I have no information that would be useful to you.

Cordially yours,

William G. Monahan
Professor in Educational Administration

WGM:df
Mr. Bob Beidler, Research Associate
Center for Educational Administration
The Ohio State University
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio

Dear Mr. Beidler:

Recently Professor Frederick Staub corresponded with me with reference to an informal survey that I made regarding the Ed. S. Degree. It seems to me that I misunderstood the nature of the information in which he was interested; I was trying to discover whether or not there was a general agreement on the residence requirement for the Ed. S. Degree. I have found that material and I talked with Dr. Staub on the telephone inquiring whether or not he thought you would be interested in it. I am enclosing this information and the letter that I received in response to my inquiry. Please feel free to use these materials any way you desire; I would like them returned when they are of no more use to you.

If there is anything else that I can do to be of service to you please let me know. When you finish your study, I would be most interested in receiving an abstract.

Cordially yours,

William G. Monahan, Professor
Educational Administration

WGM:df

Enc.
April 7, 1968

Mr. James Kirkpatrick, Associate Executive Secretary
American Association of School Administrators
National Education Association
1201 16th St., NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

I am doing an evaluation study of the Specialist Program in Educational Administration, sometimes referred to as the "Sixth-Year" program, at The Ohio State University via the program graduates, as a dissertation project. My advisor, Dr. Roy Larmee, suggested that I write to you to ask if you know of, or have access to through the AASA; studies of the sixth-year programs in educational administration.

Secondly, it was also suggested by Dr. Larmee that AASA might have a position statement regarding sixth-year preparation programs in educational administration, since many of the universities developed programs at this level to aid administrators in meeting the 1964 AASA membership requirement of a two-year planned graduate program, at least apparently.

Any assistance you can provide me regarding materials and information about the studies and/or an AASA position statement, if such exists, on the sixth-year level program would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Beidler
Research Associate
Mr. Robert E. Beidler  
Research Associate  
The Ohio State University  
29 W. Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Beidler:

In response to your letter of inquiry concerning Specialist Programs in Educational Administration: (1) I have been unable to discover the whereabouts of studies which might be of value to you; (2) AASA depends largely on NCATE's findings as they relate to accreditation; and (3) I am enclosing some materials which you may be able to use.

I regret that I cannot be of more assistance.

Best wishes.

Very truly yours,

James R. Kirkpatrick  
Associate Secretary

Enclosures
APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP
American Association of School Administrators
1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

I hereby apply for membership in the American Association of School Administrators and enclose $20.00 dues for the calendar year 19__, of which $2.00 is for a subscription to The School Administrator.

Name: (Please print)
Mr. □ Mrs. □ Miss □
First Middle Last

Present position: ___________________________ Exact title ___________________________ Dist. No.: ______________

Official name of institution or school district: ___________________________ Street ___________________________
City State ZIP Code
Dist. No.: ___________________________

Office address: Street ___________________________ City State ZIP Code ___________________________

Home address: Street ___________________________ City State ZIP Code ___________________________

I have held my present position since: ___________ I replaced: ___________
Month Year

Date: ___________________________
Signature of Applicant

☐ I am applying for ASSOCIATE membership, which entitles me to the following benefits and privileges for the calendar year: I may take an active part in the affairs of the Association, may attend and participate in the convention, and will receive all publications, benefits and privileges that are sent or accorded to members.

☐ I am applying for ACTIVE membership, which in addition to all benefits and privileges listed above, entitles me to the right to carry life membership, vote, and hold office.

☐ Must be signed by: Dean, School of Education; or Head, Department of Administration; or President or Registrar of College; or a college or university official holding a comparable position.

In accordance with the AASA constitution, applicants for ACTIVE membership must have the following completed and signed by an appropriate university official.

I hereby certify that the applicant has successfully completed a two-year program of graduate study in school administration at ___________________________ College or University ___________________________
which is approved for the sixth-year or doctoral level in the area by NCATE.

Date ___________________________ Signature ___________________________
Name ___________________________ Position ___________________________

PLEASE COMPLETE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM
— OVER —
**AASA MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS**

ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP is open to persons holding an administrative position in a local, intermediate, or state school system, college, university, or educational organization, and to professors of education and educational administration in institutions training administrators.

All new applicants for active membership must submit evidence of successful completion of at least two years of graduate study in educational administration in an institution of higher learning accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP is open to any interested person. Associate members receive all publications sent to members, may attend the convention, and shall be entitled to all the privileges and benefits of this Association except the right to carry life membership, vote and hold office. School systems, libraries, and other organizations wishing to receive publications may carry ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP.

NEA membership is a prerequisite.

