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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Generic Problem Area

Over the last half century education has undergone significant changes. Educators must address extremes in social, political, philosophical, and economic forces within and between districts. Many have charged that education is out of control, students graduate as illiterates, and that teachers and administrators have little control over classrooms and schools. A great deal of concern has been expressed and much energy has been devoted to trying to understand the forces impacting education today and to identify the requirements of education for the future. This study is an in-depth analysis of one state's attempt to strengthen its capabilities of educational administrators.
Definition of Terms

State Education Agency (SEA)

The state education agency (SEA) is identified in this study as the combination of the state department of education, the state board of education, and the chief state school officer. This term was also used to include these same three components in State Governance Models for the Public Schools by Campbell, Mazzoni and O'Shea (1974). At times specific references are made in the text to the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and this is identified herein as the SEA. SEA is also used to refer to several state education agencies.

Post-secondary Institutions (PSI)

The post-secondary institutions (or the singular form, post-secondary institution) are Ohio's colleges and universities accredited to award graduate degrees in education and identified herein as PSI. PSI is also used to refer to several post secondary institutions.

Decision-making Process

This term is used to refer to the standardized process by which the SEA altered and controlled pre-service training. This term is synonymous with the
The public policy-making process. This SEA decision-making process is divided into discrete phases. The structure and procedures of each phase may vary. At times the participants are engaged in policy creation (initiation and prescription phases of SEA process 1977-1985) and at other times they are developing program proposals to meet the mandates developed in previous phases (invocation phase January, 1984-December, 1984). In some phases the SEA promotes emergent leadership (initiation and prescription phases), investing chairpersons with more formal powers and rewarding opinion leaders and allowing the entire process to develop on its own. At other times the SEA maintains strict control of formal powers (invocation phase), providing critical information to the PSI and allowing the PSI to react to new mandates and allowing slight alterations in SEA decisions.

The identification of the phases was made with the assistance of Dr. Robert Bowers and Dr. Paul Hailey, both of whom were Assistant Superintendents of Instruction with Ohio's SEA at the time of this study. These individuals were the primary organizers for the changes in administrative standards during the period.
of the study. They provided original documentation from each of the phases in order to identify the specific mandates and timelines.

Prior to Bowers's article written in 1988 there was no written description of the Ohio SEA's general decision-making process regarding changing teacher and administrator requirements. In this article he (1988) makes recommendations for the standardization of the process. Rather than identify the phases by name, he uses more generic descriptions of phases by stipulating the mandates of various task forces and advisory committees, and suggests timelines for the various steps.

Statement of Purpose

The process through which Ohio altered its administration certification standards for educators is important because 1) it is the prototypical process by which Ohio has instituted past state-wide educational reforms, and 2) systematic knowledge about the nature of the process may better enable all stakeholders in any future educational reform process to participate more effectively in the goal setting.
processing, and in the decision-making phases of the process.

Ohio's State Education Agency (SEA) used a process for administrative standards revision whereby the SEA created one new administrative certificate and revised 10 existing certificates. The process was divided into four discreet phases which the author identified as initiation, prescription, invocation and peer review.

The overall purpose of this study is to develop a descriptive and conceptual understanding of this public decision-making process. The first objective is to describe Ohio's SEA's standardized, but unwritten, procedures which are apparently used in all standards revisions for every educator in Ohio.

The second objective is to use the case study method to describe historically the structure, operation, and final recommendations of each phase of the administrative standards revision process occurring between 1977 and 1985, with special emphasis on the invocation phase (January, 1984 - December, 1984). The in-depth analysis of the invocation phase is viewed from the perspective of representatives of certain post-secondary institutions. The interviewees were
asked to describe and analyze the invocation phase with respect to the SEA as change agent and then with respect to the PSI acting as change agent within their own institutions. The interviewees were asked to identify elements that either facilitated or hindered their development of the program proposal in response to the changes in administrative standards. Furthermore, since Ohio's SEA is continually involved in using this public decision-making process to revise teacher and administrator standards, the interviewees were asked to make recommendations that would improve the process externally in their relationships to the SEA and internally for the PSI.

The third objective is conceptual in nature. The author developed a unique research strategy to study this decision-making process. As outlined in Chapter IV under conceptual design, various methods, frameworks, and techniques were combined and blended to form a unique and robust research study that incorporated various approaches. First, conceptual clusters were integrated and a conceptual framework across paradigms was created. Second, an analytical methodology was created, displayed, implemented,
examined, and revised that would aid in the description and critique of the decision-making process. Third, a data collection and integration system was created that permitted separation, categorization, and the charting of observations. Fourth, four levels of analysis were defined as a) level one - four similar SEA processes between 1953 - 1985), b) level two - the SEA process from 1977 - 1985), c) level three - the invocation phase (1984) with the SEA as change agent, and d) level four - the invocation phase (1984) with the PSI as change agent. Fifth, the conceptual framework and analytical methodology were combined with the data at each of the four levels to a) provide a conceptually grounded description of the SEA process (Chapter V), b) assess presence or absence of existing theoretical concepts and suggestions for inclusion of additional concepts (Chapter VII), and c) assess implications for the future as to the SEA process and internal PSI dynamics with respect to successful proposal development.
Research Questions

The development of the research questions follows from the statement of purpose. This study answers the following five categories of research questions:

1. How does Ohio's SEA usually conduct a standards revision process in light of goals, actors, procedures, and timing? (Chapter V)

2. Using a conceptual framework to examine the SEA's decision-making process (1977-1985), which concepts were present or absent. (Chapter VI)

3. Does the presence or absence of elements from the conceptual framework relate to success or failure of the PSI in initial proposal development during the invocation phase? (Chapter VI)

4. After combining supported elements of the initial conceptual framework with the new elements generated from the data, what should the reconstructed conceptual framework be? (Chapter VII)

5. Based upon the conceptual framework and empirical observations, what would be the implication for action that would best predict success throughout the process? (Chapter VII)

6. What are the conceptual and methodological implications of this research? (Chapter VII)

Significance of the Study

Compared to other states, Ohio's State Department of Education is distinctive in that it has established a leadership role in mandating changes in all educational certification programs through a multipublic decision-making process. Prior to 1977, the SEA
provided the PSI with broad mandates by which the PSI would develop their individual training programs. Usually one, or several professors, would develop a program for their particular institution that addressed those standards, present it to SEA for approval, and then implement it with minor changes.

This provided a wide variety of programs, but also presented monumental problems for the SEA. Because the PSI training programs were not comparable, they could not be evaluated consistently, using uniform instruments. No one knew which programs were most or least effective. Students could not transfer easily from program to program.

As of 1977, the SEA made a significant philosophical departure from its previous position of allowing the PSI almost total freedom in their educational training programs. By 1983, the SEA had presented to the PSI highly prescriptive mandates for administrative training programs.

If this process provides an improvement in administrative training, perhaps it will become a forerunner of what will be happening in other states. If this is so, it is beneficial to know a little of
Ohio's historical and political environment in order to understand why these activities occurred first in Ohio and where such activities might occur next, given environmental similarity. Also, if other states should adopt this decision-making process to attempt such changes in their administrative standards, a complete description and conceptual analysis of the procedures followed in the process may be helpful in order to incorporate the successful components, and to avoid the unsuccessful elements. According to Johnson (1980), the intricacies and delicacies of governance among and between the various boards can be properly appreciated only through an in-depth and state by state case study.

The Ohio State Department of Education will probably continue to exhibit a leadership role in upgrading education on all fronts. Since its method has been successful in the revision of administrative certification standards, the same method will probably be used in the future to attain similar results in other educational arenas. It was discovered that several PSI utilize a similar decision-making process in their relationship with field educators to improve their training programs. It has also become evident
that change processes similar to that developed by the SEA have been adopted by local school districts. This study attempted to identify the conceptual elements that either facilitated or hindered this process in light of the relations between the PSI and SEA and internal PSI relations.

It is important that primary stakeholder groups in Ohio (both related and unrelated to education) understand the decision-making process by which the State Department of Education operates. Knowledge of this process reinforces an attitude of inter-agency cooperation, facilitating communication between stakeholders, and perhaps strengthening the confidence factor regarding the educational process.

Many times new or expanding agendas rapidly replace any thought given to analysis of previous processes. It is important that this study be done at this time in order that a description of the event will help to capture the factors involved and aid in the analysis of the events. If the aspects of the entire process can be mapped, the critical features can then be studied. Building an institutional memory has value
for both Ohio's State Department of Education and the clientele that it serves.

Limitations of the Study

This study is an exploratory case study of one phase of the decision-making process used by the Ohio State Department of Education in the revision of administrative certification standards. Although the research effort does make comparisons between Ohio's State Board of Education and other states, there has been no attempt to compare Ohio's decision process style to those of other states; nor was there an attempt to develop an extensive comparison of Ohio's most current revision of administrative certification to Ohio's previous certification revisions. As in any case study there are limits to the generalizability of the conclusions drawn.

Another drawback was that the study was conducted through an interview format in an attempt to construct history. Although the study incorporated triangulation techniques, it would have been preferable to have had an external process observer throughout the entire period.
The data analysis employed standardized techniques that have never been applied previously to this type of case study of changes in certification standards. Accordingly, some caution must be exercised in interpreting the results.

Only one phase of the process was examined closely, and it would have been preferable to apply the same methods of in-depth analysis to all phases. Also, evaluation mechanisms should be employed at the end of each phase offering time-testing of critical decisions employed throughout the process.

The study focused on the interactions and reactions of the SEA and seven PSI, and excluded information from the other 10 PSI in Ohio. Also excluded from the study were the perspectives from school districts (administrators, teachers, and students). These limitations however, are representative of the limitations inherent in any case study and should not pose any special problem to researchers, policy makers, or educators interested in conducting additional research on this subject.
Chapter Organization

Chapter I presents an introduction to the study containing a) the statement of purpose; b) a statement of the study's significance at the national, state, and individual PSI level; c) an outline of limitations of the study; and d) a review of chapter organization. Chapter II contains a review of the literature regarding background information developed as an historical synopsis to the study. Chapter III includes a description of the various sources used to develop the conceptual framework that is used to analyze decision processes.

The methodology section is found in Chapter IV. In this section is discussed the methodological frameworks that were applied to the study, data collection and analysis, and a review of the limitations.

Chapter V includes an historical review: a) level one - all four SEA processes from 1953 - 1985, b) level two - the SEA process between 1977 and 1985 that led to Ohio's revision of administrative standards, c) level three - invocation phase (1984) with the SEA as change agent, and d) level four - invocation phase (1984) with the PSI as change agent. For the invocation phase
(level three and four), the description utilizes a conceptual framework that includes both the functionalist and the radical structuralist paradigms. A comparison of the internal environments of seven PSI used for this study is also included in this chapter.

Chapter VI includes an assessment of the concept framework incorporating two paradigms developed in Chapter III, identifying whether the outcomes could have been anticipated given a relative understanding of the process and environments. Included in this chapter is an analysis of whether any elements were excluded from the conceptual framework developed in Chapter III.

Chapter VII includes the identification of conclusions and implications that could be utilized by the SEA and/or participating PSI in any future administrative standards revision process. Knowledge and documentation of the previous successes and failures could be an aid in developing successful proposals in the future.

Summary

There are a variety of organizational formats of state education agencies throughout the United States. In each state the SEA addresses the issues of
educational improvement with different philosophies, visions, decision-making formats, policies, and emphases. This dissertation contains extensive background information on one state (Ohio), a cursory look at three phases and an extensive examination of the invocation phase of a well-developed, decision-making process utilized extensively in Ohio to revise standards of post-secondary institutions for teacher and administrator certification.

To study such a process is particularly difficult for two major reasons. First, there is difficulty in interviewing key informants regarding a process occurring between 1977 and 1985. The interviewees were located throughout the state, and the process took so long that some potential key informants had retired, moved, or died. Second, the process appeared to be disconnected, so much so that participants in different phases did not necessarily understand the nature of previous phases. In fact, in some cases interviewees within the same phase did not know what other committees had done.

The contributions of this research dissertation are two. First, certain concepts contained within two
paradigms were shown to be insufficient individually to accurately describe and explain the decision-making process. Second, an extension of the concepts has been undertaken to produce a new approach that is sufficient to overcome the difficulties observed. Using the new approach, complex decision-making processes such as those used by the SEA can be better understood and stakeholders, researchers, and educators can use this knowledge to improve future processes. As complexity is a likely feature for future decision-making processes, such an improvement is important.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter contains five sub-divisions related to the literature review on the development of the SEA throughout the U.S. and of Ohio's SEA in particular.

The first division is titled "Historical Development of State Involvement in Educational Governance from a National Perspective" and served to outline the development of SEA throughout the U.S. from the early 1800s through 1989.

The second division is titled "Historical Development of Ohio's State Education Agency". It served to outline the early beginnings of Ohio's State Department (SEA). In this section is presented an outline of the development of the SEA's legal power and its capability to intervene in teacher and administrative training programs of Ohio's post-secondary institutions.
The third division is titled "Ohio's Response to Educational Reform". In this section is outlined the background information on the role of Ohio's State Department in three previous decision-making processes as well as specifics regarding the process which is the focus of this study.

The fourth division is titled "Guiding Principles of Reform Utilized by Ohio's State Education Agency". The fifth division is titled "Focus of This Study".

Historical Development of State Involvement in Educational Governance from a National Perspective

Development of the State Education Agency.

Prior to the writing of the U.S. Constitution, several of the colonial legislatures had developed a precursor of the state education agency (Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea, 1974). The adoption of the U.S. Constitution signalled the beginning of a framework that divided some governmental functions between national and state levels. During the period of history in which the Constitution was written, schooling was primarily a private enterprise, and therefore, it is understandable that there is no
reference to education in the U.S. Constitution. As a result of this constitutional omission, educational mandates have been left to the states or to the people.

Despite this omission at the national level, most of the states quickly developed some type of state-wide policy either for the establishment or encouragement of education. At the time of the formation of the Union, six of the original thirteen states had constitutional provisions and eleven of the thirteen had statutory provisions regarding education (Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea, 1974). With the creation of the New York Board of Regents in 1784 the first special structure designed for educational governance at the state level was established (Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea, 1974). Most of the states admitted to the Union thereafter also had constitutional, and/or statutory, provisions for education.

Almost concurrently with the establishment of the state board of education, the office of the chief state school officer (CSSO) developed. New York was the first state to establish the position of CSSO in 1812. This post lasted until 1821 when it was abolished and
the Secretary of State assumed the role of superintendent. The post was reestablished in 1854.

Of all the states, Michigan has had the post of CSSO for the longest. Michigan's first law regarding CSSO appointments was passed in 1829. The 1829 Michigan law provided for the appointment of a superintendent of common schools. The title of Michigan's CSSO changed in 1836, becoming that of the superintendent of public instruction. Since that time, the individual states have used various titles for the CSSO, most common of which are superintendent of public instruction and commissioner of education. (Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea, 1974)

Ohio's history of the CSSO post is similar to that of New York's. In 1837 a law was adopted in Ohio that created the Office of State Superintendent of Common Schools to be commissioned by the governor, thus making Ohio the seventh state in the Union to provide for a chief state school officer (CSSO). In 1840 the Ohio General Assembly abolished the Act of 1838, making the secretary of state the ex-officio superintendent. There was an attempt in 1850 to reinstate the position of CSSO and to create a five member State Board of
Public Instruction. However, because the General Assembly did not appoint the officers as stipulated, the law lapsed. The Ohio General Assembly at this time called for a complete maintenance and supervision of common schools which reestablished the position of CSSO, but with the title of state commissioner of public schools.

State Agency Involvement Increases with Greater Centralization.

Throughout the United States patterns similar to Ohio's educational practice of permissive control developed. Initially, the governance of education was associated with the general governance structure developed by the states. With few state-wide mechanisms for coordinating educational endeavors and the financial support of local schools coming from local tax dollars, there developed a strong tradition of local control. Increasing complexity in the educational arena led to the development of the same type of state-wide governance structure in each state.

Collecting statistical information was the primary function of the state education agency until 1900. This function required a staff of good clerical
personnel. As the nation began to grow, school districts became less geographically, socially, economically, and technologically isolated. The SEA were functionally and organizationally designed to maintain sophisticated records that included more statistical information evolving from this growing community interdependency. As the concept of universal education came to be incorporated in an increasingly greater number of communities, there also developed an economic shift from local property tax to state tax bases. The economic tax base shift required the expansion of the SEA (Thurston and Roe 1957).

Between 1900 and 1930 the SEA were primarily involved in the inspection and enforcement of standards. About 1930, the state education agencies began to enter a phase of leadership (Beach and Gibbs 1952).

Beach's and Gibbs' analysis of the 1900 to 1930 time frame identified the dominant intellectual and philosophical thrust to have come from scientific management illucidated by Frederick Taylor (1911). In 1930, the advent of state leadership came at a time of the Hawthorne studies. Simultaneously, there was a
rise of democratic administration in education during this period as noted by Campbell (1971) and Campbell, Mazzoni, and O’Shea (1974).

Over time, each SEA separately evolved in an idiosyncratic manner through a series of constitutional changes on the state level. Similarities that can be found in the constitutional and statutory laws arose in large part because of the increasing role of the federal government in areas of education.

The SEA became most dramatically involved in educational change during World War I when a gross disparity in educational ability among the recruits was noticed. In the interest of national security, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act (1917), creating a vehicle by which the federal government could impact education through the SEA. Increasingly the local districts began to rely on and demand more SEA leadership in educational affairs. (Dibella 1980)

With the adoption of the Elementary and Secondary Act in 1960, the process of federal aid extension increased dramatically. Specifically, Title V of this Act provided for the improvement of state departments of education. Murphy’s studies (1973) of the use of
Title V monies in three states indicate that the funds were used either to enhance existing programs or to develop programs of planning and research. Between 1966 and 1973, $175 million in Title V monies were allocated for SEA Improvement (Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea, 1974).

Eventually by 1968, through the Smith-Hughes Act, increased federal monies available to the states accounted for 41% of all SEA expenditures; this figure included salaries (Dibella, 1980). Several authors warned that the increased reliance on federal funds would mean an increase of time, energy, and resources spent on issues found on the federal agenda (Georgiady, 1966; Layton, 1967; Wiley, 1969). Other authors examined the impact of federal monies on SEA planning and administration (Murphy, 1973; Wiley, 1969).

In reference to dependence on federal monies, Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea (1974) have indicated that:

Many state departments now receive at least half of their annual operating budget from federal sources. Federal money, which is subject to congressional and presidential decision, often late in the fiscal year, produces considerable instability in the funding of state agencies and
at times seems to make them more sensitive to federal demands than to state needs. (p. 11)

Present State Education Agency Arrangements.

Appendix H summarizes and compares the state education agency arrangements in the 49 states with those found in Ohio. The information was provided in Campbell, Mazzoni, and O'Shea's document, State Governance Models for the Public Schools (1974).

In general, Ohio appears to be similar to other states in the functions of the SEA, and in the selection of the chief state school officer and his/her relationship to its state board. Ohio appears to be among the average in SEA staff size and education, and in the number of years the state board serves and their jurisdiction. Ohio is distinctively different in that the state board (which is among the largest of all states) is elected through non-partisan elections.

State Education Agencies and Leadership in Governance.

The elements necessary for an SEA to assume a leadership role in the governance of education on a statewide basis are constitutionally approved. A large discrepancy exists between what could be the full implementation of constitutional authority and what
typically occurs in reality. The literature on SEA most often cites the regulatory role (establishing and carrying out regulations), not the leadership role (launching new endeavors for change).

Perhaps because of the emphasis on the regulatory nature, according to Dibella (1980) SEA are generally portrayed as specialists in red tape and regulations and that they are particularly reactive and unimaginative. Another explanation for the absence of SEA studies would be that the impetus for educational change has been the domain of other segments of our society, and rarely initiated by the SEA.

Given the various role definitions for SEA and its historical roots as a regulatory body, several authors have identified organizational constraints that further hinder the SEA in maximizing their leadership potential. Layton (1967) identified four constraints: bureaucratic inertia, inadequate financial support, absence of qualified staff, and lack of agreement on maximal impact techniques. Morphet, Jesser and Ludka (1971) identified issues that were more politically based, concerning elections of lay people to state boards through popular elections, or gubernatorial
appointment of primary state education officers, conflicting political pressures and influences on educational matters, and rigid or inappropriate budgetary procedures especially related to adequate appropriations for legislation.

In several other studies the nature of SEA leadership was documented from another perspective, for instance, a national survey was used to identify the leadership performance of elementary education consultants designated by the SEA. Wiley (1969) studied organizations (such as the State Teachers Association, the Governor's office, the State legislature, and the U.S. Office of Education) having positive and negative influences on SEA leadership.

In some of the studies SEA leadership in coordinating, and/or controlling post-secondary educational institutions was documented. According to Johnston (1980), there is a great deal of variation among the states regarding the operations of state-wide boards for post secondary institutions. Not only does the size, constitution, and manner of appointment vary dramatically from state to state, but also there is variance as to the degree of actual control over
Institutions within its jurisdiction. Some boards are governing boards with legislative power having direct control over the PSI under its jurisdiction (Johnston, 1980). Other states have coordinating boards whose domain of action only exists in identifying duplication of programs, objectives and/or missions. Both types of boards, either governing or coordinating, may have statutes permitting the approval and/or disapproval of programs, or degree authorizations.

Some reports focused on state legislation that had an impact on post-secondary curriculum. Some investigated the legislative control of community college curricula in Florida's vocational education programs. Some identified some of the benefits of state involvement in post-secondary curriculum development, indicating that the PSI need governmental external management because they are entrenched in the status quo and are not usually receptive to what the public believes should be changed in education.

Johnston's document, published in 1980, titled *Provisions of State Constitutional and Statutory Law Governing the Structure of Education* outlines those constitutional and statutory provisions of each of the 50
states. Included in Johnston's discussion of structures, powers, and duties of the SEA are the ancillary bodies that have also evolved over time. Those bodies are the state agencies, offices, committees and commissions that also have great impact on the governance of education.

In 1950, Beach's classic study indentified the mission of the SEA as including leadership, regulation, and service. By 1967, Layton had included operational and developmental responsibilities, and public support to the SEA agenda. At this time Roe (1967) had prophecied that the SEA regulatory functions would continue to be diminished, while the supportive, coordinating actions requiring state-wide leadership would become increasingly more important.

Ohio's SEA leadership in the state-wide reorganization effort of school districts was assessed by McKelvey (1954). This is one of the few studies that document SEA leadership effort. His findings suggest that SEA leadership requires a person directing the leadership effort, development of criteria and standards, research studies, cross-agency planning, and technical assistance provided by the SEA. One of McKelvey's conclusions was
that SEA leadership encompassed a wide range of activities.

**U.S. Education in the 1980's.**

In the early 1980's, a renewed interest in educational reform movements emerged. In response to the growing concern about the quality of education in the U.S., the National Commission on Excellence in Education (U.S. Department of Education, 1983) published *Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (henceforth referred to as *Nation at Risk*). Following shortly after, the U.S. Department of Education (1984) published *The Nation Responds: Recent Efforts to Improve Education* (henceforth referred to as *Nation Responds*). The central theme of these two studies is that the declining level of educational standards has somehow jeopardized the nation, and that the national and state levels of government will have to become increasingly more involved in coordinating the effort to foster educational excellence.

As a result of the reform movements of the 1980's, a series of reports documented the success and problems of various states with regard to education. *Project Education Reform: Time for Results Newsletters* - May, September, and December, (1987) contains three divisions
outlining: a) "Project Education Reform" (a national project designed for the late 1980's and early 1990's); b) "The Governors' 1991 Report on Education: Time for Results", a national evaluation of education, and successes of various reform movements, and c) "...The Best Of Educations" Reforming America's Public Schools in the 1980's.

(Chance, 1986) contains reports on national educational reform with emphasis on seven states, Washington, California, Colorado, Texas, South Carolina, Illinois, and Florida. The final section of the article outlines the necessity for the various SEA to develop extensive research on policy decisions related to educational reform.

With regards to failure of reform movements, there are two significant papers. Pipho (1986) summarizes educational reform activity throughout the U.S. from 1982-1986, identifies unifying themes of reform, and outlines several reasons why some reform movements have failed. "Effects of Education Reform on Programs of School Administration in Illinois (Murphy, 1989) contains an outline of concerns of the midwestern educators regarding the previous five years of educational reform.
Two papers specifically address the issue of PSI programs and educational reform. Achilles (1988) recommends that the PSI and SEA make a more concerted effort to plan educational reform using statewide educational planning processes, emphasizing improvement of teacher and administrator training, and using the PSI to conduct state policy and evaluation studies. "Curricular Reform in Higher Education, The Current Debate and Issues for Faculty, To Promote Academic Justice and Excellence Series." (1989) contains information of PSI curricular reform throughout the U.S.

Historical Development of Ohio's State Education Agency

Introduction

This section contains a literature review from the historical perspective on the Ohio Department of Education. It serves to outline Ohio's SEA development of legal power in its capability to affect teacher and administrative training programs of Ohio's post-secondary institutions.

Public Education before Ohio became a State

Even before Ohio was admitted to statehood in 1803 public education had been clearly defined as a state
function through the influence of the Ordinance of 1785, the Ordinance of 1787, and the Constitution of the United States. Most of the entire section presented below is paraphrased from Pearson's *Education in the States* (1969, p. 950-951).

Ordinance of 1785: This ordinance indicated that section 16 of each township is to be reserved for the maintenance of public schools in that township. This reserved 640 acres for every surveyed township of 36 square miles for public school use. "It was evidently the original opinion of many of the settlers in Ohio, and perhaps even the design of Congress that these land grants, if properly managed, would support public schools without a tax on the citizens. It soon became evident, however, that this one source of income would be inadequate." (p. 950-951)

Ordinance of 1787: This ordinance permitted those lands designated for maintenance of public schools to be sold.
Constitution of the U.S.: The Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution stated that powers not delegated to the federal government were reserved to the states or to the people, as long as the U.S. Constitution did not prohibit such powers to the states or the people. (In the eighteen hundreds education was one of the clearest examples of this.)

The Ohio Constitution: This was adopted in 1802 and remained in force until 1851. "Inasmuch as the Constitution of Ohio makes it a state duty and responsibility to establish and maintain a system of common schools, education is a matter of state concern, and the system of public education in Ohio is the creature of both the State constitution and statutory laws. The policy of the Ohio Legislature and of the state from the beginning of its existence under the first constitution has been to encourage schools and to foster education in every reasonable way." (p. 950-951)
Background Information on Settlers

Several factors pertaining to the geographical and political environment and the nature of the settlers established early traditions of local autonomy as well as diverse local educational traditions. An abbreviated list of such factors appear below, but are outlined extensively in (Pearson 1969, p. 949-950).

Settlers:

1. As a frontier community, they were extremely self-reliant.

2. They had no common educational background. Predominantly, they came from New England, Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky.

3. Each of the separate tracts dividing Ohio (the Western Reserve, the Ohio Company's Purchase, the Symmes Purchase, the Virginia Military Lands, and the U.S. Military Lands) were settled by distinctive communities of people who either came into the wilderness together, or by later settlers seeking those settlements having a culture similar to their own.
Geography:
1. Heavily timbered areas made communication very difficult forcing community isolation.

Politics:
1. Soon after a bitter political struggle between Jefferson and Adams the first state constitution was formed. This was at the time of domination of the Territorial Governor, Arthur St.Clair, who had prejudiced the people against centralized executive power.
2. Early Ohio legislative actions indicate that the law was used as a vehicle to "meet the special needs and desires of particular districts, or, even in the case of school lands, the desires of certain individuals." (p. 949-950)
3. Early laws were permissive in nature, allowing each of the extremely culturally diverse communities to establish their own educational system.
Timeline of Ohio Legislation and Its Effects on Governance of Education

Unless otherwise cited, the specific information found below is paraphrased from Pearson (1969, p. 949-972).

1821: Although there was no mention of certification, the district school committee was authorized to employ competent teachers.

1825: Law of 1825: This law was in effect until 1850 and enabled each county to appoint three examiners of public schools who examined certified teachers as well as examine and visit schools.

1837: A law created the Office of State Superintendent of Common Schools to be commissioned by the governor. This made Ohio the seventh state in the U.S. to provide for a chief state school officer (CSSO). The duties of the CSSO were clerical in nature, and he was subordinate to the Office of the Secretary of State. This same law identified the township clerk as the township superintendent, and the county auditor
as the county superintendent, these appointments being primarily clerical in nature.

1838: The Act of 1838 provided the legal machinery to administer the state. The law made the county superintendents responsible to the township superintendents, who were in turn, responsible to the state superintendent. The county became the unit of certification. "An organization had thus been effected, by means of which an authorized state officer could reach out into the most remote district of the state, either to give help or information or to see that the law was obeyed. If equipped with sufficient assistance through a department of education, Ohio through this law, had the mechanism for effective educational administration."

(Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

State Superintendent Lewis occupied his position for three years during which time his accomplishments were comparable to what Horace Mann had been doing in Massachusetts. Unfortunately, when Lewis left office because of failing health, the Legislature had the
Secretary of State assume the CSSO responsibilities, leading to the entrenchment of clerical operations as the office goal as opposed to the governance of state-wide education.

1840: The General Assembly abolished the Act of 1838, making the secretary of state the ex-officio superintendent. Between 1840 and 1850 most state legislation only applied to district level concerns with the exception of the Akron Act (1847) providing for a graded system for schools.

1850: An act provided for the appointment of the State Board of Public Instruction by the General Assembly and created the office of state superintendent. The act provided the mechanism whereby each of the five state board members, during his or her final year on the Board, was appointed as state superintendent, serving in one of the four districts that divided the state.

This law never came into effect because the General Assembly called for a reorganization of
the educational division (Ohio Laws [1853]) which reestablished the state superintendency, as well as, provided for the regulation of public education for the next 50 years.

1861: A law was passed that required the officers of the teachers' institutes to furnish reports "to the state commissioner of common school an account of the money received, from what sources it came, and how it was expended." (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1873: The Law of 1873 required the codification of school law relating to the commissioner. It included the provision that the commissioner was required to furnish forms for the board of education reports, and those boards were required to report to him. In reviewing the commissioner's powers and duties during this period, it is evident that, although there was still a clerical emphasis, the position was slowly emerging as one of power and influence.

1891: A law required that boards of education select texts from an approved list established by the state commissioner.
1890-1906: During this period of time teachers' examinations came under the direction of the commissioner thus establishing more uniform standards for teachers. The law specified that "the secretary of the State Board of Examiners and Commissioner of Common Schools should prepare a series of questions, and print and distribute the same to the examiners in the several counties of the state." (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

Although the Ohio Department of Education (SEA) was not formally established until 1956 (3301.13 R.C.), there were several references during this period to SEA which suggested that SEA "has always been considered the administrative unit and organization chosen by the superintendent to assist him in his duties and responsibilities in connection with public education." (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1906-1940: "During this period of time, several things occurred which tended to give the state commissioner of common schools more authority and responsibility in administration of public
schools. This trend probably resulted, at least in part, from the existing crisis rather than from any real desire of the citizens to give up local autonomy." (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1906: State Aid System for Weak School Districts: The state commissioner, with the approval of the state auditor was able to issue funds for financially troubled districts. While initially schools were hesitant to apply for aid because of the "weak" image, eventually by 1934 between one-third to one-half of the school districts were receiving such aid.

1913: The State School Survey Commission of 1913 recommended the adoption of the New Rural School Code which created the county school districts, county boards of education which had the power to consolidate the district, and a county superintendent. This commission had stressed the need for the state to assume more control over education by recommending rural school consolidation which also divided the county into supervision districts, and instituting
supervision of teachers with the state paying
half the costs.

1929: Legislation was enacted which significantly
decreased the amount of monies obtained for
schools through tax support. The law "exempted
much tangible personal property from the tax
duplicate and also lowered the rate of
assessment on the remaining tangible personal
property." (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1929-1935: Ohioans suffered the worst economic
collapse in its history, causing additional
reductions in tax duplicate and mounting
delinquent taxes.

1933: A tax limitation was voted into the
constitution reducing the maximum amount that
could be levied without a vote from 155 mills to
10 mills.

1932-1935: A series of maneuvers shifted some of the
burden of school support from local taxes to the
state taxes. Governor White appointed a
commission to assess the financial problems and
make recommendations. The commission was funded
by the Ohio Education Association. The
commission's report and recommendations were contained in the "State Foundation Program for School Support." This report was eventually enacted upon by the General Assembly and served as the Ohio's foundation law.

1906-1940: "...the state commissioner of common schools and his staff, now known as, the Department of Education, began to assume real authority and responsibility for the preparation and certification of teachers." (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1910: An "...act granted the commissioner the power to approve normal schools, teachers' colleges, or universities as teacher education institutions. (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1921: The State Department of Education was formally established. "Between approximately 1840 and 1920, the growth of the department was extremely slow in terms of organization and personnel. From 1920 to 1930, the growth was fairly rapid, and then, as has already been mentioned, it was considerably retarded during the Depression. Since 1940, each succeeding decade has witnessed..."
a more rapid growth for the department."
(Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972)

1921-1922: The first laws regarding teachers certificates were published.

1930: A more liberal interpretation of the laws and regulations allowed the SEA to regulate the renewal of certificates which were still being issued by the local examiners. Each renewal required additional training.

1935: The changes in law abolished the local examiners and placed certificate issuance in the hands of the state director of education and five state board examiners. This law "mandated the state director to prescribe standards for the approval of institutions of higher education engaged in the preparation of teachers" (Pearson, 1969, p. 949-972).

The Division of Teacher Education and Certification was established and charged with preparing standards for both certification of teachers and teacher education institutions. (Although the 1935 law identified nine types of certificates with four grades per certificate,
It was not until 1939, that under the supervision of director, Dr. Harold Bowers, these regulations were printed and published.

1954: The Ohio School Survey was the first major attempt since 1913 to appraise thoroughly the public schools. (The manner in which the committee was organized, the representative nature of the committee members and the manner in which they conducted their business is quite similar to that used to change administrative standards 1977-1985. It is for this reason that the entire passage describing this committee from (Pearson, 1969, p. 962) report is included here.

The One-Hundredth General Assembly of Ohio enacted Sections 103.41 to 103.43 of the Ohio Revised Code providing for an 11-member Ohio School Survey Committee, charged with the responsibility of making a comprehensive study of the public school system of the state.

Organized in the fall of 1953, the committee approached its task in the firm belief that public education should not be studied from the viewpoint of the professional educator alone, or any other special group.

The Committee organized six study committees in the fields of instruction, personnel and teacher education, state educational organization, local district
organization, housing and transportation, and finance. Each committee had a highly qualified out-of-state consultant, as well as a staff assistant provided by the six state universities.

Before formulating their recommendations, the study committees collected and analyzed a mass of information from official records, personal interviews, and questionnaires. During School Visitation Week the members of these committees, the survey committee, and the consultants visited a cross section of schools in 66 of the 88 counties of the state.

1955: The recommendations of the Ohio Survey Commission for a new foundation program and for the establishment of an elected State Board of Education were enacted into law.

1956: The State Board of Education was established, composed of lay citizens serving six year terms, elected by non-partisan ballot from 23 (24 as of 1967) congressional districts. The powers of the state board were confined to policy-making and the superintendent's powers were executive in nature.

According to Pearson (1969, p. 963-972) "the board has the general power and duty to:
1. Exercise general supervision over the system of education.
2. Formulate policy, plan, and evaluate functions pertaining to public schools and adult education.
3. Exercise leadership in the improvement of public education.
4. Administer the educational policies of the state relative to public education.

(In 1991 there were 21 members of the Board of Education. Pearson does not indicate when the number of members changed from 23 to 21.)

1957: "...the State Board of Education adopted another revision of laws and regulations which became effective in 1959. Elaborate committees representing a cross section of all segments of the teaching profession, both public and private, conducted research and made recommendations to the Board. Both subject matter people and personnel from the colleges sought significant increases in semester hour requirements for their respective disciplines. ... although the board finally approved the substantial increase in semester hour requirements for certification in most of the subject matter field, it left the professional
semester hour requirements substantially unchanged." (Pearson, 1969, p. 963-972)

1961: "The board adopted one more significant change in certification in December, 1961, which affected the certification of superintendents. Acting on a request which stemmed largely from leadership of the American Association of School Administrators, the board adopted a prescribed curriculum for the certification of superintendents which required a minimum of 60 semester hours of graduate credit, at least 10 semester hours of which were to be completed while in full-time residence." (Pearson, 1969, p. 963-972) (The 1961 specifications for on-the-job training for superintendents are similar to the entry year program in administrative standards adopted in 1983.)

The following information covers the period from 1960 to 1984 and has been gleaned from Cyphert's and Nichelson's (1984) "Teacher Education Redesign in Ohio: Past, Present, and Future." Cyphert and Nichelson intended that this paper be an overview and an analysis of Ohio's teacher education practice and reform, presented
with the intent of providing a vehicle whereby others could "avoid some political miscalculations and minimize egregious conceptual errors in future planning." (p. 1-28)

1950's: The advent of Sputnik effectively focused everyone's attention on the quality of education throughout the nation. Educators and lay people agreed that the inadequacies in our educational system were directly related to the U.S. being in second place in the space race. During this period federal monies to education increased dramatically, the baby-boomers were beginning to flood the schools, a teacher shortage began to manifest itself, and soon "administrators demanded the issuance of emergency temporary certificates to ensure that classes were adequately supervised." (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 1028) The increased demands for well-trained teachers occurred concomitantly with the increasing criticism of teacher training.

Mid 1960's: Ohio faced an acute shortage of teachers. "While the public demanded change in teacher preparation practices, teacher preparation
programs were low on the academic and financial 'pecking order' of most colleges and universities. Historically, teacher education was done 'on-the-cheap'; the school of education was basically an institutional money maker. Institutional commitment to reform did not match the public's demand for change." (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p.1-28)

1966: Ohio's SEA conducted a series a regional and then state-wide conferences on improvement of teacher certification. "Long-range projections suggested that a balanced supply of teachers would be evidenced by the mid-1970's. Hence, educators perceived the seventies as a propitious time to develop new standards that would increase and improve teacher preparation and certification requirements." (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 1-28)

1967: The State Board of Education appointed an advisory council on Teacher Education and Certification which, in turn, initiated two major studies, one investigating the needs of
the elementary teacher, and the other, the needs of the secondary teacher.

1972: The findings of the advisory council on Teacher Education and Certification resulted in new standards being adopted by the Ohio Board of Education. The most salient feature of the new standards was the provision that there would be mandatory evaluation of on-campus programs by a visiting team occurring every five years. "More significant reform efforts were initiated during 1972 and 1973 as calls for dramatic redesign of teacher education came from both the public and from educational professionals. An extensive public forum on educational concerns conducted by the Ohio Department of Education and involving 125,000 Ohioans in citizen seminars and regional meetings, resulted in a mandate to make teacher preparation a priority in the revision of the State's education system." (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 1-28)

1973: The State Board of Education ordered the "thorough, comprehensive, and appropriate restructuring of teacher education in Ohio."
A highly diversified group of interested citizens, organized by the SEA, provided the direction of the redesign. According to Cyphert and Nicholson, 1984, p. 1-28:

...the recommendations of this group, three parallel sets of discussions were held throughout the fall of 1973.

Set 1: An advisory committee, appointed by the state board of education, discussed major teacher preparation programs, issues, and proposed methods of resolution. The advisory committee consisted of representatives from the major organizations of teacher education faculty and administrators, teachers and school administrators, lay citizens, and teacher education students.

Set 2: Eight representative councils composed of professional educators and lay citizen representatives were convened for a series of meetings to discuss the problems of teacher education and to suggest solutions. The following groups were involved but also met separately: deans and department heads of teacher education, the Ohio Association of Teacher Educators, the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio Federation of Teachers, the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, the Ohio School Boards Association, the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Ohio Department of Education, and interested citizens.

Set 3: Two regional conferences were held in each of the six regions in Ohio. Again, the groups identified above were invited to participate and express opinions regarding teacher preparation policies and practices."
1974: After extensive public and professional dialogue, an Advisory Committee proposed dramatic revisions of teacher preparation standards which were adopted by the State Board of Education. The recommendations outlined in the Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers were so extensive that full implementation was deferred until July, 1980. (These recommendations included the required field experience for administrator preparation program.)

1974: Reinforcing the value of broad-based participation, in 1974 the State Board of Education appointed a fifteen member Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission whose function it is to "make recommendations on teacher education programs, to assist colleges and universities in the development of teacher education programs, to review and make recommendations regarding teacher supply and demand, to analyze and report financial requirements for teacher education ... and to review each evaluation team report, as
well as the reconciliation report" (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 1-28). Although the State Board of Education has the final say in approval or withdrawal of institutional support, the Advisory Commission plays a powerful role in the process.

The Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission has been charged to bring to the State Board recommendations regarding revision of current teacher certification standards and "to develop standards for universities involved in the advanced preparation of professional school personnel" (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 1-28). This latter charge, affecting the advanced preparation of professional school personnel, authorizes and facilitates the State Board to evaluate graduate programs in the same manner that undergraduate programs are now evaluated. It is anticipated that now the graduate programs, including Educational Administration, will soon face the same periodic evaluation procedures that are utilized to monitor the
teacher training programs. Cyphert and Nichelson (1984, p. 1-28) have outlined the categories that the Advisory Commission anticipated considering (1985) regarding the training of advanced professional personnel:

- Assess appropriateness of continuing education units for renewal of certificates.
- Identify requirements for professional/permanent certification.
- Identify implication of changes in certification requirements upon advanced preparation programs for professional school personnel.
- Study the implication of finances to appropriately prepare professional personnel at the advanced level.
- Assessing competency and recency of professional practice of faculty engaged in the advanced preparation of professional personnel.

With the exception of one interviewee, the other participants of this study did not mention the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission. Either most interviewees did not know the Commission existed, or that it could have had significant impact on the two standards revisions since 1974. No information (either from the literature or from interviews) was available on the impact that this Commission might have had on the SEA's final adoptions.
when compared with the initial committee recommendations. (At the time this study was conducted the impact the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission had on the administrative standards revision 1977-1985 was unknown.)

Ohio's Response to Educational Reform

Introduction

With the focus of the nation's attention on education, the demand for educational reform was evident. Some state education agencies (SEA) have responded with a flurry of activity and immediate remedies that appear to be alleviating the problem. However, Ohio seemed to be different. According to Cossler (1978, p. 2) Ohio:

... was the first state in the nation to develop a comprehensive plan for the education of physically and mentally handicapped children, long before the federal governments got around to worrying and dictating in that area. It was the first to develop a state-wide configuration of school districts so that each of Ohio's high school students could have the opportunity for vocational education. It was among the first in career education, education of the gifted, and so on. And so it was, too, for Ohio to be the first in the redesign of teacher education.
What makes Ohio different from the other states is that it not only effectively anticipated national trends, but actually preceded and pioneered the development of programs addressing these trends. Cossler (1978, p. 2) suggested the reason was that

...only in Ohio and three of the other states do we have the unique situation of a freely elected and representative, non-partisan state board of education, which, in turn, freely appoints a chief state school officer who serves without term of office and at the discretion of the board.

Because of this structure, Ohio's SEA has a distinctive political, social, and philosophical tradition that has developed in a highly stable environment over a period of approximately 29 years. Within this stable, consistent climate Ohio's SEA has developed a process for altering all certification standards of school personnel through a slow, but methodical, balanced, and continuous process occurring over a period of six to 15 years, depending upon the standards that are altered. According to Cyphert and Nichelson (1984), through effective anticipation, a proactive, carefully monitored, and cooperatively executed approach to certification redesign has enabled Ohio's SEA to affect long-lasting, effective changes, thus avoiding hurried, reactive bandwagon
approaches. (With the appointment of Governor Voinovich, there developed an extensive statewide movement in 1991 to dismantle the elected, non-partisan, 21-member state board of education and to replace it with a governor appointed 9-member board.

**Ohio's Redesign Structure Institutionalized**

How does this redesign structure begin and then become institutionalized? According to Cossler (1978) the first signs of the procedural elements of redesign appeared in 1953 and resurfaced with more force during the mid to late 1960s when Ohio had an acute teacher shortage. In 1967, the State Board appointed an advisory council that worked closely with their research council to investigate teacher education needs. In conjunction, these two councils made recommendations to the State Board for the revision of teacher training programs. The actual developments of this initial standards revision process are detailed in Chapter V under "Level One: SEA Certification Processes Since 1953".

Since 1935 Ohio's SEA has had the legal power to actively affect the standards for institutions of higher education engaged in the preparation of teachers. Although the 1935 law identified nine types of
certificates, it was not until 1939, that these regulations were printed and published.

Since 1953 the SEA has initiated five public, decision-making processes designed to alter teacher and administrative training programs. (The fifth process, to examine teacher certification, began during the course of this study and no information has been obtained on that process.) Essentially all of the first four processes are similar in that the guiding principles are clearly evident that Cyphert and Nichelson (1984) have outlined (found below in the section titled Guiding Principles of Reform Utilized by Ohio's State Education Agency). Each of the first four processes have taken six to eight years from beginning to SEA adoption.

Although the SEA has used comparable procedures (research of information, committee tasks, good technical assistance, etc.) they appear to be experimenting with committee structure and sub-committee tasks (some committees operating parallel to each other with communication between versus ad hoc committees making their report and disbanding).
Guiding Principles of Reform Utilized by Ohio's State Education Agency

Principles of Responsibility of the State Board of Education

According to Cyphert and Nichelson (1984) through the adoption of the Ohio Revised Code, section 3319.23 the State Board of Education is authorized to monitor teacher education programs according to quality and content. Specifically this section states that the State Board of Education shall:

- Establish standards and courses of study for the preparation of teachers.
- Provide for the inspection of institutions desiring to prepare teachers.
- Properly certificate the graduates of such approved courses and institutions.
- Approve such institutions as maintain satisfactory training procedures.

(Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 1-28)

In order to qualify as a teacher education institution, each college or university must identify the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values (KSAVs) that guide the program, produce syllabi specifying prerequisites and well sequenced "practical school experiences," and develop committees of broad representation to advise the staff on curriculum design and evaluation (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, 1-28).
According to Dr. Paul Hailey (personal interview, 5/20/85) although most states have adopted certification standards for teacher preparation, they are without the ability to monitor and approve the teacher training institutions that the Ohio State Board of Education has.

The following unedited excerpt (Cyphert and Nicholson, 1984, p. 1-28) has been included here in full because it documents the values and attitude of Ohio’s State Education Agency in educational reform.

In viewing the reforms of the last two decades, certain process principles emerge as central to the efforts of those involved in Ohio in restructuring teacher education. These principles served as a foundation for the approach used by the Ohio Department of Education in involving all appropriate constituencies in the consideration of the form and substance of teacher education.

1) Legal responsibility can be and is carried out in many ways. The Ohio Department of Education has assumed the role of catalyst and facilitator for change in teacher education. This goes much beyond a regulatory function and was and continues to be an essential base for strengthening teacher education through standards and encouraging cooperation and communication.

2) The broad-based involvement of professional and lay groups in identifying issues and suggesting solutions is essential to their supporting eventual program decisions.
3) The identification of a timetable that permits change to occur at each support level is essential to effective program implementation.