---

**PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earned degree</th>
<th>Year granted</th>
<th>Full name of college or university</th>
<th>City and state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honorary degree
APPENDIX B

GRADUATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
1. Title of position prior to Specialist Certificate _______________________
   Employer __________________ Enrollment __________________
   Salary __________________

b. Title of position following Certificate ____________________________
   Enrollment _______ Employer _____________ Salary ______
   How was position obtained?
   (Own initiative, Placement Office, Professor, Promotion)

Other positions held since Specialist Certificate, beginning with most recent:

c. Title of Position ________________________ Enrollment ____________
   Employer _____________________________ Salary _____________
   How was position obtained?

d. Title of position ________________________ Enrollment ________
   Employer _____________________________ Salary ________
   How was position obtained?

2. What were your areas of study outside of education? How would you evaluate these on a scale: (1) Very valuable, (2) Useful but not vital, (3) Little value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Outside of Education</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Why did you enter the Specialist Program in Educational Administration rather than some other preparation program offered?

4a. How did you do your period of residence? (e.g., fulltime student, research assistant, employed by school district)

b. What is your reaction to the one quarter of required residence?
5. What do you feel were the major strengths of your preparation program?

6. What do you feel were its major weaknesses?

7. How long a period of time did it require to complete your specialist program?

8. What kind of an experience background do you feel is desirable for a student beginning a specialist program in educational administration?

9a. Did your experience before entrance into the program include administrative responsibilities? ___Yes ___No.

b. If so, at what level and for how long?

10a. How do you feel about the entrance requirements and screening of applicants? Were they unduly restrictive, or should they be more selective?

b. What suggestions for change would you offer to increase their effectiveness?

11a. What was the topic of your specialist written project?

b. What value do you see in it, in terms of your subsequent professional responsibilities?

12a. Were there aspects of the program, while informal in nature, and not required, which had value? Examples of these may be the Men's Round-up, inter-disciplinary seminars, study groups, and simulation workshops. ___Yes ___No

b. Which, if any, had particular value to you? (The above list is not intended to be exhaustive.)
13a. What kind of relationship did you have with your adviser?

b. Do you feel that enough opportunities were given, formally and informally, for conferences with him? ____Yes ____No

14a. Some of the more recent developments in preparing administrators are listed below. Give your opinion of their value as follows: (1) Very promising practice. Should be incorporated as a requirement. (2) Valuable. Should be encouraged as an optional experience. (3) Valuable, but not equally valuable to all programs. (4) Little value.

__________ (a) Administrative internships
__________ (b) Simulated problems, such as the "in-basket materials."
__________ (c) Interdisciplinary seminar experiences.
__________ (d) Field studies of total educational programs.
__________ (e) Exploration of newer administrative technologies, e.g., data processing and modular scheduling.
__________ (f) Wider use of practicing administrators as guest professors, lecturers, and resource people.

b. Are there others you would suggest which might be considered?

15. Listed below are courses often included as part of the program in educational administration for specialist students and others. They are in random order. Indicate your opinion of the value of these courses in light of the professional responsibilities which you have encountered. Rate only those courses which you took. In the spaces at the end, list other courses which you took which you feel were either very valuable or of questionable value. (indicate which) Use numbers as follows:

(1) Very valuable. Should be retained as it is.
(2) Very valuable. Should be strengthened or up-dated.
(3) Valuable. Should be retained.
(4) Questionable value as it is offered. Should be examined.
(5) Little or no value. Should be dropped.
### Organization and Administration

- (a) Introduction to Administration
- (b) Introduction to Principalship
- (c) Elementary Principalship
- (d) Secondary Principalship
- (e) Administrative Theory
- (f) Seminars-Problems, Trends
- (g) Superintendency
- (h) City School Administration
- (i) Pupil Personnel Administration

### Curriculum

- (s) General
- (t) Elementary
- (u) Secondary
- (v) Exceptional Children

### Supervision

- (w) Elementary
- (x) Secondary

### Foundations

- (y) Social
- (z) Educational Psychology
- (aa) History of Education
- (bb) Philosophy of Education
- (cc) Child Psychology
- (dd) Comparative Education

### Research

- (ee) Methods and Design
- (ff) Projects or Thesis
- (gg) Tests and Measurements
- (hh) Statistics
- (ii) Educational Experimentation

### Field Experience

- (jj) Study Project
- (kk) Internship
- (ll) Surveys

### Other Courses

---

---

---

---

### 16a. The objectives of the preparation programs in educational administration at OSU have been stated as "competencies needed by educational administrators." Do you feel that your specialist program advanced your professional competency in these areas?