4) The provision of sufficient funds to assist institutions in making the requisite changes in program design and faculty involvement is vital to achieving effective program implementation as well as affecting institutional support for the desired change.

5) The identification of standards that prescribe direction for practice but leave room for institutional initiative, modification, and uniqueness is essential to effective program change.

6) The realization that standards are evolutionary in nature, that they are end points, is essential to affecting constructive program change over time.

7) The positive nature of the approach to teacher education redesign tends to encourage and recognize needed changes in programs. Program evaluation is, of course, a regulatory function of the Ohio Department of Education. However, through use of a team of persons external to the Department trained in evaluation process and procedures to focus on programs, evaluations are undertaken to build upon strengths and to eliminate weaknesses. This promotion of a quasi-formative evaluation concept is an inherent and important part of each on-campus evaluation.

There was no doubt that the seven principles outlined (listed above) by Cyphert and Nichelson were evident in the most recent administrative standards revision.
Because Cyphert and Nichelson were not broad enough in their assessment, the author of this study decided to create a more comprehensive conceptual design.

Focus of This Study

Introduction

The SEA process is examined from for perspectives, or levels in this dissertation. Level one is a cursory examination of the SEA processes since 1953. Level two is a cursory examinations of the SEA process revising administrative standards between 1977-1985. Level three is a extensive examination of the invocation phase (1984) of the SEA process from the perspective of the SEA as change agent responsible for the coordination of 17 PSI. Level four is another extensive examination of the invocation phase (1984) of the SEA process from the perspective of the PSI as change agent within their own institutions.

Educational Climate in 1970s

Dramatic educational reform efforts developed in Ohio in 1972 and 1973 during which time an "extensive public forum on educational concerns conducted by the Ohio Department of Education and involving 125,000 Ohioans in
citizen seminars and regional meetings resulted in a mandate to make teacher preparation a priority in the overhaul of the State’s education system" (Cyphert and Nichelson, 1984, p. 5). In referring to the 125,000 Ohioans, Cossler (1978, p. 3) has indicated that:

Ninety-five percent of those citizens, addressing themselves to teacher preparation, recommended a complete redesign of teacher education as a top State Department priority....As a result of six years of research-based planning, the State Board of Education, on May 14, 1973, adopted a resolution calling for a comprehensive and appropriate restructuring of the whole of teacher education....On December 9, 1974, the State Board of Education adopted new standards for teacher education.

Given the preliminary success of the citizen involvement process over an extended period of time, Ohio’s SEA began its second revision of all administrative standards in 1977 using the same process with minor revision. The first administrative standards revision occurred in the '60s and was closely related to teacher standards revision. It is interesting to note that in 1985 that the SEA had already begun the initiation phase of the third teacher and supervisory standards revisions process, using similar committee structures and timelines as were used for administrator standards revision. This
recurring structural vehicle appears to be a relatively institutionalized process by which Ohio revises standards.


Between 1977 and 1985 Ohio’s SEA had completed four phases of the administrative standards revision. The Bowers (1988) article on Ohio’s SEA decision-making process identifies the policy sciences literature of Lasswell as the bases for the process. For the purpose of this study, the author identified the four phases of the SEA process (1977-1985) as the initiation, prescription, invocation and peer review phases based on Lasswell’s (1971) works.

The Initiation Phase (June, 1977 – January, 1982)

Although review of the administrative standards was already an agenda item for Ohio’s SEA in 1978, Mayher’s (1977) newspaper article titled "Redesign Administrator Training" and Paul Hailey’s (1977) response outlining the process for revision, added impetus to the initiation phase. During the Grob Conference (October 5, 1978), the Chief State School Officer (CSSO), identified the specific areas targeted for improvement in graduate education of professional personnel. One of those areas was administrator education.
In May, 1979, Franklin Walters (CSSO) formally recognized an ad hoc advisory committee whose task it was to examine administrator training standards and recommend needed revisions. This advisory committee produced three reports: a) data from practicing administrators and faculty from post-secondary institutions (PSI), b) administrative certification requirements of other states, and c) a review of the literature on administrator preparation. The final report from this committee was completed in September, 1980, and indicated that there was a need for a modification of the existing administrative certification standards.

The Prescription Phase (January, 1982 - January, 1984)

Acting on the suggestions from the advisory committee in the initiation phase, in 1981, Superintendent Walters established the Administrator Certification Advisory Committee which did not meet until January 8, 1982. This committee had three tasks: a) to review the history on administrative certification, b) to develop a better understanding of the legal framework of the standards, and c) to develop an agenda for revising existing standards. The Administrator Certification Advisory Committee formed three subcommittees on a) common core graduate education
requirements, b) field experiences, and c) certificate renewal and conversion. The Administrator Certification Advisory Committee made recommendations that were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1983, to become effective September 1, 1985.

The Invocation Phase (January, 1984 - December, 1984)

After the approval and adoption of the new administrative certification standards by the State Board of Education in 1983, the State Department of Education initiated and conducted a series of technical assistance conferences for the 17 post-secondary institutions (PSI) affected by the revisions. Those conferences were held on January 23, March 19, May 7, and August 24 of 1984. The PSI were to submit to the State Department their proposals for new administrative certification programs on December 1, 1984.

The Peer Review Phase (December, 1984 - June, 1985)

A peer review panel was directed to review and constructively criticize the PSI proposals in order that the respective institutions could rewrite the proposals. During the initial review process 12 of the original 17 proposals were accepted, with some requiring only minor editing. By June, 1985, the peer review panel had
recommended that the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission approve all 17 PSI proposals.

Other Phases not Examined in This Study

The implementation phase began September 1, 1985, and the SEA at that time anticipated beginning the evaluation and assessment phases as early as 1987 or as late as 1990.
CHAPTER III
A LITERATURE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF TWO PARADIGMATIC CATEGORIES FOR DESCRIBING AND EXPLAINING THE SEA STANDARDS REVISION PROCESS

Introduction

In the previous chapter there was a discussion of the study of Cyphert and Nichelson (1984). Their seven general principles did not have enough analytical power to adequately describe and analyze the public decision-making process of the SEA. For example, the Cyphert and Nichelson principles did not explain adequately the philosophical emphases of the SEA guiding reform, the tensions (open hostility in some cases) between the SEA and PSI, the critical points of the process that could be improved, or the distinctions between PSI that were successful and unsuccessful in initial proposal development.

For this case study there was developed a more intensive overview of organizational theory to first describe and then to analyze this process. The author assumed that educators functioned theoretically within
an equilibrium (functionalist) paradigm with occasional incursions into the conflict (radical structuralist) paradigm. The author recognized that the SEA process for standards revision could be examined from both the equilibrium and conflict perspectives. A conceptual framework was developed that incorporated the use of conflict and equilibrium paradigms.

When this study began in 1984 an extensive review of the literature was conducted which revealed no studies within the U.S. incorporating the use of the conflict and equilibrium paradigms such as those presented in this document. Another literature review conducted in Fall of 1990 documented the continued absence of U.S. studies. However, the latter review did reveal a body of international literature which began to appear in the mid 1980s utilizing equilibrium and conflict paradigms (similar to the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms of this study).

The international study most closely related to this dissertation is titled "National and World-System Explanations of Educational Reform" (Ginsburg, et. al., 1989). In this paper Ginsburg examined educational reform using equilibrium and conflict paradigms at both
national and world-systems levels. In this article, Ginsburg (1989) cites various authors involved in the following research areas:


2. There exists the placebo nature of reform designed to retard actual social change (Campbell, 1982; Mitchell, 1987; Weller, 1988).

3. Educational reform has been examined from only the equilibrium perspective (Merrit and Coombs, 1977; Sack, 1981; Simmons, 1983a, 1983b, Spaulding, 1988).

4. Educational reform has been examined from the conflict perspective (Altbach, 1974; Apple, 1986; Carnoy, 1976; Ginsburg, Wallace, and Miller, 1988).

5. Educational reform should be examined as evolutionary in nature and/or as a combination of societal forces (Beoby, 1966; Green, Ericson, and Seldman, 1980; Merritt and Coombs, 1977; Simmons, 1983a;)

It is important that these concepts eventually be applied to the study of macro-social systems within the U.S. such as Ohio’s SEA process.

Since this body of literature was not available during the development of this study, another mechanism had to be developed using existing theorists to develop a conceptual framework that would incorporate the use of the functionalist and radical structuralist
paradigms. Burrell and Morgan (1979) developed an overview of social and organizational paradigms that reflected the equilibrium and conflict dimension. From the Burrell and Morgan literature base a set of concepts from organizational theorists of both paradigms was developed. There was already in existence a body of research of phase theorists (Havelock and Lasswell) directly related to education reform.

The concepts of the organizational theorists were reoriented to reflect application to the dissertation and integrated with those concepts of the phase theorists to reflect an integrated conceptual framework across the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms that would be used to describe and analyze the SEA process. The intent was to see if this type of integrated conceptual framework could be used to describe and analyze the SEA decision-making process.

The theoretical framework explained in this chapter represents an integration of concepts of organizational theorists (identified by Burrell and Morgan) and phase theorists (Havelock and Lasswell)
within the functionalist paradigm and the radical structuralist paradigm.

This chapter contains four major divisions. The first section titled "Paradigmatic Bases" identifies the organization of social and organizational theory developed by Burrell and Morgan (1979). The second and third sections are titled "Organizational Theorists" and "Phase Theorists" and explain how certain concepts were developed and tailor-designed for this study. The fourth section is titled "Organizing the Conceptual Framework to Facilitate Data Collection and Graphic Presentation" and explains the development of Appendix A - the conceptual foundation of this study.

Figures one and two below illustrate this integrated conceptual framework using organizational theorists and phase theorists.
Figure 1: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK COMBINING ORGANIZATIONAL AND PHASE THEORISTS
Figure 2: IDENTIFICATION OF KEY CONCEPTS INDIGENOUS TO THIS STUDY
Paradigmatic Bases

Overview of Burrell and Morgan’s Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis

This study incorporated two (functionalist and radical structuralist) of the four paradigms Burrell and Morgan (1979) developed for analysis of social theory outlined in their work titled Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis.

Appendix A contains the integrated conceptual framework for the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms combining the concepts of organizational theorists identified by Burrell and Morgan (1979) and concepts of phase theorists (Havelock and Lasswell).

Burrell and Morgan’s Basic Assumptions

Burrell and Morgan have four basic assumptions. First, that social science theories are based on assumptions related to ontology, epistemology, human nature, and methodology, all of which can be divided into subjective and objective dimensions. Second, studies regarding the nature of society can be divided into the equilibrium – conflict debate which Burrell and Morgan call the regulation and radical change
dimensions. Figure 3 below is directly from Burrell and Morgan (1979, p. 18) and illustrates those dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociology of regulation is concerned with:</th>
<th>Sociology of Radical change is concerned with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) The status quo</td>
<td>(a) Radical change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Social order</td>
<td>(b) Structural conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Consensus</td>
<td>(c) Modes of domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Social integration and cohesion</td>
<td>(d) Contradiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Solidarity</td>
<td>(e) Emancipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Need satisfaction</td>
<td>(f) Deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Actuality</td>
<td>(g) Potentiality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: The Regulation - Radical Change Dimension

Third, the two basic dimensions (subjective/objective and regulation/radical change) are classified into four paradigms. This study did not incorporate the use of two of those four paradigms (radical humanist and interpretivist) because this dissertation focuses on the manner in which organizational entities interact with each other.

Furthermore, the author of this study imposes a great deal external form and structure to the SEA's decision-making process, and this is the antithesis of
the interpretivist inquiry which seeks to probe the viewpoint of the actors, not the observer. This decision to utilize only the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms is similar to that used by Ginsburg (1989).

Figure 4 below (similar to Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 22) illustrates the four paradigms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sociology of Radical Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjective ←———→ Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sociology of Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Four Paradigms for the Analysis of Social Theory

Four, according to Burrell and Morgan (1979, 29) all sociological and organizational theories are incorporated into the four paradigms. It will be shown later how the phase theorists (Havelock and Lasswell) are located in both the radical structuralism and
functionalist paradigms. Figure 5 below (similar to Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 29) illustrates theories separated into the four paradigms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sociology of Radical Change</th>
<th>Radical Humanist</th>
<th>Radical Structuralist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI Anarchistic individualism</td>
<td>Critical theory</td>
<td>Conflict theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ul Solipsism</td>
<td>Russian social theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl French Existentialism</td>
<td>Interpretilivist</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eJ Interpretivist</td>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Social system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1 Solipsism</td>
<td>Hermeneutics</td>
<td>Objectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l1 Phenomenology</td>
<td>Phenomenological socio.</td>
<td>Social action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi Social action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Social action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Social Theories Associated with the Four Sociological Paradigms

Organizational Theorists

Introduction

Using the organizational theorists from the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms outlined by Burrell and Morgan, concepts were identified, re-interpreted to reflect this study, and organized into conceptual clusters (goals, actors, procedures, and timing) within both paradigms.
Concepts of Functionalist Paradigm (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

This is the first paradigm used in this study and is within the objectivist and regulation dimensions, and is the general view the study of organizations. Its primary emphasis is directed at explanations of the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction and actuality. Its approaches are realist, positivist, determinist, and nomothetic. Mechanical and biological analogies are favored while identification, measurement, and analysis is dominated by techniques common to the natural science perspective. The SEA decision-making process is grounded predominantly within this paradigm since the emphasis of the process is maintaining equilibrium between social forces such as the legislature, the public, the PSI, the courts, etc..

The four broad theoretical concepts listed below within the functionalist paradigm incorporate and reinforce the nature of socio-scientific reality. The socio-scientific reality contains three dimensions. First, there is an assumption that society has a
continuing order and pattern, and that theories should explain why the social fabric of society tends to hold together. Second, the theories share a purposive rationality in that they assume that there are external and universal standards of science that can be used to identify, assess, and analyze the external and universal laws of social order. Third, the methods of natural science are the tools that should be used to impose order and regulation from the standpoint of the observer.

The functionalist perspective comes under criticism on three fronts. This perspective does not incorporate issues of conflict, change, and deviancy. Its bias is to examine only structural elements. It often ignores the emergent nature of social organizations.

Below is found a list of the four broad categories of functionalist social science themes identified by Burrell and Morgan.

Integrative theory contains Blau’s (1964) exchange and power model, Merton’s (1968) social and cultural structure model, conflict functionalism (Merton, 1948, 1968; Coser, 1956, 1967) and morphogenic systems (Buckley, 1967).
Social system theory is a combination of structuralism (Comte, 1853; Spencer, 1873; Durkheim, 1938, 1947, 1951; Malinowski, 1936; Radcliffe-Brown, 1952; Parsons, 1951; Merton, 1948, 1968; Buckley, 1967) and systems theory (Parsons, 1951; Homans, 1950; and Buckley, 1967). These two perspectives are unified through use of a common analogy, the biological model.


Interactionism and social action theory is a combination of the theories developed by George Simmel (1950, 1955) and George Herbert Mead (1932, 1934, 1938) regarding social action, with those of Blumer (1966, 1969), Rose (1962), Strauss (1964) regarding social interactionism, and those of Weber (1947), Durkheim (1938), and Pareto (1934, 1935) regarding social action theory.

**Concepts of Radical Structuralist Paradigm (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)**

This is the second paradigm used in this study and is within the objectivist and radical change dimensions, with primary emphasis on radical change, modes of domination, emancipation, deprivation and potentiality. It includes approaches that are realist, positivist, determinist and nomencletic. From this perspective, society is continually changing as a result of resolution of conflictual patterns which
create crises, in turn emancipating man from outmoded social structures.

The unifiers of this paradigm include focus on forces that bring pressure for social change, structures as concrete elements that pose contradictory and antagonistic elements with each other, and a crisis orientation supportive of catastrophic change.

There are three broad categories within the radical structuralist perspective: Russian social theory, contemporary Mediterranean Marxism, and conflict theory. Below is found a list of the three categories of radical structuralist thought (identified by Burrell and Morgan) with the major theoretical contributors.

Russian social theory contains Bukharin’s (1888-1938) historical materialism and anarchistic communism of Kropotkin (1842-1921).

Contemporary Mediterranean Marxism includes the works of Louis Althusser, Louis Colletti and Antonio Gramsci.

Conflict theory includes radical Weberianism. Ralf Dahrendorf and John Rex are authors representing this perspective.
Concepts of Interpretivist and Radical Humanist Paradigms (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

The interpretivist perspective is within the subjectivistic and regulations dimensions. Like the functionalist paradigm, its primary emphasis is directed at explanations of the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction, and actuality. Unlike the functionalist paradigm, its approaches tend to be nominalist, anti-positivist, voluntarist, and ideographic. Because this approach questions the existence of organizations beyond a conceptual sense, it is rarely applied to the study of organizations and has generated very little organizational theory.

The radical humanist perspective is within the subjectivistic and radical change dimensions, modes of dimensions with primary emphasis on radical change, modes of domination, emancipation, deprivation and potentiality and approaches that are nominalist, anti-positivist, voluntarist, and ideographic. From this perspective, ideological superstructures create and dominate a cognitive frame which prohibits many from realizing their true consciousness, thus preventing
maximum human fulfillment. This paradigm is in direct opposition to the functionalist paradigm.

The radical humanists focus on deep political and economic factors and delve into revolutionary change that frees consciousness. Burrell and Morgan (1979: 307) indicate that, "the functionalist usually dismisses radical humanists as Utopian radicals hell-bent upon fanning the flames of revolutionary consciousness, or as mindless existentialists who will not or cannot adjust to the world of everyday 'reality' and accept the inevitable march of 'progress'." There are three broad categories within the radical humanist paradigm: critical theory, anarchistic individualism, and French existentialism.

Phase Theorists

Introduction

Figures 1 and 2 above show that the integrated conceptual framework utilizes both the organizational theorists cited above and the phase theorists cited below.
Overview of Havelock's Change Model

After a comprehensive review of the history of the SEA and a preliminary review of the documents, the author decided that the SEA's institutionalized decision-making process closely paralleled Havelock's (1973) recommended stages for implementing innovation. Phases are extensively reviewed in Havelock's The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Havelock has suggested that there are six stages of planned change. The first is building the relationship. In this study the historical review and the questionnaire help the researcher identify the relationship(s) existing and emerging among the various educational coalitions. The second is diagnosis moving from pains, to problems, to objectives. The third is acquiring relevant resources. The fourth is choosing the solution, during this period a needs assessment is developed, viable alternatives are surfaced and negotiated, and the "best" solution is chosen. The fifth is gaining acceptance, during this phase the implementors are made aware of the adoption and they begin to design the innovation to fit their own circumstances. In this study, this refers to the
Individual post-secondary institution. The sixth is stabilizing the innovation and generating self-renewal. During this phase continuance, evaluation, and redesign of the innovation becomes entirely the responsibility of the implementors.

In this study Havelock's phases were used to help identify the various relationships with the individual educational coalitions through the different phases. At various points throughout the process the clients change, necessitating changes in procedures for working with different key people, norms, and in larger social environments.

Havelock has suggested various issues to consider regarding the management of initial encounters: friendliness, familiarity, rewardingness, and responsiveness. The ideal relationship incorporates elements of reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, and involvement of all relevant parties. He also suggests danger signals and ways to assess the relationships. The strengths and weaknesses of a change process can be identified through applying Havelock's model.
Overview of Lasswell's Social Process Model as Related to This Study

Lasswell and Ohio's SEA

When dealing with multi-institutional situations, rarely do single individuals impact as directly on the events as they do in single organizational settings. Often any cooperative, adaptive effort of multi-institutional bodies take on the flavor of a conglomerative power seeking to establish a monopoly. Therefore, multi-institutional decisions have the capability of drastically altering not only public policy, but also those of base values and attitudes evolving from those changes. The resulting changes have the capability of altering the evolvement of systems associated with them. This is where the social process models would be well adapted for analysis.

One example of a symbiotic mutation was the Ohio's State Department of Education's (SEA) decision to alter the standards for 11 administrative certificates for the K-12 educational institutions. Not only did the SEA involve in the decision process all 17 post-secondary institutions (PSI), but they also included the active participation of many other coalitions or
stakeholders in the process. The primary stakeholders involved were the SEA, and PSI (specifically faculties of educational administration). Other dominant coalitions involved in the process included practicing administrators and teachers, and educational associations.

The changes instituted by the SEA not only altered the standards of the training of administrators, having immediate effects on the curriculum of the PSI, but also were designed to alleviate a myriad of problems, such as improving the K-12 institutions in general, facilitating multi-cultural understanding, improving instructional leadership, introducing computer technology into the schools, and enhancing administrator/personnel and school/community relations. Whether the changes are related to the functionalist or radical structuralist perspectives was dependent on the extent to which the various participants and institutions challenged previous formats. It is the author's opinion that the changes instituted by the SEA appear to be of a functionalist design that are meant to be pervasive in their long-term effects.
In order to accomplish these diverse, long-term goals, the SEA had to use mechanisms that not only incorporated the views of diverse stakeholders into the decision process, but that actually also brought these various audiences to consensus.

**Lasswell’s Decision Process Model and the SEA Process**

The Lasswell model permits the researcher to examine the interdependence between the various systems within organizations and at the same time permits explanations that combine structural, group, and individual frameworks (Pugh, 1981). Use of Lasswell’s overall conceptual model allows the various phases to be linked so that a specific study of reciprocal feedback loops is possible. This makes it possible to move beyond simple identification of structural characteristics or the effects of individual actors. Such a design was recommended by Pugh, et al (1969). A study is strengthened by employing a model that examines both system constraints and individual action by looking at the interplay between systems (Pugh and Hinings, 1976).

The SEA had previously used a decision-making process similar to the Lasswell Decision Process Model.
to accomplish extensive, state-wide standards revisions (Bowers, 1988). Although the SEA made no direct reference to the Lasswell process during the administrative standards change process from 1977-1985, this model continued to permeate all the committee structures within each phase (Bowers, 1988). This SEA process had worked successfully in the past providing balance mechanisms between many coalitions, and is functionalist in design in that the coalitional balances are to be maintained. Because Lasswell's theories were utilized so extensively by the SEA, the standards revision process easily fit Lasswell's categorization and description of phases. That is why the author used the Lasswellian terms of initiation, prescription, and invocation to define the SEA's committee organizational pattern.

Below is found a detailed description of the Lasswellian frameworks designed for such a change process matched with the multi-institutional perspective that was outlined as a mechanism for identifying how the decision process evolved with respect to the SEA in its administrative standards revision.
The Decision Seminar

Lasswell (1956, 1958, 1960, 1965, 1971, 1974) developed the use of the decision seminar as a design that enabled the diverse audiences to examine issues from multiple perspectives, to generate high quality alternatives, and select a plan of action that would be most effective in both accomplishing the objectives, as well as being implementable. This format is similar to that utilized by the SEA to complete several standards revision processes (Bowers, 1988). One of the premises of the decision seminar was that all participants serve dual roles, that of value shaper and that of value sharer.

Analysis of SEA's action through the decision seminar concepts aids in the identification of evolving patterns which guided the sponsoring body, the SEA, in the formation of multi-institutional policy. Lasswell is primarily theoretically grounded in the functionalist paradigm, with incursion into the radical structuralist paradigm with his emphasis on indulgences, deprivations, argumentation, conflict, coalitions indulged, and values saluted or rejected. Lasswellian concepts are found in both the
functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms and therefore concepts generated from a Lasswellian perspective are incorporated into both paradigms of Appendix A.

**Lasswell's Intelligence Phase and the SEA Process**

According to Lasswell the first activity undertaken is to outline and define the goals and sub-goals. The second is to examine the trends relative to the goals and sub-goals (an historical review of the research). The third task is to examine conditions related to the trends (data aggregated by members of the research staff is augmented by outside experts). Fourth, the criterion of relevance to the planning objective is applied. For a major planning objective considerable time is expected to be invested in the inspection of relative, current research conditions. In the SEA process all of the activities occurred in the initiation phase which began in June, 1977, and ended in January, 1982 (see Appendix D).

**Lasswell's Promotion Phase and the SEA Process**

promotion phase the sponsor is actively testing the environment, determining the extent of agitation for change and the resistance to change from power groups that will possibly support or reject change. The force of these feelings are then used to predict the behavior of coalitions who might either support or block implementation (Nutt, 1984). Many alternative master plans are quickly evolved, tested, discarded, and incorporated into an eventual strategy designed to accomplish the process goals.

Lasswell's Prescription Phase and the SEA Process

In the case study under investigation, the promotion and prescription phases were combined and identified as the prescription phase occurring between January, 1982, and January, 1984 (see appendix D).

Lasswell’s Invocation Phase and the SEA Process

Lasswell described the invocation phase as the development of specific, concrete solutions designed to conform to the prescription. In this phase "each alternative may imply new norms or standards which are the root of the support or resistance measured in step
two (promotion). The planner seeks to identify these norms and their offensive or supportive features."
(Nutt, 1984, p. 360)

As for the SEA's change process, the invocation phase occurred between January, 1984, and December, 1984 (see Appendix D).

The next phase initiated by the SEA was the peer review phase occurring between December, 1984, and June, 1985. A peer review panel was directed to review and constructively criticize the PSI proposals in order that the PSI could rewrite the proposals. During the initial review process 12 of the original 17 proposals were accepted (some required minor editing). By June, 1985, the peer review panel had recommended that the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission approve all 17 PSI proposals.

Lasswell's Application, Termination, and Evaluation Phases

During application the solutions are applied. During termination the previous goals are assessed with emphasis on the problems. For evaluation a multi-public consortium assesses the previous phases and the successes or failures of the process.
This case study addressed the issues surrounding the process from June, 1977, until June, 1985, with emphasis on the invocation phase, and therefore did not incorporate the study of the application, termination, and evaluation phases because the SEA had not initiated or completed these subsequent phases.

**Phases in This Study**

The evaluator must have the capability of analyzing each phase from multiple perspectives. The Lasswell model served to facilitate this analysis. A similar social network analysis for assessing organizations was used by Aldrich (1974) and Tichy, Tushman, and Fombrun (1979).

Van de Ven (1981) reinforced the need to identify the pluralistic nature of the environment. He suggested the use of three approaches. First, he treated the unit or position (not the total organization) as the focal point. That was why this study used the perspective of the PSI representatives. Second, he identified the specific groups inside and outside that are interdependent to that focal point. Third, he utilized a social network approach that measured the transactions occurring between the phases.
In this study the conceptual framework facilitated analysis of interactions from four levels: a) level one - the four SEA processes since 1953, b) level two - the SEA process 1977-1985, c) the invocation phase (1984) with the SEA as change agent, and d) the invocation phase (1984) with the PSI as change agent.

Although only one of the four phases (from 1977 to 1985) was studied in depth, information pertinent to the other phases and processes was incorporated in the data analysis, especially when it had a bearing on the results of the success of the PSI in initial proposal development. For the purpose of this study the author looked at resource flows (work, materials, money, and personnel) as well as information flows (communications transmitted through written reports and memos, personal discussions, and group meetings). Van de Ven (1981) indicated that resource flows accomplish three objectives: they "appear to be the basic elements of process in organizations, behaviorally indicate the forms and intensities of instrumental and maintenance activities between units, and provide a different perspective of interdependence, coordination, and control among organizational components that
complements the structural perspective to assess the design of jobs, units, and the overall organization. The transaction analyses were addressed in the perspectives in Appendix A.

In this study committees were found throughout the phases. Within the committee process there developed a consensual awareness that Follett (1926) described as the "law of the situation." She used this term to describe the perceptual identification of tasks, problems, and issues requiring coordination. The purpose of each phase is extant only in terms of the macro-organizational design. That is, the life cycle of each phase ends temporally with the birth of the next phase. It was through this step-wise design that coherence was maintained by the state department employees in this case. The information about initiation, prescription, and peer review phases was documented when it had a bearing on the primary focus of the study - the invocation phase.
Organizing the Conceptual Framework to Facilitate Data Collection and Graphic Presentation

This section is a description of the development of Appendix A - the conceptual framework for this study.

A paradigmatic structure that incorporated the equilibrium and conflict dimensions of social theory was needed. Burrell and Morgan had already divided social and organizational theory into these dimensions. Two of four of Burrell and Morgan's paradigms were used, those being the functionalist and radical structuralist. From the organizational theorists of these two paradigms, concepts were developed and re-interpreted for direct application to this study.

There were other sources for concepts. Education phase theory from Havelock and Lasswell was most applicable to this study and was translated into concepts that would be directly applicable to this study. The theoretical concepts of the phases were sub-divided into whether they were applicable to the entire process, all phases, or a particular phase. The Havelock and Lasswell concepts were integrated with the concepts of the organizational theorists and sorted as
to whether the concepts fit the functionalist or radical structuralist paradigms.

In order to facilitate description and analysis, the concepts within the paradigms were further sorted into conceptual clusters of goals and objectives, actors, procedures, and timing. To facilitate graphic presentation, the concepts of each paradigm were limited to 20 elements.

In appendix A is discussed the 20 concepts within each of the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms subdivided into conceptual clusters, the relation between the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms, the models within the study, the theoretical bases used to develop the individual concepts, and the extended list of concepts for the entire process, all phases, and specific phases. Each of the concepts is referenced to preceding material specifying theoretical categories where applicable and names of specific theorists related to the issue. The narrative in Appendix A explains the rationale and issues within those four divisions, first from within the functionalist and then the radical structuralist paradigms.
From the conceptual framework a series of questions (Appendix B - Interview schedule) and reminder statements (Appendix C - Interviewer probes) were generated. These formed the main elements of the data collection used to view the SEA process from the two paradigms (functionalist and radical structuralist).

Summary

Organizations can be analyzed from different paradigms. In order to do this, a conceptual framework and interview schedule need to be developed, and responses need to be analyzed according to concepts within each paradigm. Burrell and Morgan presented the view of many theorists, some of which were not endemic to the study of the process under investigation. Therefore, the specific concepts of Burrell and Morgan's functionalist and radical structuralist theorists were integrated with Havelock and Lasswellian thought. The concepts were chosen for their particular saliency in the context of this study, and the implications and analysis followed from those concepts.
The interviewee responses were then considered with respect to these two paradigms (functionalist and radical structuralist) in what had actually happened (Chapter V), what could have been anticipated through a critique of the concepts (Chapter VI), and the subsequent implications for action according to the concept reinforcement from the paradigms (Chapter VII).
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology for a field case study of the Ohio's state education agency's (SEA) decision to revise administrative certification standards. A short section on background information and separation of phases is included in this section. The section on conceptual design contains a complete outline of the this study.

The case study was chosen as the research strategy most appropriate to address the research questions and because it would best capture the situational contextuality observed the certification revision process. Principles for executing qualitative and case study research are presented as they were used to guide the author in interpretation, analysis, and synthesis.

Also included in this chapter is information related to data collection including timing, interviewee selection process, interview procedures, and identification of primary documents. Specific
procedures used to verify, interpret, analyze and synthesize the data are described. Reliability, limitations of method, and implications of the study are discussed. Finally, the closing statements of the chapter include overviews of Chapters V, VI, and VII.

Case Study Research

Qualitative Research

Qualitative methods are especially helpful in understanding the dynamics of social processes. Qualitative methods are helpful in understanding the extent of interactive dynamics within and among sub-units of analysis.

Patton (1980, 88-89) suggests qualitative methods are appropriate for at least eight reasons, each of which have immediate application to this study. Those reasons are outlined in the Figure 6 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patton's Rationale compared to SEA's Policy-Making Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Qualitative methods are appropriate to describe and assess particular outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Qualitative methods are appropriate to understand the internal dynamics of a program, the strengths, weaknesses, and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Qualitative methods are appropriate when studying information about critically important cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Qualitative methods are appropriate when focusing on diversity, idiosyncrasies and unique qualities of individual programs or persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Qualitative methods are appropriate when gathering information to improve the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6: COMPARISON OF PATTON'S RATIONALE FOR USE OF QUALITATIVE METHODS AND THIS STUDY
**Fig. 6: COMPARISON OF PATTON'S RATIONALE FOR USE OF QUALITATIVE METHODS AND THIS STUDY (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patton's Rationale</th>
<th>SEA's Policy-Making Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Qualitative methods are appropriate when exploring features of program quality.</td>
<td>As each of the 17 post-secondary institutions submitted proposals, it was evident that both content and process elements of prior phases had become incorporated in some of the proposals and had not been incorporated in others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Qualitative methods are appropriate in discovering whether a process may be affecting clients in unanticipated ways, having either positive or negative side-effects.</td>
<td>Some of the post-secondary institutions experienced qualitative changes within the curriculum and coordination among the faculty that was evident only by discussing the process with people from each institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Qualitative methods are appropriate for developing a holistic view of the process.</td>
<td>The invocation phase of the decision process was analyzed from the functionalist and radical structuralist perspectives and also according to SEA/PSI relations as well as internal PSI relations. An action plan designed to improve the process was then developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding qualitative methodology, Miles (1979, p. 125) has suggested that:

the most serious and central difficulty in the use of qualitative data is that methods of analysis are not well formulated. For quantitative data, there are clear conventions the researcher can use. But the analyst faced with a bank of qualitative data has very few guidelines for protection against self-delusion, let alone the presentation of unreliable or invalid conclusions to scientific or policy-making audiences. How can we be sure that an 'earthy,' 'undeniable,' 'serendipitous' finding is not, in fact, wrong?

**Interview Waves**

Patton (1980) suggested that the qualitative methodology can be used to first discover what is happening and then to verify the discovery. A questioning strategy was designed in this study for such an interaction to occur. First, a person (described as a first wave interviewee) reputed to be knowledgeable of the event was asked to describe the phase in detail. From these descriptions interviewees from the second, third, and fourth waves either corroborated, or discussed from a different perspective the same situation. The results of these interviews were later reviewed with the first wave interviewee. Using this method a researcher can continually shift back and forth between the findings
derived from one wave of interviewees with those described from another level. Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest that this system of continued interactive analysis provides a vehicle whereby the findings "fit" the phenomena under investigation both in terms of convergence and divergence so that the holistic elements were captured.

Case Studies

The case study is the major research approach employed in qualitative methodology. In utilizing the case study method, the researcher is able to discover patterns and consequences that could be lost if quantitative tools were used that treat the variables in isolation. The case study a researcher attempts to provide a deeper insight into a phenomenon by tracing interrelationships between variables in an effort to develop a comprehensive, holistic perspective of the events. Good and Scates (1954, 726) have indicated that the "essential procedure of the case-study method is to take account of all pertinent aspects of one thing or situation, employing as the unit for study an individual, an institution, a community or any group considered as a unit." Another feature of the case study as identified by Yin (1984) is
that its format allows the researcher to analyze a variety of data sources.

Yin (1984) has indicated that the case study should be used when the research questions focus on how and why, when no control is required over behavioral events, and when the focus is on contemporary events. He further explains that case studies can be exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory in nature. This report is both descriptive and explanatory.

The case study approach has other factors that make it especially appealing to researchers. The case study approach could have four themes as its foundation: the particular, the holistic, the longitudinal, and the qualitative. The particular theme of the administrative certification revision study focuses on key actors, specific levels of interviewees, and certain phases. The holistic theme of this study focuses on perceived totality of each of the four phases as well as the entire process. The longitudinal theme permitted the analysis of interwoven issues, conflicts, and strategies evolving within each phase and throughout the entire process. The qualitative theme incorporated the element of
There are at least three weaknesses of case studies, the greatest of which is lack of rigor. "Too many times, the case study investigator has been sloppy, and has allowed equivocal evidence or biased views to influence the direction of the findings and conclusions" (Yin, 1984, p. 21). This issue can be addressed by developing techniques that strengthen the chain of evidence supporting any conclusions drawn. Another problem according to Yin (1984) is that there is little basis for scientific generalization. In this research a well-established body of academic literature is used from which scientific generalization are possible. A third problem is that case studies are time consuming for the researcher and the final reports are simply too voluminous. This report has developed several qualitative data reduction techniques to make the volume more manageable and to permit a clearer understanding of the forensic source of the data.
Collecting Background Information and the Role of the Researcher

Throughout the invocation phase the author was a graduate student in educational administration at The Ohio State University. Her job was to represent the faculty at all SEA meetings regarding the changes of administrative standards, to bring all information back to the faculty, and to remind them of timelines. She was also employed to assist the faculty in developing the OSU proposal.

Much of the background information incorporated in the literature review regarding the SEA's history was gathered through document review and informal interviews with key SEA personnel including the assistant superintendents and two administrative specialists. While the preliminary informal interviews were designed to gather the background information, the author specifically reviewed the foci and levels of the study and requested any information that the SEA personnel might have regarding the nine-year process. During the informal interviews with the SEA personnel three tasks were accomplished: a) clarification of the timing and foci of the phases, including the time frames, the actual events occurring in each phase (see Appendix D), b)
Identification of goals and objectives, key actors, procedures and timing of each phase, and c) partial development of the interview schedule. The SEA personnel were invaluable in assisting in the development of the interview schedule, both in terms of identifying specific questions and also in terms of phrasing the questions directed at the various waves of interviewees of the different phases.

The author specifically designed the study to incorporate interviews of a limited number of PSI (six or seven PSI were believed to be an adequate representation of three sizes of PSI and whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development). Ohio's Assistant Superintendent, Robert Bowers assisted in the selection of institutions designated for interviews by identifying large, medium, and small institutions that were successful and unsuccessful in initial proposal development in all three size categories. He also suggested that at least one private post-secondary institution be included in the interviews and that added to seventh PSI to the study.

The complexity of the process, the inter-institutional involvement, as well as the nine years
covered by the period under study required the extensive and systematic accumulation of background information covering all four phases (initiation, prescription, invocation, peer review). A chart listing the phases, times, and critical events is found in Appendix D.

**Critique of Collecting Background Information**

Yin (1984) has noted that a problem with collecting background information is that biases occur with either poor recall and (especially appropriate in this study because the process was so dispersed) with inaccurate information. The way in which a researcher overcomes this is to use other data sources to corroborate interviews. For the purpose of this study, almost every available document related to the SEA process was secured for corroborative purposes. It was discovered early during interviewing that key informants in each interview wave occasionally did not know what other committee members in the same phase were doing. Not only did this certification revision process have the complicating elements of long time lines, multiple phases, differentiated committee structure within phases, and large numbers of participants from many educational coalitions, but also, by SEA design, the phases were
discrete with different participants, and only selected information regarding previous phases was communicated to committees of subsequent phases. The corroboration produced by multiple data sources was critical for a study such as this because the process was quite dispersed.

Because the author was involved in the proposal development for the largest PSI in the state, she was aware of the time, energy, and sheer numbers of people that were needed to submit an acceptable proposal to the SEA. If the largest PSI had difficulty because of personpower, certainly one area of concern would be the size of the PSI, and if they were successful how they overcame the personpower issue.

There were problems in identifying small, medium, and large PSI. Since the SEA personnel assisted in this process, perhaps their information was based on figures averaged over the previous several years. One PSI, identified as being a large PSI by the SEA, had an interviewee who indicated that they were actually medium because the Board of Regents had placed growth limits on them a number of years ago, and therefore they had a smaller educational administration faculty and fewer students in their masters and doctoral programs than a
larger PSI would have generally experienced. Staff at one of the small PSI indicated that they felt that they were actually among the largest because a greater number of students obtained administrative certification through their institution than perhaps any other institution in the state. There could have been other reasons for interviewees claiming alternative classifications for their PSI and it is unclear whether the claims were also based on unfounded perceptions of other PSI programs.

The author did attempt to corroborate the information regarding size. What appeared to be a simple matter of determining PSI size is actually very difficult for three reasons. First, faculties of educational administration may not be formally constituted as such at some PSI. The educational administration program may be fully integrated with all other graduate education programs with professors teaching from a generic perspective (e.g. research methods), and it would be the student's responsibility to apply this information to their own field specification. In this situation, the professors were often classified as members of the education faculty with no formal division between administration, curriculum, special education, etc.. Conversely, another
PSI might have designated 20 professors as the faculty of educational administration, and some of these people might be teaching what another PSI might consider to be predominantly curriculum and instruction courses. In other words, if a researcher asked for the number of professors on a specific PSI faculty of educational administration the answers may range from zero to 35 depending on the perceptions of the interviewee and/or departmental organization of the PSI and this would be unrelated to enrollment figures of the college or of the university. Unbeknownst to the SEA personnel who helped identify the sizes of PSI, the terminology and organizational divisions for education administration faculties were not consistent between PSI.

Second, as to the matter of administrative certification, prior to 1986 a student needed a masters' degree in any field of education, and anywhere from one to five administrative courses (depending on the standards of each PSI). The masters' degree and the various administrative courses could conceivably come from different PSI. A researcher could perhaps gain access to the individual PSI records advising that certification be given to specific number of students. Prior to 1986 this
would have meant that the PSI had verified that the student had obtained a masters' degree in "something from somewhere", and had taken at least one course from that PSI. However, it would in no way indicate whether the student completed any program in educational administration from any PSI.

Third, there were some PSI that had no existing program in educational administration at the masters' and/or doctoral level. Yet, some of the small PSI had previously recommended large numbers of persons for administrative certificates, and therefore legitimately claimed that their small PSI was actually large when involved in the certification of students.

Furthermore, during confirmation interviews these discrepancies were brought to the attention of SEA personnel. Given the complexity of the question, it is no wonder that even the SEA did not have comprehensive knowledge of the sizes of various faculties, average number of students admitted to masters' and doctoral programs in each PSI per year, and number of administrative certificates originating from each PSI per year. Given the problems associated with size designation, probably the SEA personnel are still in the
best position to intuitively know which PSI should be assigned to which category.

With all of the confusing dimensions associated with what appeared to be a simple categorization (size), the author decided to maintain the original PSI size designations as suggested by the SEA personnel.

Another recommendation from an interviewee was that it would have been advisable to interview all 17 PSI, not just seven. To interview all 17 PSI was simply unmanageable with this type of qualitative design, and given the sampling techniques incorporated into the study, it was felt that including all 17 PSI would not have yielded enough significant additional data to make the effort worthwhile.

Conceptual Design of This Study

Introduction

A conceptual design for this study was developed that allowed the idiosyncrasies of the process to be examined and yet maintained the integrity of the process so that patterns and consequences would not be lost. The author began this study with a working knowledge of the invocation phase. To facilitate discussion of the SEA's
decision-making process the author decided to divide the study into phases. The section below identifies how this was done.

The next step was to establish an integrated conceptual framework that could be used to describe and analyze the certification revision process. The rich theoretical concepts were developed and divided into the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms with sub-divisions of goals and objective, actors, procedures, and timing (see Appendix A for this integration of perspectives). An interview schedule (Appendix B) and an Interviewer probe (Appendix C) were generated from Appendix A.

The third step was to conduct the interviews (described below under Data Sources).

The fourth step was to take the information gathered during interviews (interview transcripts, publications, official records, reports, primary/secondary documents), verify the accuracy, and change the interview transcriptions to charted data. The description of this is found below under Data Collection and Presentation.

The fifth step was to apply the concepts from the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms
(Appendix A) to four levels within the study. These theories were applied to the first level to examine the usual SEA standards revision process, to the second level to examine the elements of the total SEA process (1977-1985), to the third level to examine the Invocation Phase (1984-1985) with the SEA as change agent, and finally to the fourth level to examine the Invocation Phase (1984-1985) with the PSI as change agents. (This is discussed in Chapter V)

The sixth step was to use the examination at four levels (Chapter V) to identify and explain consistencies or inconsistencies that were evident between the process and theoretical concepts (Chapter VI). This produced the concept-building structure of the dissertation. In this manner the conceptual framework was critiqued, new conceptual elements were generated, and previous concepts were reconstructed to incorporate the new findings.

The seventh step (Chapter VII) was to develop conclusions and implications for action that could be used to improve all similar SEA processes, such as the SEA process related to changes of administrative standards, the invocation phase, and the handling of problems related to the internal dynamics of the PSI.
The diagrams of the entire conceptual design of the study is found below in Figures 7 and 8.
| Basic knowledge of Invocation phase and whole process | Chapter II |
| Conceptual bases that describe the process | Chapter III |
| Development of conceptual frameworks from concepts | Chapter III | Appendix A |
| Development of interview schedule and interviewer probes | Appendixes B,C |
| Interview transcriptions, important documents | Chapter IV explanation |
| Charted data combined with data sources | Chapter IV explanation |
| Description of Process | Chapter V |
| Critique Concepts | Chapter VI |
| Implications for Action | Chapter VII |

Figure 7: OVERALL CONCEPTUAL DESIGN OF THIS STUDY (Administrative Standards Revision 1977-1985)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Researcher's Analytical Processes</th>
<th>Component of the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1983-1985</td>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>Basic knowledge of the process (Chapters I, II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Author as participant observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEA helped identify phases that facilitate discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985-1985</td>
<td>Paradigmatic Framework Leading to Development, Expansion and Revision of Questions and Questionnaires</td>
<td>Paradigm Bases (Chapter III) (Appendices A, B, C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1985-1985</td>
<td>Interview Methodology</td>
<td>Interviews provided: transcripts official records reports primary/secondary documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(explained in Chapter IV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1986-1988</td>
<td>Evolution of Procedural Methodology Utilized in the Transition of Interview Data to Charts explained in Chapter IV</td>
<td>Charted Data (quantification of qualitative data base) (Chap. IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1988-1989</td>
<td>Descriptive Design</td>
<td>Process Description (Chap. V) at four levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1988-1989</td>
<td>Analytical Methodology Connecting Interview Data and Theoretical Bases (Chapter III) categorization &amp; sorting data, theory critique, derivation of action plan</td>
<td>Process Description of Invocation Phase (Chapter V) Critique of Concepts (Chapter VI) Implication for Action (Chapter VII)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8: DETAILED CONCEPTUAL DESIGN OF THIS STUDY (Administrative Standards Revision 1977-1985)
Procedures Used to Derive The Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework used for this study was organized in such a manner that different conceptual elements could be pulled to examine different foci and search patterns.

The concepts used were divided into two paradigms, (functionalist or radical structuralist). Concepts were generated from the theoretical bases, and those were then divided into four conceptual clusters: goals, actors, procedures, or timing. From the conceptual framework an interview schedule of eight questions (Appendix B) was developed that a) elicited information covering the canonical questions of who, what, where, when, why, and how which were endemic to the process; and b) was designed to parallel the theoretical perspectives. From the interview transcripts and documents, the data were generated and paraphrasing was charted according to whether the responses applied to the functionalist and/or radical structuralist paradigms and as to whether the data related to goals, actors, procedures, or timing.

The charted paraphrasing was used to generate a description of the process, a critique of the original concepts, and to develop conclusions and implications for
action for the next phase of the public decision-making process.