Please indicate your opinion for each "competency area:"

1. Possession in reasonable degree of appropriate personal attributes and of a disposition to improve them.  
   - Yes  
   - No

2. Understandings, attitudes, and skills resulting from an adequate general education (including skill in written English).  
   - Yes  
   - No
3. An understanding of the role of the school in the social order.  __Yes  __No

4. An ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action and a disposition to use this ability.  __Yes  __No

5. An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development.  __Yes  __No

6. Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration.  __Yes  __No

7. Understandings and skills in the administrative process.  __Yes  __No

8. An ability to apply sound problem-solving procedures to school concerns and a disposition to use this ability.  __Yes  __No

9. An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgements.  __Yes  __No

10. An ability to understand one's own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people and a disposition to use this ability.  __Yes  __No

11. An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others and a disposition to use these abilities.  __Yes  __No

b. In which competency areas do you feel your specialist program aided you most?

In which competency areas do you feel your specialist program aided you least?

17. If you were talking with a person who has a master's degree and is considering the specialist program, what would you suggest as the values of this program?
18. Would you have any (a) criticisms and/or (b) recommendations that we haven't discussed which would help improve the program and better prepare this person for his professional tasks?

a.

b.

19. Have you taken further university training since completing the specialist program? Yes No. If YES, why did you take the training, and what was its nature?

20. In your opinion, what professional status is accorded the specialist preparation program by these groups? (1) Very High (2) High (3) Average (4) Low (5) Very Low

____ (a) Practicing Administrators
____ (b) Boards of Education
____ (c) Professors of Educational Administration

21. Are you a member of:

AASA Yes No
CASA Yes No
APPENDIX C

PROFESSOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
PROFESSOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Personal Data:
   a. Name_____________________________________________________
   b. Years at OSU in Educational Administration_____________________
   c. Number of specialist advisees "graduated"_______________________
   d. Estimated percentage of specialist program enrollees and/or advisees who complete the program and graduate:
      _______ enrollees _________ advisees
   e. Do you feel that you have had enough time for conferences, either formally or informally, with your specialist advisees?
      _____Yes _____No

2a. The objectives of the preparation programs in educational administration at OSU have been stated as "Competencies Needed by Educational Administrators." Do you feel that the specialist program at OSU uniquely advances the competency of the students in these areas?

   Please indicate your opinion for each "competency area:"

   1) Possession in reasonable degree of appropriate personal attributes and of a disposition to improve them. ______Yes ______No

   2) Understandings, attitudes, and skills resulting from an adequate general education (including skill in written English). ______Yes ______No

   3) An understanding of the role of the school in the social order. ______Yes ______No

   4) An ability to cooperate with other people in planning, executing, and evaluating courses of action and a disposition to use this ability. ______Yes ______No

   5) An understanding of the instructional program and skills in curriculum development. ______Yes ______No

   6) Understandings and skills in the task areas of educational administration. ______Yes ______No

   7) Understandings and skills in the administrative process. ______Yes ______No
8) An ability to apply sound problem-solving procedures to school concerns and a disposition to use this ability. __Yes __No

9) An inclination to act in terms of conscious value judgments. __Yes __No

10) An ability to understand one's own motivations for action and how they affect his way of working with other people and a disposition to use this ability. __Yes __No

11) An ability to lead lay and professional people in considering the continuing improvement of the school and community, and the ability to discover and promote such leadership in others and a disposition to use these abilities. __Yes __No

b. In which competency areas do you feel the specialist program is providing the most value to the student?

c. In which competency areas do you feel the specialist program is providing the least value to the student?

3a. Are there differences in the recruitment, selection, preparation and program determination procedures for the specialist from the Ph. D. program? __Yes __No

b. If YES, what do you feel some of the differences are, and why do they exist?

4. For what kind of students is the specialist program designed, in your opinion?

5. Is the specialist program a terminal program? __Yes __No Should it be?

6. What is your reaction to the one quarter of required residence for the specialist program?
7. In your opinion, what professional status is accorded the specialist preparation program by the following groups:
   (1) Very High (2) High (3) Average (4) Low (5) Very Low
   _______ (a) Practicing Administrators
   _______ (b) Boards of Education
   _______ (c) Specialist Graduates
   _______ (d) Professors of Educational Administration

8a. It is my understanding that the practicum is no longer a requirement for the specialist program. How do you feel about this?

   b. (back-up) Should the practicum be rescheduled so as to be available to these students?

   c. (back-up) Should something be required in its place? What?

9. A charge of obsolescence has been leveled at the two-year "specialist" program in the literature. To what degree do you feel this is a fair charge?

10. What are some unique values of the specialist program?

11. Should the specialist program in educational administration continue to be an active program in this University as it now exists? ___Yes ___No

12. Do you have further specific criticisms or recommendations not embodied in the preceding questions which would help to improve the program, and/or better prepare its "graduates" for their professional tasks? (strengths-weaknesses)
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