The figures below (Figures 9 and 10) outline the relationship of the theoretical bases to questions to the phase descriptions, theory critiques, and conclusions and implication for action. An in-depth discussion of these relationships is included in Chapter III.
Conceptual Bases - Chapter III

- Conceptual Level
- Concepts

- Functionalist & Radical Structuralist Paradigms (goals, actors, procedures, timing)
- Concepts

- generated operational questions found in

- Appendix A and B - Functionalist & Radical Structuralist Paradigms (goals, actors, procedures, timing)
- Conceptual Framework

- combined for convenience to develop

- Interviewee Schedule & Interviewer Probe - Appen. B,C
- who, what, where, when, & how
- Interview Format

- data generated and charted by

- Functionalist & Radical Structuralist Paradigms (goals, actors, procedures, timing)
- Data Generation

- charted data used to

- Describe process (Chapter V)
- Concepts

- Critique Original Concepts (Chapter VI)
- Return to Concepts

- Develop Implications for for Action (Chapter VII)
- Return to Concepts

Figure 9: DESIGN OF CONCEPTUAL SHIFTS FROM THEORY TO ACTION
Statement from Conceptual Framework (Functionalist Paradigm - Goals):

Whenever there is organizational change one question is whether the participants understand the goal of the entire process. The extent to which the goal is clear and articulated will correlate with the degree of success of the process.

Question in Appendix A:
1. Were the goals and objectives of the time period clear, articulateable?

Question in Appendix B
1. What were the goals/objectives of the SEA during the phase, through the whole process?

Question in Appendix C
1. What were the goals/objectives of the SEA during the phase, through the whole process?

Probes/subcategories: educational, political, financial, sociological, institutional, personal, other

Data Generation and Charting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and objectives</th>
<th>PSI Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Ohio's administrators</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade pre-service training</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate writing of proposal</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA to hear/handle potential grips</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get cooperation of PSI</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get program uniformity/conformity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description (Chapter V):
The goals and objectives from the functionalist perspective were clear and well articulated. (See rules for recognizing patterns in section titled Data Analysis.)

Conceptual Critique (Chapter VI):
Even though the goal (to improve Ohio's administrators) was clear and well articulated.

Conclusions and Implications for Action (Chapter VII):
The SEA should continue to maintain this as a goal for subsequent processes.

Fig. 10: SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF CONCEPTUAL SHIFT
Critique of Procedures Used to Derive The Theoretical Framework

It is obvious that different researchers would choose different authors and theoretical concepts. By using an integration of concepts across two paradigms this study has become much more representative of general theory bases than if a researcher had chosen only one theoretical positions such as that of Havelock or Lasswell. A person reading the same general theory bases might have chosen different authors and statements from which theoretical perspectives would be generated, however, the findings would generally be similar if an equally large sample was drawn from the literature.

Separation of Phases

The decision-making process regarding the change of administrative standards, implemented by Ohio's SEA was a very complex four-phase process involving many lay people, educators, educational associations, field administrators, as well as immediately affecting 17 post-secondary institutions. This study is focused primarily on the third phase (Invocation, January, 1984 - December, 1984) of the decision-making process with background information
on the other three phases (initiation, prescription, and peer review). Through informal interview and by providing publications, primary documents, secondary documents, and official records, the SEA personnel were instrumental in identifying which activities occurred during which time period. Each step of the decision-making process was characterized by utilizing certain mechanisms to achieve change, and included the incorporation of specific structures and procedures designed to attain certain goals while fostering a balance of input between players and coalitions.

The primary focus of the study, the decision-making process during invocation, was analyzed within the appropriate contextual setting. The author's knowledge of extensive background information facilitated the interviewing process with key participants who were involved during the various phases. The questions were designed to gather perceptions regarding the process as well as designed to stimulate the interviewees' thoughts regarding alternatives that could have been incorporated into the process. By integrating background information that clarified the process with a carefully constructed interview schedule and focused interviews with key
participants at each level, a clear perspective of the invocation phase was developed.

Data Sources

Data Collection

There were five sources of information: a) publications from the SEA files, b) direct observation by the author during the Invocation Phase (explained above in section titled Collecting Background Information and the Role of the Researcher), c) successive interviewing yielding tapes, tape transcriptions, and written notes from interviewer probe sheets, d) primary documents outlining official committee mandates, and e) secondary documents giving information regarding committee operation. These information sources are outlined below in Figure 11.
PUBLICATIONS SECURED FROM SEA FILES


Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers, 1975, State Board of Education of Ohio (referred to as the "red book").


Cossler, W.. Revitalizing Teacher Education in Ohio (from State Department of Education files - presentation).

Direct Observation
   Author was present during SEA/PSI meetings during which proposal development was explained.

Successive Interviewing
   Various documents listed above, Tapes, Tape Transcriptions, Written Notes from Interview Probe Sheets.

Fig. 10: DATA SOURCES
Primary and Secondary Documents, Official Records from Specific Phases

**Phase 1 - Initiation**
- Laurence T. Mayher's article "Redesign Administrator Training" with a cover memo from F. B. Walter to the Executive Staff (June 6, 1977).
- Paul W. Hailey's response to the memo and article in which he indicates that the groundwork had already been laid for redesigning administrator training.
- Proceedings of the Grob Conference (October 5, 1978) which focused on graduate education for professional personnel. Dr. Walter focused on graduate education and identified specific areas for improvement and development in administrative education.
- History of standards and of actions taken to study administrator standards and propose a revision process/plan.
- Administrator Training Advisory Committee (membership list)
- Proposed Timeline of Activity

**Phase 2 - Prescription**
- Recommendations to State Board of Education for Proposed Mandates
- Administrator Certification Advisory Committee (membership list)
- Administrator Certification Advisory Committee (organization association)

**Phase 3 - Invocation**
- Standards for School Administrators
- Introductory Statement from SEA regarding Initiation and Prescription
- Administrator Certification Standards Implementation Timeline

**Phase 4 - Peer Review**
- Administrative Preparation Programs Review Panel (committee assignments).
- SEA Instructions and Suggested Review Questions to Peer Review Panel: Questions, Comment Page.
- Interview Schedule Administrator Preparation Program Proposals
- Report of the Review Panel on the Proposal by X Institution
- List of Representatives of Institutions Defending Their Proposals
- Initial Proposals from: Xavier University, Miami University, Wright State University, University of Dayton, Ohio State University, Ursaline College, Cleveland State University, and Toledo University.
- Entry Year Program Proposal from Wright State University
Yin (1984) indicated that data collection is not routinized in case study research and therefore is particularly difficult because of the greater demands on ego, emotions, and intellect. Furthermore, Yin (1984) indicated that the researcher needs to guard against biased procedures and to take full advantage of the opportunities rather than being trapped by them. He (1984) has indicated that in order to overcome some of the case study weaknesses of the past, the researcher must use multiple data sources, create a data base, and maintain the chain of evidence. In this research study there was an attempt to overcome some of the weaknesses outlined by Yin such as: over-reliance on documents, interpretive reliability of archival evidence, interviewee bias, poor recall or inarticulation, and the inclination of the researcher to become an advocate of the researched group.

**Interviews with Key People and Securing Background Data**

This study was organized to include an inductive, exploratory process, allowing the author to discover and to pursue further variables and interrelationships that the author had not identified as important when the study was initiated. The exploratory nature of the study
Incorporated what the author has indicated as a successive interviewing technique (waves) for obtaining background information.

**Interviews**

The general format for multiple interviewing is found in Miles and Huberman's *Qualitative Data Analysis* (1984). They suggested that the interviewer conduct "multiple interviews with key informants and single interviews with peripheral actors using a common, semi-structured schedule, across sites, covering the principal research questions" (Miles and Huberman 1984, 19).

**Interview waves**

The inductive element of the interview process was further enhanced through the initial identification of interviewee waves that were specifically chosen to assure an incorporation of multiple perspectives into the study. In order for the study to be maximally adaptive, seven waves of interviewees were identified at the outset. With accumulation of background information, the author targeted the participants for those seven waves.

The first interview wave was composed of Ohio Department of Education personnel having primary responsibilities in the changes in the administrative
certificates throughout 1977-1985. Some of the SEA personnel had a great deal of knowledge regarding a specialized segment of the decision process. Failure to interview these individuals might cause an omission of a perspective that is not usually tapped, that of the technical expert, the person behind the scenes, whose usual function is to deliver specified data upon request. These serve as a verification devise and as a reality frame check.

The second interview wave was composed of four faculty members from The Ohio State University (two of whom attended SEA meetings, and all of whom were heavily involved in the development of proposal). This wave served as a pretest for the Interview Instruments. All four faculties members assisted in testing, revising, and refining the Interview schedule and interviewer probe sheet. Three interviews were taped (two of these interviews were transcribed, and one tape was not transcribed because of poor quality, but the Interviewer's notes were used).

The third interview wave was identified through the recommendations of the first level SEA personnel. These third wave interviewees were often the chairpersons of
various committees and sub-committees during four phases, or they were persons who exhibited exceptional leadership during the process. The names of the third wave of interviewees were gathered from the first wave of interviewees, but were selected because they were identified by the SEA as sharing views similar to the SEA.

The fourth interview wave was composed of persons who served as fostering counterpoint opinions to the dominant coalition previously interviewed in waves one and three. The fourth wave of interviewees were also identified by SEA personnel.

The fifth interview wave was composed of persons who were selected because they were identified as persons who were external to the actual process. One individual, for example, had studied the SEA public decision-making process previously. Another had to develop the proposals for two institutions, but had not had input in the process. The fifth wave of interviewees were identified through information gleaned from waves one through four.

The sixth interview wave was the professorial representatives of seven of the 17 PSI that were involved during the invocation phase (the primary focus of this study). They were chosen as representatives of large,
medium, and small institutions which were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development. Four of the interviewed faculties of the PSI were successful in initial proposal development; three were unsuccessful. The seventh interview wave was identified as persons who could clarify any discrepancies noted in the first, through sixth waves. These persons were SEA assistant superintendents (Dr. Bowers and Dr. Hailey) directly associated with the standards revision process.

Interview Timing and Tape Transcription

The actual length of time of the interviews varied with availability of interviewee and their comfort levels. The tapes were transcribed within a week of the interview. Any documents obtained were filed according to specific phases, whole process, or general SEA information.

Interview Protocol

Initial interview contacts were made by telephone to schedule the appointment, and a copy of the interview schedule was mailed. As to the question of anonymity promised to the interviewees, there was an effort to avoid attributing any point of view to a single person.

Regarding the comfort level of the interviewee, Yin (1984, p. 75) has indicated that:
For interviewing key persons, the investigator must cater to the interviewee's schedule and availability, not that of the research team. The nature of the interview is much more open-ended, and an interviewee may not necessarily cooperate fully in answering the questions. Similarly, in making observations of real-life activities, it is the investigator who is intruding into the world of the subject being studied rather than the reverse; under these conditions, the investigator must make special arrangements to be able to act as an observer and the investigator's behavior is the one likely to be constrained.

Initially the interview protocol called for an open-ended questionnaire with one question on each page to be filled out by the interviewee prior to the appointment. This was followed by a taped interview session. Since the respondent knew the questions beforehand, the tape recorded interview was semi-structured, allowing the interviewee the latitude for discussing issues or concerns that were perceived as important to the study.

The preliminary introduction to the questions well in advance of the actual interview served a four-fold purpose. First, a list of the questions that would be covered during a subsequent interview gave the interviewee some assurance that the project was organized and highly structured. Second, the advance notice of the content of the questions was intended to put the interviewee at ease. Third, the interview was conducted more efficiently in
that the interviewee had time to think about each question and to prepare a concise, straight-forward, but well-constructed responses that reduced ambiguity in interpretation. Fourth, if the interviewee so wished, the questionnaire was filled out in advance so that most of the interview time allowed the interviewee either to elaborate on the questions or to suggest other areas of concern that might have greater importance than what the author had originally thought.

One major difficulty arose with the original interview protocol. It was discovered early in the interviewing that the first couple of interviewees had not written anything down on the questionnaire. This could have occurred for at least two reasons: a) the questionnaire was too long (8 pages) and b) the answers could have taken a myriad of forms and without the interviewer, the present specific intent of the questions was unknown.

To correct this situation and to put the interviewees more at ease, the author condensed the questions to fit on one page and proceeded with taping all the interviews with a focused interview format. By using this format the author could explore issues that would corroborate or
contradict previous interviewees. This format seemed to match the styles of most participants in the study. (One individual refused any taping; another asked that the tape recorder be turned off between questions so that he could better organize his answers.)

The interviews lasted from between one hour to five hours over three days. The rule for length of time was that the interview would cover each question to the satisfaction of the interviewee. Some of the interviews had one respondent with others having as many as three; it was the option of the interviewees to decide what was most comfortable for them. When the interviews contained only one respondent, the period was usually only approximately one hour and very straightforward. When there were multiple respondents present the interview took on the form of a cathartic, consensual format where the interviewees were trying to combine their various perspectives to establish a consistent and more accurate memory of events.

Summary of Interviewing Process

The same interview schedule (Appendix B) was used for every interviewee in waves three through six. During wave one the background information was surfaced and the
Interview schedule was being developed. During wave two interview pilots were run. During waves three through seven, questions were asked as a form of clarification and triangulation.

Following each interview transcriptions of the interview were immediately typed. A review of the interview transcript provided guidance as to what issues to pursue, which persons to contact next, and collaborated information gathered from other interviewees that was not originally believed to be important.

There were 32 separate interviews with 36 persons. Six persons were involved in secondary interviews. 20 interviews were taped; 19 were transcribed.

Figure 12 below identifies the waves, number of interviews in each, whether the interview was formal or informal, how the interviewee was chosen (targeted), what portion of the process they discussed, how many persons were in the interview, and the dates.
Figure 12: SUCCESSIVE INTERVIEWING (WAVES)
Critique of Interview Process

The original intention of the author was to complete each wave of interviews sequentially, starting with wave one and ending with wave seven. This was originally designed so that each wave was reflected in a successive focusing process whereby information and references gained from previous levels were incorporated into the selection process used to identify key people and important issues at each successive wave.

However, with the press of professional responsibilities, the interviews occurred with a) wave one, SEA information; b) wave two, OSU faculty assisted development of interview schedule; c) mixed interviews among waves three, four, five, six; d) wave seven with confirmation interviews with SEA personnel; and e) finishing mixed interviews among waves three, four, five, six. Possibly, the mixed waves of interviews were better than the original sequential design in that major problems that arose in the third and fourth waves could be discussed with participants from waves one and two. This offered a type of triangulation and confirmation process. Furthermore, by identifying
critical issues occurring in later phases, the participants from earlier phases were able to focus their attention on whether those same problems arose in earlier phases, and how they thought they had resolved those issues previously.

The assistance and participation of the SEA personnel (the assistant state superintendents and two technical assistants) was very critical to the completion of this report. With the exception of the 17 letters from the SEA to the PSI after peer review outlining the superior points of their proposals, the author received every item requested almost immediately. This coincides with the conclusions drawn by participants in initiation and prescription, that the SEA provided an excellent example of technical assistance.

The preliminary identification of waves of interviewees was a success of this project. There were extreme varieties of viewpoints between waves and many consistencies within waves, as had been anticipated.

At times the interviewee was a participant in more than one phase. Since the interview schedule was applicable to each phase, the participant was asked to
address each question in each phase. Initially, the interviewer thought that the simplest way to ask these questions was to review the question as it applied to phase one, then phase two, three, and four. It was discovered very early that some participants had difficulty focusing in that manner. When this occurred, the interviewer identified which phase that was under discussion and then asked eight questions pertaining to that phase only. Then the interviewer moved to the next phase and asked the same eight questions again.

Participants of the invocation phase were asked to respond to the same question from two levels. It was found that for some it was easier to ask all eight questions from the level of SEA as change agent, and then all eight from the level of PSI as change agent. Other interviewees found it easier to respond to consider both levels (SEA as change agent and PSI as change agent) simultaneously while answering each question.

Some interviews began in a hostile manner, with a great deal of frustration directed at the SEA and having an interviewer from one of the PSI.
One interviewee took exception to the author's use of the term conflict with identification of critical issues. He did not want to identify any conflict, but there were a lot of critical issues. This individual was the youngest, least experienced interviewee who had recently been appointed to a PSI faculty.

When there was more than one interviewee during the session the style, format, and responses changed significantly. Of the 32 interviews, three were with more than one participant. Two of those three began with a great deal anger directed at the SEA. All three multiple participant interviews were used as a development of consensual institutional memory. In these three the attitude of trying to understand elements of a painful process was more evident.

Perhaps the study would have been more accurate if all the interviews were conducted as a group (all the faculty members participating in the SEA process would be present). One problem with this recommendation is that due to the nature of process, the SEA invites older, well-established professionals to participate, and over the seven year period several critical participants had died.
A simple, straight-forward questionnaire could have been used. The interview process permitted at least three major advantages: a) It allowed the interviewer to focus on critical issues identified from other interviews, b) If a question arose as to the meaning of a specific focus from the interview schedule the interviewer could interpret it in a manner that the interviewee could understand, and c) any ambiguities could be probed (i.e. in which ways was technical assistance both good and poor).

Glaser and Straus (1967) have suggested that the simultaneous interweaving of data collection, coding and analysis can provide an evolving documentation of emerging concepts or developments from data collected from each successive stage of the study, in this case each successive interviewee. It was for these reasons that the author chose the methods of data collection described above and those of collation and presentation described below.

**Data Collation and Presentation**

The method for data collection and analysis was specifically chosen for its interactive, integrative
character. The method was not employed to freeze a moment in time, but rather to generate and create a symbiotic relationship with the various frames in order to more effectively generate understanding for the researcher and the reader. To study such a complicated decision-making process it was necessary to use multiple strategies that would simultaneously capture the multiple perspectives, inter-institutional complexity of interaction, and contextuality, while at the same time facilitating the collection, collation and presentation of data that would allow a description and analysis of the SEA’s decision-making process.

The first consideration was to use a strategy that would capture the interactive dynamics occurring and evolving within and during the phases of the decision process. In the author’s view, utilizing a qualitative, naturalistic research model such as the case study was the best vehicle available for such a purpose.

For the purpose of this study the author had to develop a comprehensive data reduction technique which in this study is called collation and is the careful comparison of the various transcribed interviews. The
end product of collation was a concise presentation in chart format from which three objectives could be realized: a) the qualitative data could be quantitatively assessed for patterns, b) the convergences could be discussed in terms of the operational questions and their concomitant theoretical bases, and c) the divergences could be identified, analyzed, and discussed.

To begin the collation process the tape of each interview was transcribed within the following week. The transcripts were then analyzed by the author using data reduction techniques described by Miles and Huberman (1984). Miles and Huberman (1984, 21) indicate that because of the information overload intrinsic to qualitative data, that it is necessary to "reduce complex information into selective and simplified Gestalts or easily understood configurations."

Initially the researcher used the transcripts and charted paraphrases to create a myriad of charts and to develop the narrative. The most significant problem with this method was that an independent reviewer looking at the charts would have to review as many as 88 pages of a single PSI transcript to locate the quote
that could possibly be paraphrased as the chart had indicated. This was quickly recognized as a drawback for replication and multiple reviewer reliability. A new design was created that allowed replication given the same transcripts and that provided a high degree of reviewer reliability. The new design identified page numbers on which direct quotes were taken and the actual paraphrasing beside it. A mechanism was developed that brought the study full circle by way of linking the paraphrasing directly to the theoretical perspectives. The paraphrasing was matched to one or more of the theoretical perspectives. These linkages are diagramed below in Figure 13.
Question: What were the goals and objectives of the invocation phase during the invocation phase?

During the invocation phase, the major goal was to get each institution to do the process, to cooperate, to go along with it.

---

Figure 13: TRANSITION OF TRANSCRIPT TO PARAPHRASE
Data Separation

Data were then separated as to whether they applied to each of the four levels of the study. The levels of the study are explained in detail below in the section titled Levels of Analysis. Those levels were: 1) all similar SEA decision-making processes (1953-1985), 2) total SEA process (1977-1985), 3) Invocation Phase with SEA as change agent, and 4) Invocation Phase with PSI as change agent. Therefore, Chapters V (description and examination), VI (theory building), and VII (conclusions and implications for action) contain those same four levels of examination: a) all SEA processes, b) SEA process 1977-1985, c) Invocation Phase with SEA as change agent and d) Invocation Phase with PSI as change agent.

A mechanism was developed that brought the study full circle by way of linking the paraphrasing directly to the theoretical perspectives. The paraphrasing was matched to one or more of the theoretical perspectives and given a point value according to its power of presence within the study (power of presence is explained below in the section titled Pattern Search and Power of Theory. This is diagramed in Figure 14.
Fig. 14: SEPARATION AND PRESENTATION OF DATA
Data was matched to theoretical concepts. Values were assigned regarding pattern within data. Information was presented in stacked column design to strength of each theory.

Chapter V - Description and Data Presentation

Chapter VI - Critique of Concepts

Chapter VII - Implications for Action
Data reduction techniques for interviews involved the following steps:

1. The original transcripts were divided into one of the four levels that the interviewee had addressed (Level 1 - all similar SEA processes, Level 2 - the total SEA process (1977-1985, Level 3 - Invocation Phase with SEA as change agent, and Level 4 - Invocation Phase with SEA as change agent).

2. Since the Invocation Phase was the primary focus of this study, only that portion of the transcript was scrutinized extensively.

3. Large poster charts were made of preliminary reviews of the transcripts.

4. Responses of interviewees were paraphrased in a manner that could be traced back to the original data. Statements were cross-referenced when stated as answers to more than one question.

5. The questions from the two unified theoretical paradigms (Functionalist and Radical Structuralist - Appendix A) had already been divided into four divisions (goal and objectives, actors, procedures, and timing). The paraphrasing of each interviewee was first separated as to whether it fit the Functionalist and/or Radical Structuralist Paradigms, and then further separated into one of the four sub-divisions.

6. Charts were developed for each transcription with the final subdivisions. According to Miles and Huberman (1984, 21) the display (in this case charts) is an "organized assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action taking."

7. The data (paraphrased responses) from each of the interviewees was combined in chart form (See Appendix E for an example).

8. The paraphrasing was then matched to one or more of the theoretical perspectives and given a point value according to its presence within
the study (power of presence is explained below in the section titled Pattern Search and Power of Theory).

Critique of Data Collation and Presentation

According to Miles and Huberman (1984, 18) qualitative data are especially vulnerable to "sources of bias, imprecise measurement, weak generalizability, overload of data, and extreme labor-intensiveness." The major problem of data reduction of a qualitative study is that the researcher chooses what quotes to paraphrase, which paraphrases to use, and how the paraphrases are grouped under major headings. At least with the process outlined above, an independent reviewer can quickly trace the paraphrase to the direct quote.

Data Analysis

Levels of Analysis

This report has incorporated within it four levels of examination, two of which are very brief (Level 1 - similar SEA processes 1953-1985 and Level 2 - total process 1977-1985) and two that were more extensive (Level 3 - Invocation Phase with SEA as change agent and Level 4 - Invocation Phase with PSI as change
agent). Level 3 - Invocation Phase with SEA as change agent was designed to examine the leadership of the SEA throughout the Invocation Phase (the way it handled state-wide meetings, timelines, interactions, etc. in directing the PSI in their development of their proposals. Level 4 - Invocation Phase with PSI as change agent was designed to examine how the PSI had acted within their own institutions to accomplish this massive project.

Regarding qualitative methodology, Miles (1979, p. 131) has suggested that:

the most serious and central difficulty in the use of qualitative data is that methods of analysis are not well formulated. For quantitative data, there are clear conventions the researcher can use. But the analyst faced with a bank of qualitative data has very few guidelines for protection against self-delusion, let alone the presentation of unreliable or invalid conclusions to scientific or policy-making audiences. How can we be sure that an 'earthy,' 'undeniable,' 'serendipitous' finding is not, in fact, wrong?

In order to overcome the limitations that Miles has identified above, this study incorporated several mechanisms. The first mechanism was to design a systematic process of transition between the transcription to paraphrasing (Figure 13 above). The second mechanism
was the categorization of the data using explicit decision rules (found above under Data Separation). The third mechanism was the cross-checking of the data with respect to patterns arising in the data (four of which were anticipate and one that emerged). Figure 14 below diagrams those data patterns.

**Pattern Search and Presence of the Concepts**

The sections above contain explanations as to how paraphrasing was linked to the theoretical concepts. The next step was to examine each concept as to whether the theory was supported by the data. Because of the small case numbers involved in this study the quantification system used was based on simple frequency counts and not a statistical analysis. There were five ways in which a theory would appear to be supported by the data.

For reasons related to graphic presentation the appearance of the concept within the data five patterns were defined. Those patterns include:

**Pattern A:** The data would identify theories where there was a general consensus of interviewees from five or more PSI.

**Pattern B:** The data would reflect whether the theory was important to those PSI that were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development.

**Pattern C:** The data would reflect whether the theory was critical as it was related to the size of the PSI (large, medium, or small).
Pattern D: The data might reflect another pattern, unexpected at the beginning of this study, and unrelated to the previous three patterns. This pattern occurred in PSI #2, 3, 5, and 6.

Pattern P: At least one respondent referred to the concept during the interview.

Figure 15 below shows how the patterns occur within the data and the points assigned to that pattern.
Pattern A - General Consensus: 10 Points awarded because of consensus of interviewees from at least five of seven PSI.

Concept: Post-secondary Institution

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 \\
1 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
2 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
3 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
4 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
5 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
6 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
\end{align*}
\]

Pattern B - PSI Successful or Unsuccessful in Initial Proposal Development - 8 Points awarded because the study was organized in such a manner that this would have been the next most significant separation of data.

Concept: Post-secondary Institution

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 \\
3 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
4 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
5 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
6 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
\end{align*}
\]

Pattern C - Size of PSI - 6 Points awarded because the study was organized in such a manner that this would have been the third significant separation of data.

Concept: Post-secondary Institution

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 \\
1 & : 1 : 1 : m : m : s : s : s \\
7 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
8 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
9 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
10 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
11 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
12 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
13 & : x : x : x : x : x : x : x \\
\end{align*}
\]

* (in 12 - as explained previously, PSI 2 often functioned as if it were a medium-sized PSI)

Figure 15: PATTERNS
Pattern D - Unexplained Emergent Pattern - 4 Points awarded because it occurred and should carry more points than if at least one interviewee mentioned this issue.

Pattern D - Unexplained Emergent Pattern - 4 Points awarded because it occurred and should carry more points than if at least one interviewee mentioned this issue.

Pattern P - At least one interview mentioned this issue - 2 Points because it was mentioned at least once (the 2 points were also given if it was present in any other pattern because it had to be mentioned at least once to show up there)
The original primary focus of the study was to examine the invocation phase, to view it from different paradigms (functionalist and radical structuralist), from different levels of analysis (Level 3 - SEA as change agent and Level 4 - PSI as change agent), and to identify whether or not concepts were supported in five ways: a) if the phase was examined as to whether the data reflected general consensual support (Pattern A), b) whether the data reflected support when examined according to whether the PSI was successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development (Pattern B), c) whether the size of the PSI was a factor (Pattern C), d) whether the concept was evident in the emergent pattern (Pattern D), and/or e) whether the concept was mentioned by any respondent.

On the graphic presentations (Figures 18 - 33) there were two ways in which the patterns were identified. Due to restrictions of the graphic program the following legends were used to refer to Patterns:
Legend Notation | Meaning of legend item
--- | ---
SEA - A or S - A | referred to the SEA as change agent with pattern A occurring.
SEA - B or S - B | referred to the SEA as change agent with pattern B occurring.
SEA - C or S - C | referred to the SEA as change agent with pattern C occurring.
SEA - D or S - D | referred to the SEA as change agent with pattern D occurring.
SEA - P or S - P | referred to the SEA as change agent with the concept present.

PSI - A or P - A | referred to the PSI as change agent with pattern A occurring
PSI - B or P - B | referred to the PSI as change agent with pattern B occurring
PSI - C or P - C | referred to the PSI as change agent with pattern C occurring
PSI - D or P - D | referred to the PSI as change agent with pattern D occurring
PSI - E or P - E | referred to the PSI as change agent with the concept present

A point system was developed in order to assess the significance of the concept in the study and to facilitate the visual display of the data on charts. The author decided that pattern A would be credited with the most points (10 points) in that the majority of the respondents felt that the concepts cited were important. It was decided that pattern B would be next in significance (eight points) in that this pattern separated PSI on the basis of whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development. Pattern C was the next purposeful search and the study was organized to identify
data separation on the basis of size of PSI, and therefore this pattern was assigned six points. Pattern D was an unexpected emergent, and although it occurred more often than pattern B in level three of the analysis, it was assigned four points. Pattern E was assigned two points for the pattern being mentioned be at least one interviewee. It was anticipated that pattern E would be most prevalent of all the patterns. If pattern E was not evident, then none of the other patterns could occur for that concepts. Similarly, if even one of the other patterns was present, the pattern E was also present. The following is offered as a review of the patterns and point system.

Pattern A: The first pattern search was based of whether the interviewees generally agreed on anything, irrespective of the size of their institution or whether they were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development. According to the literature review, certain conditions must be existent if the process is to be maximally effective. For the purposes of this study, it was decided that for Pattern A to be present, at least interviewees of five of the seven PSI should have made reference to the theory in one way or another. The author viewed this pattern as the most powerful test of significance of theory and therefore assigned to it ten points of significance. Chart 2 below shows how Pattern A would appear in the data.
Pattern B: The second pattern search was for a division of the data on the basis of initial success (or lack thereof) in developing proposals. The presence of this pattern was defined as data response being present or absent for those PSI that were successful in contrast to the opposite response in those that were unsuccessful (give or take one in either the successful or unsuccessful PSI). The author viewed this pattern as the second most powerful test of significance of theory and therefore assigned to it eight points of significance. Chart 2 below shows how Pattern B would appear in the data.

Pattern C: The third search was on the basis of size, the assumption being that whether the PSI was large, medium, or small would have a bearing on the responses. The presence of this pattern was defined as data response being present or absent for those PSI related to their relative size (a little deviation was acceptable as charted below). The author viewed this pattern as the third most powerful test of significance of theory and therefore assigned to it six points of significance. Chart 2 below shows how Pattern C would appear in the data.

Pattern D: The researcher was sorting by pre-identified patterns and had not anticipated that a strong emergent pattern to appear. This Pattern D did emerge with more frequency than and of the three anticipated Patterns above. The author viewed this pattern as emergent and had no explanation for its presence and therefore assigned to it four points of significance. (Although a two was assigned as the point value of significance, because this pattern was strongest of all, a 10 or 12 could legitimately be assigned as the point value of significance.) No explanations for this pattern were proposed in Chapter IV or VI. Chart 2 below shows how Pattern D did appear in the data.

Present: If an interviewee made reference to a theory and that reference was not in any of the identified patterns, it was assigned a point value of two.
Charting the Presence of Patterns within the Data

The next step in data analysis was to develop a vehicle that would simultaneously identify the concepts and show the point values for the significance of the patterns. This was achieved by using a stacked column chart. Figure 16 below shows how that information looks for varying data patterns.
Figure 16: Stacked Column Charts

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
The creation of the stacked column charts was the final stage in the process of data presentation. These charts were used in Chapter VI to describe what was happening conceptually and to critique the concepts. The deductive analysis required that there be a vehicle that would facilitate comparison of whether each concept was supported or not. The inductive analysis involved identifying the divergences between the original concepts and the new concepts and in explaining previously unidentified intervening conditions and/or generating new concepts to explain the divergences. Figure 17 below diagrams the relationship between original theory bases and theory reinforcement and creation.
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Figure 17: CYCLE OF CONCEPT CREATION AND REINFORCEMENT
Patton (1980) has suggested that qualitative methodology assists the researcher to capture what people say in their own words by using direct quotations or excerpts from people regarding their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs and this permitted the recording and the understanding of people in their own terms. Mulhauser (1975, 23) has warned that the narrative text found in many case studies "are almost useless for policymakers who cannot afford the time and energy required to comprehend a long account and draw conclusions for their work." For this reason the responses of this study are paraphrased and systematically organized in a way that optimized richness and comprehension and then linked to the theoretical perspectives.

Miles and Huberman (1984, 79-80) suggest that one way to avoid the dispersed and vaguely ordered text is to use displays that are "as simultaneous as possible, are focused, and are as systematically arranged as the questions at hand demand." They add that displays show data and analysis simultaneously, allow the analyst to see further implications for study, facilitate comparison of data sets, and permit direct use of results in a report.
The author has used a stacked column charting method to display the strength of the theoretical perspectives according to the data. Specific formats of the displays for this study were conveniently designed to present the data on one page, in order to facilitate analysis so that parallel data could be easily combined for purposes of comparison. By changing the data to stacked column charts the anonymity of the interviewees was further protected.

Reliability

Verification and Validation of Qualitative Studies:

Triangulation

By using different data-collection techniques the research verifies the consistency of the findings. By using the same method with different data sources, consistency can be examined. Patton (1980, 134) has indicated that "triangulation is a process by which the evaluator can guard against the accusation that a study's findings are simply an artifact of a single method, a single data source, or a single investigator's bias."

Rather than expecting a consistent picture from comparisons of multiple qualitative data sources, Patton (1980) explains that the research should anticipate
differences because different instruments and strategies should capture different data. Patton (1980) states further that it is the task of the analyst to understand and explicate the differences. The extent to which overall patterns are consistent within reasonable explanation contributes significantly to the credibility of the study (Patton 1980).

**Triangulation 1: Comparisons of Multiple Data Sources**

Comparisons of multiple data sources employ a consistency check between information obtained at different times using different mechanisms for gathering the data (Patton, 1980). This study incorporated four comprehensive sources of data (see Figure 10 above). First there was the SEA publications related to all the decision-making processes (these came directly from the SEA files). Second, there was participant observation data collected throughout a two-year period immediately preceding the study. Third, there was successive interviewing of participants of the process. Fourth, there were primary and secondary documents and official records from specific phases that came from interviewees.
**Triangulation 2: Comparisons of Successive Interviews**

The consistencies of perspectives of different levels of interviewees (SEA personnel, chairpersons, counterpoints, PSI faculty, administrative assistants, and in some cases powerful external others) were examined. These would be interview waves number three through seven found above in Figure 11.

**Triangulation 3: Comparisons of Multiple Perspectives from Multiple Observers**

Using this technique requires that two or more persons independently analyze the same qualitative data set (Patton 1980). While this study did not utilize two persons to collect the data, a method was employed whereby an external person independently verified the degree of accuracy between original text, paraphrasing, and chart systems. This was facilitated by using the author's method explained in Chart 1 above.

**Summary of Triangulation**

All three triangulation techniques are outlined in the Figure 18 below.
Fig. 18: THREE TRIANGULATION METHODS USED IN DATA ANALYSIS
Limitations of Method

Case study research has several problems associated with the data collection. Case studies are designed to be expansionist rather than reductive in scope. The author used three techniques in an attempt to overcome this problem. The interview schedule and interviews were highly focused. Coding sheets with categorical variables were developed before the interviews. Methods of display, description, and analyses were designed to be reductive.

With the wealth of information that could be collected, the researcher must have well-established parameters as to what was to be collected, discarded, and/or analyzed. The author used an interview schedule that was reviewed by at least four people before interviews were conducted. The questionnaire review process was designed to assure that the questions reflected the purposes of the study.

Analysis and recording of the wealth of information is a complex, tedious, and lengthy business. Coding and recording techniques were designed to facilitate accuracy and ease of recording. Techniques of description and vehicles for data analyses were combined by displaying
data in a concise, consistent manner with columns and rows for description and analysis incorporated into the original display.

Generalizability is another limitation. The details and uniqueness of this specific case have been described extensively, especially in Chapter II, Literature Review, so that future readers can assess the match between the study under investigation and their own.

Implications of This study

Reference to the evolution of the SEA decision-making process is cited in the literature review. Despite the SEA's environment in Ohio, the decision-process described in this study could be duplicated and therefore be of interest to other states. The development of Ohio's SEA decision-making process may be of interest to Ohioans in instances where predictability of future actions may be needed.

Categorical divisions and subdivisions of each framework were used by the author and a second person in order to verify accuracy between charts and transcripts. Only that information pertaining to the questionnaires was transcribed in the interest of focusing on the data,
conserving time, and limiting expense. Subsequent comments, divergences, issues, future suggestions for study, and/or concerns regarding the interview schedule were noted.

Summary

The commentary developed in this chapter reviewed the rationale for the methodological techniques employed in examining an field case study. The conceptual framework for this study was the use of case study method included in qualitative research. The conceptual framework used to organize the study was explained. Data collection, collation, and presentation formats were reviewed. Finally, the limitations of methodology were discussed.

The collected data is described and analyzed in the next chapter (Chapter V). Chapter VI contains a critique of concepts culminating in new emergent concepts. Chapter VII contains conclusions and implications for action for similar SEA decision-making processes.
CHAPTER V

DESCRIPTION OF FOUR LEVELS OF ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter contains four divisions, one for each of the four levels of analyses discussed in previous chapters. The first division (Level 1) contains a description of the four SEA certification processes since 1953. The second division (Level 2) contains a description of the SEA certification process 1977-1985. The first and second divisions were not the primary focus of the study and therefore the descriptions are cursory in nature.

The third division contains a description of the Invocation Phase with the SEA as change agent. The fourth division contains a description of the Invocation Phase with the PSI as change agent. Because the Invocation Phase was the primary focus of the study, this information was obtained from the perspective of the interviewees of 7 PSI.

Level 1: SEA Certification Processes Since 1953

There have been four SEA certification processes since 1953. The first teacher standards revision
process undertaken by the SEA was from 1953 - 1959, the second process occurred from 1966 - 1972, and the third occurred between 1972 - 1980. The fourth standards revision process was related to administrative certificates and occurred from 1977-1985.

The previous three processes appear to be significantly different from the administrative standards revision (1977-1985). In the previous phases a single committee divided into subcommittees and the actors were specific professors of educational administration faculties.

The following summarizes the four processes since 1953.
1953-1959 Teacher Standards Revision

Goal
100th General Assembly (1953) wanted a comprehensive study (the Ohio School Survey) of Ohio’s public school system (previous study completed in 1913).

Actors
The Ohio Survey Commission was composed of representatives of various educational organizations.

Procedures
Fall 1953 formed six committees:
Committees:
1. Instruction
2. Personnel and Teacher Education
3. State Education Organization
4. Local District Organization
5. Housing and Transportation
6. Finance

Technical Assistance for each committee:
1. An out-of-state consultant
2. Staff assistance provided by one of the six state universities

Final recommendations to SEA 1955.
SEA appointed (1957) committee of Ohio’s educational coalitions to conduct research and make recommendations to SEA.

Timelines
1953 SEA commissioned first committee
1955 committee recommendations to SEA
1957 SEA appointed another advisory committee
1958 Standards enacted
1959 new regulations became effective

Results
Significant increase in semester hours.
1966–1972 Teacher Standards Revision

Goal
SEA wanted improvement of teacher preparation programs. SEA conducted series of regional, then state-wide conferences.

Actors
In 1967 SEA appointed an advisory council on Teacher Education and Certification (educators and lay citizens).

Procedures
Council initiated 2 studies:
1. Needs of the elementary teacher
2. Needs of the secondary teacher
SEA incorporated findings of council in Teacher Education and Certification

Timelines
1966 SEA conducted fact-finding meetings
1967 SEA appointed advisory council on Teacher Education and Certification
1972 SEA adopted Council’s recommendations
1972-1973 SEA convened public forum on educational concerns input from 125,000 people, regional meetings

Results of 1972 adoption
On-campus program evaluations became mandatory.
Results of 1972-1973 public forum: Teacher preparation became a priority in revision of Ohio’s educational system.
1972-1980 Teacher Standards Revision

Goal
SEA wanted a thorough, comprehensive and appropriate restructuring of teacher education.

Actors
Highly diversified citizens groups provided the direction for redesign and called for the formation of 3 committees. Committee 1 - representatives of major educational coalitions, teachers, administrators, lay people, and students. Committee 2 - deans and department chairs of teacher education faculties, lay citizens, OEA, OFT, BASA, OSBA, OCPT, and SEA. Committee 3 - open to public to express opinions.

Procedures
Three parallel committees held discussions.
Committee:
1. Discuss teacher preparation programs, issues, and recommendations.
2. Formed 8 representative councils to identify problems of teacher education and solutions.
3. Two conferences held in each of 6 state regions.

Timelines
1973: Began committees
1974: SEA adopted recommendations of committee
1980: Standards implemented

Results
The Standards were so extensive that full implementation was deferred to 1980. It included the requirement of field experiences for administrative preparation programs.
1977-1985 Administrative Standards Revision

Goal
SEA wanted administrative standards revised.

Actors
Committee 1 (Invocation): major educational coalitions.
Committee 2 (Prescription): major educational coalitions, but purposely different for first committee.
Committee 3 (Invocation): SEA and all PSI program representatives.
Committee 4 (Peer Review): Lay citizens, selected PSI representatives.

Procedures
Committee:
1. Completed research (administrator questionnaire, survey of other states, survey of research). Results sent to committee 2.
2. Recommended specifics as to how standards should be revised.
3. Used monthly meetings for PSI representatives to develop proposal to meet new mandates.
4. Subdivided into 4 committees, reviewed and made recommendations as to acceptance of PSI proposals.

Technical Assistance provided by SEA

Timelines
January, 1982 - January: 1984 Prescription
November, 1983 - SEA adopted changes
January, 1984 - December, 1984: Invocation
June, 1985 - Peer Review

Results
Mandates for changes in administrative training programs became highly prescriptive, increasing field experience, and now requiring entry year program.
Level One: (1953-1985) Goals and Objectives

The original goal in the 1953-1959 process was to thoroughly survey existing conditions. The concept was continued through the next three phases, but became increasingly more sophisticated and incorporated into the standard procedures of each process.

The goals of subsequent processes - to revise programs - produced outcomes that became increasingly more prescriptive, first for under-graduate teacher training programs and then for graduate administrative training programs.

Level One: (1953-1985) Actors

The actors of the earliest process were representatives of educational organizations. The SEA found various mechanisms to extend involvement to most educational coalitions so that there eventually developed an increasingly broad-based public decision-making process.

Level One: (1953-1985) Procedures

The procedures vary, at times utilizing simultaneous committees, at other times discrete phases. The technical assistance first came from out-of-state experts and then totally from SEA personnel.
With the very positive descriptions from interviewees of the initiation and prescription phases of the last process (1977-1985), it appears that the SEA has increasingly refined systems of technical assistance delivery appropriate for at least these elements of the process. There appears to be increased committee sophistication and the addition of the peer review phase in the latest process. The peer review phase (1985) was so successful in transferring proposal acceptance to committee process format that the SEA personnel indicated that subsequent phases will probably include this element.

**Level One: (1953-1985) Timing**

All four of the SEA processes have taken six to eight years. This is a problem identified in the last process by PSI interviewees and SEA personnel. With such a long time period, careful management is needed so that information, original intent, and momentum is not lost.
Level Two: The SEA Administrative Certification Process (1977-1985)

While the three previous certification processes focused on teacher training, the fourth SEA standards revision process (1977-1985) was the first to address administrative standards solely. The SEA goal was to revise pre-training programs for administrators. There were four discrete phases operating during different time periods.

Level Two: (1977-1985) Goal

The SEA wanted to improve educational administrators. The SEA objectives included changing pre-service administrative training programs which affected 17 PSI that issued formal academic degrees in educational administration.

Level Two: (1977-1985) Actors

The actors of the first phase (initiation) were almost entirely PSI representatives. The actors of the second phase (prescription) were representatives of the major Ohio educational coalitions. The actors of the third phase (invocation) were SEA personnel and representatives of all 17 PSI affected by the new mandates. The fourth phase (peer review) contained lay
citizens, field administrators, and selected PSI representatives.

**Level Two: (1977-1985) Procedures**

During initiation three committees completed research regarding administrative training programs. This research was forwarded to the prescription phase and used to make specific recommendations as to how standards should be revised. During invocation the SEA used monthly meetings for the PSI representatives to develop proposals to meet new mandates. Peer review participants were subdivided into four committees which reviewed and made recommendations as to acceptance of PSI proposals. Technical assistance throughout the process was provided by the SEA. Phase activity is explained below in further detail.

**Level Two: (1977-1985) Timelines**

Phases and timelines occurred as follows:

- June, 1977 - January, 1982 | Initiation |
- January, 1982 - January, 1984 | Prescription |
- November, 1983 | SEA adopted changes |
- January, 1984 - December, 1984 | Invocation |
- June, 1985 | Peer Review |
Phases of the SEA Process (1977-1985)

The Initiation Phase (June, 1977 - January, 1982)

The initiation phase began as a grass roots effort. According to Pat Crisi (then superintendent of Tallmadge City Schools), she had expressed interest in administrative standards revision. This resulted in her being called and asked if she would be interested in attending an ad hoc meeting of a couple of university professors, a couple of superintendents and someone from BASA (Buckeye Association of School Administrators) to look at what problems might exist. These initial meetings focused on the deficiencies of administrative training programs, especially in the areas of collective bargaining, labor relations, and interpersonal relationships. There were no training programs available at that time leaving it up to the discretion of each student to enroll in whatever kinds of workshops and institutes that he/she thought would up-grade his/her skills. (Interview with Crisi, 1985)

After Crisi became an assistant superintendent with the SEA, she discussed the concerns of the ad hoc committee with SEA personnel. The SEA gave the project legitimacy by sending out information on SEA
letterhead, and provided minimal funding. Crisi met with the people from the Division of Teacher Education and Certification and established scheduled meetings for each of the institutions to send a representative. The initiation phase had representatives from almost all of the universities that prepared administrators of any level and a representative from BASA. (SEA documents)

Crisi did indicate that Walter (state superintendent) requested that the committee accomplish four objectives to discover: 1) what was happening at each of the PSI, 2) what the training programs were, 3) what the national literature was indicating, and 4) what the various professional organizations recommended. It was not the kind of advisory committee that is typically formed by the SEA in that it didn't represent all of the various groups upon which any change would impact (they were not charged with developing any changes). (Interview with Crisi, 1985)

In May, 1979, Franklin Walter formally established an ad hoc advisory committee whose task it was to examine administrator training standards and recommend needed revisions. This advisory committee produced
three reports: a) data from practicing administrators and faculty from post-secondary institutions (PSI), b) administrative certification requirements of other states, and c) a review of the literature on administrator preparation. The final report from this committee was completed in September, 1980, and indicated that there was a need for a modification of the existing administrative standards. (SEA documents)

The primary actors by and large were professors or deans of PSI. In almost every instance they were professors, either educational administration professors, curriculum professors, or professors that span more than one area; some of whom were in secondary education and leadership. (SEA documents and interview with Crisl, 1985)

Their first objective was to discover what kind of training programs are available. They identified what was being provided by each of the institutions for administrators, what the other states were doing, what the literature said, and problems as perceived by the administrators in the field and the faculty at the universities. They provided a summary of all the information in a final report to the superintendent.
They were then divided into four subcommittees. The entire committee was made up of dedicated volunteers. The subcommittees brought all the information back to the committee of the whole and reached consensus on everything before final reports were drafted. As to technical assistance, the only support they had was clerical in nature from the SEA. (Interview with Crisl, 1985)

The committees for the initiation phase met four or five times in a year (beginning in May of 1979) and finished with a culminating report in September of 1980. (Interview with Crisl, 1985)

There were four critical issues. First, it was possible at that time to obtain a masters degree in an area other than educational administration, take a course in educational administration, complete an internship or a planned field experience in educational administration and end up with a principal's certificate. It was felt that many of the existing administrators were trying to function without an adequate, formal preparation in administration. Second, some committee members wanted to include supervisors in the study. The SEA personnel decided
that they did not come under the umbrella of administrators and that the certification of the supervisors does need to be looked at by another group at another time. Third, there were concerns on the part of some of the professional organizations (i.e. BASA, OEA Principals Association, etc.) with respect to their inability to provide course work for the administrators and have those courses receive credit. The previous standards were very specific about connection between course work and university credit. Some professional organizations felt that there should be some way for them to provide some of the professional growth and staff development experiences for the administrator; it shouldn’t all have to come from a university. Fourth, during the mid and later 1970s, both the OEA (Ohio Education Association) and the NEA (National Education Association) were actively engaged in trying to sell the notion that they should be the ones to certify who should teach, who should enter the profession and who should be continued in the profession.

There were at least five strengths in the initiation phase. First, a thorough review of
literature was completed. This included attitudes of field administrators, PSI programs in other states, and Ohio's PSI programs. Second, there was committee cohesion, dedication, and the ability to produce a concise final report. Third, when they begin the process again, Crisl suggested that they again do another similar study in order to keep abreast of what has been occurring throughout the country. Fourth, even though Crisl was not an active participant in the subsequent phases, she indicated that the recommended standards revisions as adopted by the State Board of Education were very close to the original impetus of the grass roots ad hoc committee that initiated the entire process. Fifth, the initial phase served as a springboard for next phase and their research added a great deal to the field.

The Prescription Phase (January, 1982 - January, 1984)

Acting on the suggestions from the advisory committee in the initiation phase, in 1982, Dr. Walter established the Administrator Certification Advisory Committee which did not meet until January 8, 1982. The State Board of Education received their recommendations in November. After some rewriting the
State Board adopted the standards as they appear in Appendix G.

The chairperson for the prescription phase (identified as the Administrator Certification Advisory Committee) was Homer Mincy, a superintendent in the Columbus area. There were 28 members representing most educational coalitions in Ohio (PSI representation balanced carefully between public and private sectors). Mincy met with Bowers, Halley, and other persons from the division of certification to plan the organization of the subcommittees, and to identify chairpersons for the subcommittees. Other participants were assigned to specific committees and were told that they could switch committees if they desired (although no one switched). Criss met with the group initially and all research documents from the first phase were made available to the committee. Bowers attended several meetings. (Interview with Mincy, 1985, and SEA documents)

This committee had three tasks: a) to review the history on administrative certification, b) to develop a better understanding of the legal framework of the standards, and c) to develop an agenda for revising
existing standards. This committee made recommendations that were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1983, to become effective September 1, 1985. (SEA documents)

Mincy indicated that he was given the directive to bring the committee to consensus, a difficult task with domain issues and internal struggles. The group of 28 was divided into three subcommittees to develop recommendations for: a) common core graduate education requirements (chaired by Stan Siders of Ashland College), b) field experiences (Chaired by Joseph Ellis from the University of Dayton), and c) certification renewal and conversion (chaired by Dick Boyd - Superintendent of Lakewood City Schools).

These subcommittees were to prepare reports and then, working as a committee of the whole, they blended the standards, and eventually established those standards that were then referred to the State Board of Education for adoption. Mincy floated between subcommittees, and SEA personnel kept all committees on task. The committee of the whole spent one or two meetings studying reports from initiation phase. Occasionally subcommittee meetings were scheduled
between the regularly scheduled full committee meetings.

First the committee as a whole developed a concept paper that was submitted across the state soliciting input (initially they were going to have a first round of hearings but this occurred during the last stage of the Rhodes administration and no funds were available for public meetings, so the SEA gave the directive to develop and distribute the concept paper). The SEA collected the information and took quite some time pulling all the information together. A series of regional public meetings were scheduled at which written comments were secured and committee representatives came to closure as to the flavor of the recommendations. The original research, the concept paper, and the comments from throughout the state were used to develop the standards in all three subcommittees.

According to an SEA document, during the prescription phase the subcommittees and committee of the whole met over twenty times. The initial concept paper was sent to more than 6,000 Ohio school administrators during the summer of 1982. Further
document revision occurred and was presented at five regional public conferences during October, 1982. Public testimony was incorporated into the final document presented to the State Board of Education for consideration for adoption in mid-1983. For technical assistance the SEA assigned staff persons as consultant representatives to each of the three subcommittees. The SEA personnel offered assistance when asked, and delivered and reviewed background information.

Mincy indicated that there were at least six major issues. First, one of the hidden agendas from the SEA was that both teachers' and administrators' standards should be a great deal more rigorous, and that administrators' standards should be the first programs to be subjected to higher standards. Second, that the committee had to mediate domain issues as to who controls teacher certification. Third, there was a rift between the field and preparation programs. The greatest single argument was related to who would control the Entry Year Program. Fourth, organizations could now offer Continuing Education Units (CEUs) and the PSI representatives perceived this innovation as the field making inroads into their area. It was
decided that any organizations that met the SEA standards could offer CEUs. It was agreed in the end that there would not be that many organizations offering CEUs. Five, some coalitions in the field (i.e. blocks of superintendents and others) did not want the SEA to control anything. Input was solicited from all these groups and processed in the committees. Six, there was a major shift from training managers to developing leaders in the PSI programs.

Mincy identified at least five major strengths in the prescription phase. One, excellent resource people were working on the subcommittees. Two, it was important for the general chairperson to know most of the persons serving in the phase (Mincy was very insistent of maintaining balance between private and public, colleges and universities, higher education and field educators). Three, it was very difficult to reach consensus regarding the proposed standards, but that was achieved. In his opinion the administrator training programs were changed dramatically and strengthened, and all this was done with consensus of the whole committee. Four, all committee members were willing to express their views, to listen carefully and
to come to consensus. Five, anyone who wanted to be involved in the process was involved.

One weakness according to Crlsl was that the SEA wrote to the deans of each of the PSI and invited them to participate in the process or appoint someone to participate in the process. The members of individual education administration faculties may not have known the process was proceeding if the dean did not relay the information.

One recommendation that would improve the prescription phase would be to notify directly all PSI faculties that would be affected by any changes being reviewed.

The Invocation Phase (January, 1984 - December, 1984)

After the approval and adoption of the new administrative certification standards by the State Board of Education in 1983, the State Department of Education initiated and conducted a series of technical assistance conferences for the 17 post-secondary institutions (PSI) affected by the revisions. Those conferences were held on January 23, March 19, May 7, and August 24 of 1984. The PSI were to submit to the
State Department the proposals for new administrative programs on December 1, 1984.

The invocation phase was a complex process conducted at two levels. At one level the SEA called together representatives of the 17 PSI that had administrator training programs and conducted training programs to facilitate the writing of the proposals. In this instance the SEA was acting as the change agent. At another level, each of the PSI had to take the SEA information back to their respective institutions and organize themselves within their institutions so that they could submit a proposal and continue to be authorized to train educational administrators in the state of Ohio. At this level the PSI were acting as change agent. Since this study identified Level 1 as the examination of SEA processes (1953 - 1985), and Level 2 as the examination of the total SEA process (1977 - 1985), it was decided that for the purpose of this study the invocation phase with the SEA as change agent was identified as Level 3, and that the invocation phase with PSI as change agent was identified as Level 4.
The Invocation phase was the primary focus of the study. This phase was analyzed from two levels (Level 3 - SEA as change agent and Level 4 - PSI as change agent). The origin of the interview schedule for the study was the theoretical perspectives developed in Appendix A (Functionalist and Radical Structuralist). From asking this series of questions, it was anticipated that there would be three significant patterns arising from the data. It was anticipated that interviewees from at least five of the seven PSI would express agreement on certain issues (Pattern A). It was anticipated that another pattern would arise from the data on the basis of whether the faculty of the post secondary institution was either successful or unsuccessful in their initial proposal development (Pattern B). It was anticipated that a response pattern would occur as to whether the PSI was large, medium, or small (Pattern C). An emergent pattern that was unanticipated occurred in the responses from PSI #2, #3, #5, and #6 (Pattern D).

It was from the basis of these four patterns of responses that a more complete description of Level 3 (Invocation Phase - SEA as change agent) and Level 4
(Invocation Phase - PSI as change agent) was developed in the sections below.

The Peer Review Phase (December, 1984 - June, 1985)

This was the first time a peer review panel was used in a standards revision process.

The SEA chose the participants for the four panels and identified which PSI would be studied by each panel. The panels were divided by the SEA with a balance between public and private, and large and small schools. Homer Mincy was identified as the chairperson of the entire committee.

This phase began with a review process by Bowers. The panel chairpersons were briefed one-fourth of a day on the new standards, the whole process, and the expectations of chairpersons.

The committee as a whole was brought together February 25, 1985, to review procedures and reporting methods for the panel review. Every person was given an outline of the mandates that were to guide the development of the proposals. They were given a checklist for suggested review questions categorized into curriculum, faculty, and facilities. A form was provided that outlined how the final draft of the panel
review reports should look. The morning of February 26 was spent with four panels separately reviewing their assigned programs. The afternoon of the 26th the interviews with the PSI were scheduled. The evening of the 26th, as a committee of the whole, they reviewed procedures for finalizing their reports, and then broke into individual panels to complete their drafts. February 27, each panel reviewed every report; they tried to develop a consensus as to what was appropriate. During that afternoon they finalized reports. The panel reviewers knew that they did not hold the final stamp of approval and that their recommendations were to be reviewed by the SEA.

The peer review panel was directed to review and constructively criticize the proposals to assist the PSI in writing the revisions. It was difficult to adopt common standards through all of the panels with all of the PSI. In order to accomplish this, each of the four panels met separately to discuss and study the proposals assigned to them. After each panel met with the PSI representatives who defended their proposals, the next step was to meet as a whole committee and for each panel to review the shortcomings that they had
found. After each panel presentation the whole committee developed some common understandings and then the next panel would report. There was a lot of information processing during lunch, between reports, listening to concerns regarding certain aspects of the proposal and whether changes should actually be requested. Some decisions about the proposals were changed as a result of this process and in the desire to have as much commonality between panels as possible. An example given pertained to adequate library resources applicable to the proposals. During the initial review process 12 of the original 17 proposals were accepted with some of these requiring only minor editing.

After the initial panel reviews the entire committee met as a whole again to review the process. The chairpersons (and a few others) were the primary persons involved in the second round of hearings. They organized themselves to establish what additional information was needed, what changes had to be made, what clarification or additional information was needed. They met with the PSI representatives for a full day of hearings. By the end of the second round,
June, 1985, the peer review panel had recommended that the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission approve all 17 PSI proposals. As to technical assistance, the SEA took all the recommendations of the panels, processed it, and attempted to arrange it in some order.

Mincy identified four strengths during the peer review phase. First, there should be one group of people in peer review that conducts all PSI interviews, but this would be too extensive a task to read all the proposals and the cross fertilization of ideas from many constituencies would be lost. Second, the committee structure was very good and strengthened the process. Including people in the peer review process who had not been in previous phases strengthened the process in that their questions required a complete review of the process and the development of the standards. Third, it was important to have some participants on the peer review panel who were in previous phases. Four, the PSI appeared to like the peer review process better than relying on the sole judgment of the SEA to assess the adequacies of their proposals.
There were at least three weaknesses during peer review. During invocation there was no model for proposal development and some PSI felt that they were working blindly. The SEA personnel had carefully reviewed the PSI proposals during the two months preceding the peer review process and possibly could have easily remedied some of the problems with telephone calls to the PSI alerting them of areas that needed revision. Another problem that arose was that certain panel members of the peer review phase became rather demanding in that they felt that their area of specialization should be incorporated into all the proposals that they reviewed. In contrast to the strength mentioned above, some of the participants in this phase judging the proposals had no knowledge of previous phases and had no basis on which to advise PSI as to the adequacy of the proposal in addressing the mandates.

Level 3: Invocation Phase (1984) SEA as Change Agent

As indicated above, the invocation phase was examined from the level of the SEA as change agent (Level 3). The SEA called together representatives of the 17 PSI that had administrator training programs and
conducted training programs to facilitate the writing of the proposals. In response to a series of questions, the interviewee data separated into four patterns:

Pattern A: Interviewees of at least five of seven of the PSI would express agreement on certain issues.

Pattern B: the faculty of the post secondary institution either successful or unsuccessful in their initial proposal development.

Pattern C: the PSI was large, medium, or small.

Pattern D: an emergent pattern occurring in the responses from PSI #2, #3, #5, and #6.

The following description of level three (Invocation phase - SEA as change agent) was derived through the four patterns of responses arising from the data. The description proceeds through the identification of the pattern, the presentation of the data table related to the pattern, and an expanded discussion of the data.

**Pattern A - Interviewees of at least Five of Seven PSI Expressed Agreement on Issues.**

The data related to this pattern are displayed in Appendix E.

On level three, Pattern A, there was general consensus of interviewees from five or more PSI in three areas: 1. the existence of various hidden
agendas, 2. some strengths within the process, and 3. some weaknesses within in process.

The existence of hidden agendas could have indicated that the PSI interviewees were suspicious of ulterior motives which could have formed the foundation of resistance to the process. As to the strengths of the process the interviewees had consensus in identifying the primary goal of the SEA as that of improvement of Ohio's administrators & education. Other strengths identified included that of the total process being good, specifically they agreed on goals, objectives, and certain aspects of structure, procedures, and technical assistance.

The weaknesses of the process included procedures being at times too flexible and at other times too inflexible, poor technical assistance (especially in terms of ineffective communication), the absence of certain PSI representatives throughout all phases, a drastic change in student population as a result of the new SEA requirements and teachers required to obtain a masters degree in their own field, and renewed tensions created within the colleges as a result of SEA programmatic demands. Also included in the weaknesses
were three items that questioned the premises of the SEA process. These included an indication that the SEA's emphasis on technical training (field experience) was unsound, that the PSI were too reactive to SEA demands, and finally that the entire process should include pilots with assessment instruments and procedures.

Pattern B - the PSI Faculty Were Successful or Unsuccessful in Their Initial Proposal Development

The data related to this pattern are displayed in Appendix E.

On Level three, pattern B, the data separated on the basis of successful or unsuccessful initial proposal development, there were four points mentioned by the representatives of the successful PSI, but not mentioned by the representatives from the unsuccessful PSI. The points from successful PSI included reference to the fact that although some elements of the SEA structure and procedures were poor, the positive and/or excellent elements included the goals and objectives, technical assistance, structure, and procedures.

The one point of consensus from the interviewees of the unsuccessful PSI was that only selected post
secondary institutions were invited to have representative throughout the various phases. The interviewees of the unsuccessful PSI felt that their institutions had been excluded from phases. This caused feelings of alienation, explaining resistance to the process and to requests from the State Education Agency in general.

**Pattern C - whether the PSI was large, medium, or small**

The data related to this pattern are displayed in Appendix E.

On level three, pattern C, as to whether the data separated according to size of the institution, there was no separation on the basis of all large, all medium, or all small. However, there was indication of consistency when the responses of medium and large were examined. These elements included the identification on one specific hidden agenda item, that of the attempt of the SEA to centralize their power and to exert control over administrative training programs.

When asked how the phase was organized they identified some elements of the structure and procedures as good and poor. Two items consistently identified under poor procedures were in the technical
assistance (they could not get the answers from the SEA when they needed them) and that timelines were given and changed. In the area of critical issues under the concern for changing student population, they identified the inability to advise students correctly until the SEA made some critical decisions as to teachers being required to have a masters degree in their own field for re-certification. Also, in the division of critical issues, this group initially identified the need for pilots and assessment instruments and procedures. Other interviewees later identified this need when asked weaknesses of the process or elements to be changed. Also in the area of weaknesses, the representatives of the large and medium institutions recognized that a programmatic concern was that a SEA philosophical shift created dramatic changes in PSI programs.

Pattern D - an emergent pattern occurring in the responses from PSI #2, #3, #5, and #6

The data related to this pattern are displayed in Appendix E.

An unexpected pattern emerged from the data as shown below:
Pattern D - Unexplained Emergent Pattern -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Post-secondary Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S U S U S U S U S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 m m m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.......x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.......x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Successful        U = Unsuccessful
l = large            m = medium        s = small

It is interesting to note that this pattern occurred only in Level 3 (SEA as change agent during invocation) and did not occur in Level 4 (PSI as change agent during invocation). PSI #2, #3, #5, and #6 had remarkably similar views and concerns related to the SEA regarding the SEA as change agent. One of these PSI was large, one medium, and two small. Two of these PSI were successful and two were unsuccessful in initial proposal development. One of the PSI was private while the others were public.

Level Four: Invocation Phase (1984) PSI as Change Agent

As indicated above, the invocation phase was examined from the level of the PSI as change agent (Level 4). Each of the representatives of the 17 PSI took the information presented at the SEA meetings back
to their institution to work on the development of their proposal. For the purpose of this study, representatives of seven of those 17 PSI were interviewed. The seven PSI that were chosen for the study represented a mixture of large, medium, and small institutions which were successful and unsuccessful in initial proposal development. Also included in the interview process was a private PSI.

The section below contains a general description of each of the PSI that were used in the interviews. In order to facilitate an understanding of their relationship to this study, the description are in the form of goals, actors, procedures, and timing.

**Internal Dynamics of Seven PSI**

**PSI #1 (Large, Successful)**

**Goal.** It appeared that the faculty desired to completely reconceptualize their program.

**Actors.** Every faculty member (approximately 10) were heavily involved in the program redesign. Faculty members knew the SEA process for certification revision. Most faculty members were very secure professionally (tenured, experienced in Ohio’s redesign, previous/current association with national
systems of educational reform). As one faculty member stated, most of the individuals had had a productive career in education, and especially in educational reform. They saw this effort (January, 1984 - December, 1984) as perhaps their last before they retired, and therefore wanted it to be their most excellent effort.

One faculty member had been a force in the redesign process since 1977. In order to attend the January, 1984, SEA meeting this faculty member checked himself out of the hospital (he died a month later). His death was quite a shock to his colleagues, and perhaps they felt that their efforts would be a memorial to him.

As related to attendance at the SEA meetings, although no one faculty member attended consistently, the person serving as their technical assistant did attend each SEA meeting with a number of different faculty members.

Procedures. The chairperson of educational administration program assumed the role of facilitator, organizer, (and sometimes devil’s advocate) keeping everyone on task and meeting all timelines. Several
subcommittees worked extensively on concepts, logistics, boiler plate, and brought everything to the whole committee for discussion, change, and approval.

They had the capability to generate an extensive number of documents for committee consideration because of the amount of knowledge each faculty member (regarding the process and education in general) and because of the assistance available for typing. At one point an office of an associate dean and another typist were working on the boiler plate.

**Timing.** This was organized early and established schedules whereby they knew they could accomplish reconceptualization and meet all the SEA timelines.

**PSI #2 (Large, Unsuccessful)**

**Goal.** The goal for this PSI was to figure out how to survive. This faculty had a great deal of hostility toward the SEA for a variety of reasons. A major reason was that their entire masters’ and doctoral programs were research based and they saw the new administrative mandates for programs as eliminating that entire research base.
Actors. During 1984 every tenured faculty member (with the exception of one) of the educational administration had taken early retirement (predominantly due to conflict with the dean). The lone faculty member was not aware of guidelines, timelines, that committees had been making recommendations since 1977, and worked alone with a little assistance from a young faculty member of curriculum and instruction. The SEA sent all correspondence on the administrative standards revision to the dean's office, and this appears to be one case where the dean (perhaps through oversight, perhaps intentionally) never transferred information to the faculty.

Procedures. There were no faculty meetings regarding the process. The week before the proposal was due, the faculty member elicited the assistance of a graduate student and together they sat down and wrote the proposal.

Consistently mentioned in the interview was that they could not get the SEA to return telephone. When they were given advice it was later changed. They felt that after the peer review committee had approved their
proposal that the SEA doubly scrutinized it and required specific changes on items that the peer review committee had already approved. This was a source of further alienation.

**Timing.** Even though this PSI was represented at each SEA meeting, nothing was being done throughout the year on proposal development. It was only a day or so before the proposal was due that they sat down to work on it. The same process occurred for the proposal rewrite for the second evaluation. The Entry Year Program proposal (dropped by SEA in August of 1985) was written entirely by a graduate student with no input from faculty (although there was indication that one faculty member had reviewed it).

**PSI #3 (Medium, Successful)**

**Goal.** At first they were confused, but then decided that this was an opportunity to totally reconceptualize their administrative training program.

**Actors.** They changed department chairs several times, leading to confusion regarding the process. Finally an appointment occurred for a department chair, timelines were getting short, faculty members began to realize the opportunity before them, and they moved
very rapidly after that. Subcommittees reported back to the whole committee (the entire education faculty).

One major difficulty was to deal firmly with those faculty members that believed that the SEA standards revision process as just another program review and that therefore updating syllabi would be sufficient. The faculty of educational administration wanted to eliminate specific courses and faculty associations that they perceived were no longer useful, and eventually they moved forcefully to do just that.

They didn't realize the importance of sending a consistent representative to the SEA meetings, and this they decided to correct during the next SEA process of standards revision.

**Procedures.** They developed subcommittees and those reported to the whole committee. They had a concern regarding the university governance structure, the inability to change PSI curriculum quickly, and the use of external faculty.

**Timing.** After they found the right logistics, they moved very quickly.
PSI #4 (Medium, Unsuccessful)

**Goal.** Their goal was to try to deliver a proposal.

**Actors.** Many of the faculty traditionally spent large portions of the year in foreign teaching assignments. They were concerned that none of their faculty had been involved in previous phases.

**Procedures.** The internal PSI climate was turbulent due to a myriad of problems with other faculties.

**Timing.** With the faculty gone from the university it was very difficult to begin the process and put together a document that would serve everyone.

PSI #5 (Small, Successful)

**Goal.** Although they were upset regarding the highly prescriptive nature of the program replacing the liberal arts focus, they knew that they had better meet the mandates to the letter.

**Actors.** The faculty were very secure in their positions, knowledgeable of several SEA certification processes and participated in the earlier phases of the current process.
Procedures. Because they were a small PSI, the faculty preparing the proposal was the entire faculty of education. They already had in place an extensive multi-public decision-making process for their programs similar to the SEA certification processes. One individual organized the subcommittees which reported back to the whole committee. This appeared to be done easily with little internal problems. This faculty had an excellent evaluation model that followed their graduate students for many years after graduation.

Timing. It appeared that they moved quickly and efficiently.

PSI #6 (Small, Unsuccessful, Private)

Goal. Their goal was to meet the mandates so that they could get on with the task of continuing to produce a high number of administrators.

Actors. When asked for an interview it was difficult for them to identify even one person who knew what happened during the invocation phase, and this individual did not know many details.

Procedures. It appeared that there were no subcommittees or committees of the whole. The interviewee was especially concerned that private PSI
were consistently excluded from all SEA certification processes and that no one from his PSI was invited to attend earlier phases or be represented on the peer review panel. This absence of invitation to participate caused considerable alienation.

Timing. The interviewee had little knowledge of the process or timelines used.

PSI #7 (Small, Successful)

Goal. They knew exactly what they had to do to develop the proposal to meet the mandates.

Actors. The faculty were very secure in their positions, knowledgeable of several SEA certification processes, and participated in the earlier phases of the current process (as subcommittee chairperson).

Procedures. Because they were very small, the faculty preparing the proposal was the faculty of education. They already had in place an extensive multi-public decision-making process for their programs similar to the SEA certification processes. One individual organized the subcommittees which reported back to the whole committee. This appeared to be done easily with little internal problems. One exciting feature of this PSI was their ability to get field
administrators to design, develop, and then teach their programs (this originally began as a survival mechanism). For students this meant close association with field administrators (as opposed to ivory tower educators).

Timing. It appeared that they moved quickly and efficiently. They had a well-established program review process and simply incorporated the SEA mandates into their regularly scheduled, ongoing monthly meetings designed for program development.

**Description Supported by Data Patterns**

The following description of level 4 (invocation phase - PSI as change agent) was derived through the three patterns of responses arising from the data. The description proceeds through the identification of the pattern, the presentation of the data table related to the pattern, and an expanded discussion of the data.

In response to a series of questions the interviewee data separated into three patterns (Pattern D did not occur in this data set):

**Pattern A:** Interviewees of at least five of seven PSI would express agreement on certain issues.
Pattern B: the faculty of the post secondary institution either successful or unsuccessful in their initial proposal development.

Pattern C: the PSI was large, medium, or small.

**Pattern A - Interviewees of at Least Five of Seven PSI Expressed Agreement on Certain Issues.**

The data related to this pattern is displayed in Appendix E.

The data separation in Pattern A was in the categories of actors and procedures. A major strength of the process was that the faculties experienced cohesion and emergent leadership. Consensus was reached to improve the PSI programs. The faculties either initiated or renewed contact with the field. Also a strength was that the process was considered a great success. The faculties recognized the opportunity to radically alter their program as a result of the legitimacy of the project established from an external power - the SEA.

One of the weaknesses identified by the majority of PSI representatives included insufficient guidelines and time to prepare the proposal for the Entry Year Program. Another weakness identified by the majority was in the area of "turf" issues. The concerns were
related to the extent of involvement of the entire college/university in administrator training programs, the effects of changes in certification standards for teachers (masters' degrees in their field of certification) and the number of students that could enter an educational administration program.

**Pattern B - the PSI Faculty Were Successful or Unsuccessful in Initial Proposal Development.**

The data related to this pattern is displayed in Appendix E.

The pattern at this level was the most significant separation within the data. In the area of goals, the faculties that were successful took a comprehensive look at their entire program building it from the ground up with this goal as the primary focus of the entire faculty for a long period of time (over at least four quarters). The faculties that were unsuccessful did not do this.

In the area of actors, those faculties that were successful experienced good cohesion, a consensus to improve the program, and a commitment to linkages with the field. Also, those successful faculties had individuals who had been involved in previous SEA
standards revisions processes and had direct involvement in the earlier phases of administrative standards revision. Furthermore, these faculties had individuals who knew all the major issues, who understood the idiosyncrasies of the institution, and who therefore could avoid the internal institutional hurdles that could arise any time a faculty makes significant program changes.

In the area of procedures, the successful faculties used a self-organizing process, used subcommittees extensively and developed extensive timelines. They also designed the committees to use the SEA recommendations simply as guidelines, not as strict mandates. These PSI felt empowered by the SEA recommendations to alter radically their programs, to be most creative in addressing the issue of training administrators. They felt pride in developing the most creative program to address those needs. These faculties were not paralyzed by "turf" problems (in three out of four successful PSI, the administration, curriculum and foundations divisions were within the same department).
Those PSI that were unsuccessful in initial proposal development not only had the opposite of the above, but also were plagued with the following problems: only inexperienced faculty were available to work on the proposal, leadership was by default, SEA recommendations were considered as strict mandates with no flexibility, and they had so many "turf" conflicts that other faculties could not assist them.

There were specific concerns expressed by the successful PSI and not expressed by the unsuccessful PSI. Those included the effects of changes in educational administration with all other graduate level education programs, the loss of a significant potential student pool if the teachers' masters degrees would be required in the field of the teachers' certification, and that each PSI needs to develop internal long-range planning in response to the SEA processes.

Perhaps the unsuccessful PSI were so embroiled in internal problems that they could only concentrate on trying to survive. They could not divert any energy to focus on potential future problems created by the
required changes by the SEA on state-wide administrative training programs.

Pattern C - Whether the PSI were Large, Medium, or Small.

The data related to this pattern is displayed in Appendix E.

The strength of the large and medium PSI were in the areas of having a supportive university governance structure. Their weakness included the fact that most of the proposal was completed in the summer, that only a couple of people integrated everything in the final stages, that there was a communications breakdown with the faculty as a whole, and that they were late in beginning the actual proposal development. They expressed concerns which included: the proposal was only on paper (whether there would actually be any change in the program was questionable), and that the standards would significantly change the student clientele. They suggested that the SEA/PSI meetings should be continued for purposes of dialogue.

The small and medium PSI felt that the faculties of smaller PSI were a positive factor in proposal development. It was much easier to organize themselves
as compared to the large PSI. They experienced no turf problems compared to the amount of energy that the large PSI had to divert to this issue. They felt that including different perspectives was a healthy process.

Summary

In this Chapter the actual data was used to develop a rich description of each of the four levels of the study. In Chapter VI the same data base was used to reflect on which of the theoretical perspectives were reinforced or absent. The patterns within the data were used to test the strength of the presence of the various theoretical perspectives.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS OF THE DATA RELATED TO THEORY

Introduction

This chapter contains a critique of the theoretical concepts explained in Chapter III and identified in Appendix A. This chapter is divided into six major divisions:

1. Level one analysis is related to the four SEA certification processes between 1953 and 1985.
2. Level two analysis is related to the total SEA certification process (1977-1985).
3. Level three analysis is related to the invocation phases with the SEA as change agent (January, 1984 - December, 1984).
4. Level four analysis is related to the invocation phase with the PSI as change agent (January, 1984 - December, 1984).
5. A summary of the concepts of the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms is presented.
6. A summary of the data patterns is presented.

Levels one and two of analysis were not the primary focus of the study, and therefore only a general reference to the concepts is included in these sections. Levels three (invocation with SEA as change agent) and four (invocation with PSI as change agent) were the primary focus, and these levels were examined extensively from the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms as to what degree each of the
concepts was reinforced and as to the separation according to patterns arising from the data. To facilitate the discussion at all levels the subdivisions of goals, actors, procedures, and timing were used.

Level One: Four SEA Process (1953 - 1985)

The data source for this level is primarily through documents obtained from the SEA files (outlined at the end of Chapter II) and through comments of interviewees regarding the SEA's certification processes.

Goals and Objectives

The goal of the first three processes was to improve teachers. A portion of the third process and the fourth process had the goal to improve administrators. The interviewees representing five of the seven PSI included in the study indicated that the SEA should control the certification revision process. The reasons they gave included that the SEA was the most independent of all educational coalitions, that they alone have the authority to unite various coalitions to improve educators, that without SEA pressure the PSI would continue to plod along, and
would rarely challenge themselves for total program change. This would suggest that the goal (to improve educators) was generally a common view of reality (Hackman, 1981), that there has been an evolution of an organizational goal at a macrosystems level (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967), and that there was a widespread belief that the policy problems are tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis (Paris and Reynolds, 1983).

In reviewing the documents from the previous processes the trends that appear to be developing include the fact that the mandates are becoming increasingly prescriptive and that there is developing an increasing similarity between PSI programs for SEA evaluation purposes. The interviewees representing six of the seven PSI questioned the premises regarding the general goals and objectives of all the certification processes. The premises questioned suggested that the pragmatic approach was not the best way to develop educators, that PSI programs should serve various communities through their diversities, and that the liberal arts and research approaches should not be eliminated. Another recommendation arising from the
data included is that the implications of philosophical shifts contained within the mandates have not thoroughly been reviewed, analyzed, and incorporated within the rationale for changes. Conceptually, this corresponds to the problems which arise when the goals are not designed to critique the status quo (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

Concept statements related to the sociotechnical systems model were on target when referring to four elements. Related to goals Van de Ven (1981) indicated that the researcher should be able to trace some development of similar patterns evolving historically through which the origins and emerging changes in philosophy and goals of an institution (in this case the SEA processes). Knowing the historical background of the SEA allows the researcher to better understand how each of the four processes may have led to such a degree of institutionalization that the original flexibility may have been lost. Rational action is correlated to the degree to which everyone agrees upon what the ends should be.
Actors

A great deal has been written to suggest that the more active the participants are in self-assessment and the corrective processes, the more receptive they will be to adoption of solutions (Argyris, 1968; Bass, 1971; Bennis et al., 1962; Delbecq et al., 1975; Filley et al., 1976; Van de Ven, 1981).

The participation of key actors in the four processes varied dramatically from the first process (beginning in 1953) to the fourth (ending in 1985). In all four SEA certification processes there was the inclusion of many educational coalitions throughout the entire state. This broad-based public policy process evolving over a period of years was praised by almost every interviewee. The question then arises as to why the SEA needs to begin the process again so soon after the previous one is completed.

Procedures

The interviewees consistently questioned the absence of evaluation criteria, this appears to be a consistent problem with all the SEA certification processes (Havelock, 1973).
The fact that all four processes move very smoothly during the initial phases, but run into problems at the point where the PSI are to address the mandates is significant. The strengths of the evolving procedural operations used during the initiation and prescription phases of all four processes appear to be excellent technical assistance, selection of key actors, committee structure, and an environment that facilitates emergent leadership from a variety of perspectives.

Analysis of the systematized mode helps to ascertain the thought structure, the values and norms, and the deep culture or the ethos of the organization that guide consistent patterns of responses in relation to the perceptions of itself and its role with other organizations. Warren has suggested that this institutional ethos "is reflected in the technological and administrative rationales of organizations, the source of their legitimization, and their relation to power configurations" (1971, p. 67-68). The developmental mode is identified as the program used to handle various issues. In this study each process had specific goals, a time limit, a set of norms and
expectations. According to Delbecq and Van de Ven (1971) and Van de Ven and Delbecq (1974) the
developmental mode is team intensive, temporary, and
focused on specific solutions through techniques of
creative problem solving.

The process models incorporate analysis of
managerial functions of coordinating and include
controlling and procuring resources for the performance
of technical functions (Parson and Smelser, 1956; and
Katz and Kahn, 1978). When there occurs a discussion
of managerial functions, the literature separates into
two camps. Crozier (1964), Blau and Schoenherr (1971),
Pugh et al. (1968), and Galbraith (1977) typically
define managerial functions as structural elements
designed for coordination and control, measurable
through identifying differentiation, departmentalization, and administrative overhead. Another way to look at managerial functions is from the
social network perspective similar to the manner of
Tichy (1973) and Roberts and O'Reilly (1979). They
indicate that premature closure is avoided by locating
pockets of resistance and drawing them out. Their
focus is on information flows, and on patterns of
coordination and control. They indicate that these are functions of coordination, control, and procurement.

Regarding evaluation, this was a questionable element in all of the SEA processes, especially 1977-1985. All of these processes affect PSI programs, but other than the existence of on-site PSI evaluation there is a question as to exactly what criteria are being evaluated.

Regarding assessment, Burrell and Morgan (1979) has suggested that most organization theorists and researchers have dwelt upon trying to describe the functioning of an organization as a sociological entity and have generally ignored the criterion that apparently matters most to managers -- the performance effectiveness or efficiency of alternative organizational designs. The absence of performance criteria by which organizational structures can be assessed under varying environmental conditions has been one of the major block in putting organizational theory and research into practice. The assessment system is lacking in the SEA processes.
Timing

All of the four SEA certification processes required six to eight years. The SEA personnel identified this element as a problem relating more so to the loss of momentum and enthusiasm. As to the relationship of timelines and regressive behavior, many persons interviewed on the 1977-1985 process indicated that the timelines were a problem because of the inability of PSI representatives to follow developments within and between the phases. Some PSI faculties have high personnel turnover and a project lasting more than a single year presents logistical difficulties.

Summary

The existing concepts were found to be applicable to level one, however, there should be some modification to existing concepts and some additions. The modification to theory would be that at the time of the formulation of goals and objectives that the evaluation model with identified performance criteria should be as clearly designated and should be linked directly to the goals and objectives. The challenge to the concepts is that not only must the goals, objectives, and evaluation systems be identified and
well-articulated, but just as importantly so must be the premises (i.e. high structure and technical training is superior to a highly flexible liberal arts programs) and implications (i.e. the effect of changes on all other graduate programs) of all the prospective mandated changes. Only a few theorists advise use of a macro-systems approach, but for the success of the SEA process the identification of premises and implications are mandatory.

Level Two: SEA Certification Process (1977-1985)

Goals and Objectives

In relation to objectives, weaknesses in the process were related to some premises and implications that were questioned and remain unresolved. The premises include: a) the SEA pragmatic emphasis is unsound; b) the proposed programs are too structured; c) SEA should focus on other, more efficient ways to improve administrators; and d) the commitment to liberal arts and research has been ignored. The unresolved implication pertained to the impact of revisions of all graduate education programs and their impact on each other. A suggestion for dealing more
effectively with this implication was to have the advisory committees studying graduate education combine elements of teacher and administrative programs, or to have the advisory committees meet simultaneously and discuss the implications of program changes as one committee.

Actors

Regarding actors in the process there were two problems: a) some PSI were not included in each phase and therefore lacked ownership in the process (Trist, 1981), and b) one Interviewee felt that the school systems and professional associations were too weak throughout the process (Churchman and Emery, 1966).

The problem was not whether the key actors gave of their full support to the process, but rather, the problem was in the SEA’s identification of key actors. The persons who would ultimately be responsible for developing PSI programs (PSI faculties) to match the state mandates were often not invited to participate in developing those same mandates.

Procedures

With information coming predominantly from the 1977-1985 process, major problems arose during
invocation, the point at which the SEA tried to assist the PSI in developing program changes to meet the mandates. Mentioned consistently was: a) the lack of technical assistance in proposal development; b) actual implementers were excluded from previous phases; c) discussion formats were dictatorial in nature; and d) paradigm clashes (research or liberal arts vs. pragmatism) and frame clashes (university governance structure vs. SEA timelines). All of these remain unresolved.

In regards to information flows, some PSI interviewees were involved in every phase and expressed anger over the issue of inaccurate information being transferred from phase to phase. Another element regarding information and courtesy, participants in early phases devoted a lot of time and effort to provide the best product of the phase. Some of these participants felt alienated when the phase dispersed, no information was forth-coming from the SEA, and eventually they heard that the final mandates were not similar to the committee recommendations.

Unlike the previous three SEA certification processes, the 1977-1985 process contained a peer
review phase in which committees of educators (including some PSI representatives) reviewed and made recommendations on proposals. Although there were some minor problems which will be addressed later, the SEA personnel felt that the addition of this phase was a significant strength and that subsequent processes will contain this element.

Pugh's (1981) work incorporated a process outcome analysis. This provided a vehicle to question consequences that the processes have for the wider organizational life. From this perspective it was probed as to whether the SEA process contributed to any change or whether it served to reinforce the existing SEA philosophy and vision as to what education in Ohio should be.

Timing

Program changes (even single course changes) take a long time to develop at the university level. One frame clash consistently identified was that the SEA can move very quickly and the PSI cannot.

Summary

As in level one, it is recommended that an evaluation system should be specified and be clearly
linked with the goals and objectives for each phase and for the entire process. The evaluation system for each of the phases would be different from those of the entire process. Again, as in level one, the premises and implications of the new mandates continued to cause frustration and problems. Clarification of the premises and implications at the time of the explanations of goals and objectives are a necessity.

Level 3: SEA as Change Agent

Functionalist - Goals and Objectives

The goal or objective of the SEA to improve Ohio's administrators was very clear and well-articulated (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967) according to the majority of interviewees (Pattern A). However, a major undercurrent of skepticism was mentioned when the majority of interviewees responded to the question regarding hidden agendas (new theory). Among hidden agenda items, the most consistently addressed was a shift of power in favor of the SEA, taken from the PSI.

One of the successes of the invocation phase was that the relationship between the SEA and the PSI closely matched the PSI institutional ethos which was reflected in the technological rationale, in the source of legitimation, and in its relation to power.
As in level one and two, the interviewees, especially from the emergent pattern (SEA - Pattern D) identified weaknesses in the lack of attention to the premises (emphasis on technical training) and implications (effects on all graduate education programs). They felt that the premises and implications should have been fully discussed before they made the changes (addition to existing concepts).

**Functionalist - Actors**

Regarding an understanding of the client's systems norms (Trist, 1979B, 1981; Havelock, 1973) there were weaknesses in this area especially identified through the emergent pattern (D). PSI #2, 3, 5, and 6 experienced problems when the SEA revised standards in that they had significant difficulty moving quickly with their university governance structures. The SEA could change quickly; these particular PSI could not.

The issue of the Initial relationships (Havelock, 1973) between the SEA and PSI appeared within the data, but not significantly in any of the patterns. The issue of heterogeneous groups as a strength or weakness (Churchman and Emery, 1966) did not appear within the data with Level 3 (the SEA as change agent).
A weakness of the process identified by the interviewees of the emergent pattern (Pattern D) was that many PSI representatives had not been included in previous phases and knew very little about how the invocation phase fit into the total picture (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967).

The interviewees representing the majority (Pattern A) and the successful/unsuccessful PSI (Pattern B) felt that a weakness of the invocation phase was that multiple stakeholders did not have sufficient input (Trist, 1981). They suggested that students, teachers, professional organizations, and field administrators needed more input.

Another area of weakness within the phase was identified by Pattern C and D (size of PSI and emergent pattern) was that the variety of effectiveness goals had not been met (Herbst, 1974; Van de Ven, 1981). The suggestions included the need for a variety of pilot programs and the need for ongoing PSI program evaluation systems.

**Functionalist - Procedures**

A major weakness (identified through all data patterns) was that the goals, tasks, and performance of the phase weren't related to clearly specified
evaluation criteria (Hackman, 1976). The interviewees did not know what to expect in the peer review phase.

Related to procedures, Keldel (1978) has referred to the emergence of an organizational community bonded by an organizational ecology (Emery and Trist, 1973; Trist, 1977A) in which, because of mutual interdependence, no single coalition is capable of controlling the others (similar to Ohio's educational coalitions). There is a clear challenge to theory on this issue that appeared through the majority of interviewees (Pattern A) in that they indicated that the SEA was the best change agent that could most effectively organize or change the PSI programs for the better.

Due to the interdependency and common forces of environmental turbulence more organizations, by necessity, are designing change through a large-scale social systems model incorporating cooperation and collaboration. Rather than incorporating a bureaucratic paradigm which traditionally leads to totalitarian design, an inter-organizational collaboration reflecting participative, democratic principles is needed. A success of the phase was identified as the mechanism the SEA used effectively
when working with multiple PSI was a degree of normative incrementalism that incorporates continuous adaptive planning (Pava, 1980).

An alternative to implementing SEA mandates might be to allow what Trist (1981) calls thematic facilitation whereby individual PSI identify, design, implement, evaluate, and redesign innovative projects with programmatic themes developed within the purview of the SEA. Maximum flexibility in process structure leads to the feeling of ownership and commitment that are critical to the success of the project (Hackman, 1981).

Managing interdependence (Van de Ven, 1981) was a weakness in that information flows were interrupted among units and people. A critical problem was that the deans of the colleges of education were the recipients of all correspondence regarding meetings, critical information, etc. In some cases the deans knew to transfer all the information to the educational administration faculties. However, in other cases the deans believed they were receiving updates to information sent to the faculties, and therefore they did not transfer the information.
In regards to information flows (Van de Ven, 1981), some PSI interviewees were involved in every phase and expressed anger over the issue of inaccurate information being transferred from phase to phase. This anger had an effect during the invocation phase and fueled suspicions that the SEA hidden agendas (new theory) were in operation. Weaknesses of the phase were related to the inability to articulate and integrate the phases (Ackoff and Emery, 1972; Sommerhoff, 1950, 1969; Trist, 1981). This issue was also related to how individual PSI accepted the innovation but did not appear in the Level 3 data (Havelock, 1973; Hackman, 1981).

The discussion of various times during which the SEA exhibits a mechanistic or flexible style (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981) was addressed above in the section related to all processes. Briefly, the SEA appears to act as the ultimate facilitator in initiation and prescription phases, but, unfortunately a weakness identified was that it exhibited a mechanistic style during invocation thus stifling discussion of critical issues (premises, implications, problems in funding the Entry Year Program which was later dropped by the SEA). These issues were also related to how the group

The successes or strengths of the invocation phase identified through the data are related to all SEA processes. Briefly, the strengths include: a) the SEA should become stronger (a challenge to existing theory in the radical structuralist paradigm) and be in charge of coordinating efforts of educational coalitions to improve educators, b) the process incorporates normative incrementalism which could be used to radically change programs, c) it has a very broad base for public input, and d) it provided the PSI the opportunity to examine and/or restructure their programs and to re-establish a link with field personnel.

Regarding social aggregates (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Emery and Trist, 1973; Kieldel, 1978; Trist, 1977a), there were elements of power system clashes such as: a) the SEA wanted to establish more control over PSI curriculum; b) the SEA would better control programs if there was a reduced number of PSI programs in the state; c) the SEA would be pressured to reverse decisions regarding schools, students, and PSI; d) there were elements of cooperation and tension between
private and public PSI; and e) the extensive certification program will affect faculty/student ratios and negatively impact small PSI.

There was very little agreement of the educational coalitions due to a variety of style, paradigm, and frame clashes (Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981). In addition to the disagreements arising on the issue of premises there were several other problems. Related to procedures the problems identified included: a) the whole process didn’t make sense, b) there was no evaluation model in the process, c) the process needs pilots, and d) because of programmatic shifts there will probably be negative effects on student populations. The critical issues included: a) the prohibitive costs for administrative certificates might attract only upper and middle class students, perhaps with a greater appearance of white males, b) because teachers may be required to obtain a masters’ degree in their own field, there will be enrollment cuts in educational administration, c) these factors may eliminate good potential administrators from certification, and d) a lack of administrators could eventually occur.
As to whether the entire educational coalition (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981) of Ohio was in agreement with goals, philosophy, and vision of SEA, and whether the design, structure, and decision process follow concomitantly, many interviewees suggested that the SEA maintained its own agenda despite information to the contrary proposed in previous phases. The major area of agreement according to interviewees was that if anyone is altering the training programs of the PSI, it should be the SEA. One of the major disadvantages of not uniting the educational community in goals, philosophy, vision and follow through with a decision process based on consistency of recommendations was that interviewees felt that the SEA did not maintain integrity. The process had the appearance of multi-public participation, but was controlled in large part by SEA philosophy despite SEA protestations to the contrary. As to whether or not there should be agreement between the SEA and the entire educational coalition, the basis of agreement should have been focused on the various ways to improve education (administrative training being only one element).
**Functionalist - Timing**

The majority of the interviewees (Pattern A) called for the use of a variety of pilot programs. This would extend timelines indefinitely, but might prove more effective to achieve the goal to improve educators. To achieve the goals established by the SEA during the invocation phase, requests for pilot programs had to be denied. The length of the process was a factor in success of the phase (Havelock, 1973; Trist, 1981).

**Radical Structuralist - Goals and Objectives**

The goals and objectives were not designed to critique the status quo (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). The goals and objectives were arranged so that the program alterations would comply with the changed philosophy and vision of the SEA. The goals and objectives were designed to initiate disequilibrium and then to establish a new equilibrium (Bukharin, 1965), but that new equilibrium was challenged in that the philosophy and vision of the SEA did not match the recommendations from previous phases nor the visions of the PSI.
One challenge to theory was that the SEA should have control over the revision processes. The majority of interviewees indicated that the SEA was in the best position to initiate change while maintaining a balance between coalitions.

One of the consistent complaints of the interviewees was the false image of an open, multi-public, decision-making process divided into phases for standards revision. There appeared to be legitimate mechanisms for the expression and aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy (Paris and Reynolds, 1983), but in reality it was an extremely closed process controlled by the SEA. There was a widespread belief that school policy problems were tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis (and the process led to the appearance of these attributes). However, the vision of the SEA seemed to suggest that these problems would be resolved by compliance of all 17 PSI in one programmatic administrative training design throughout the state.

Radical Structuralist - Actors

According to Lasswell’s (1971) value categories, factions were operating primarily from the categories of power (SEA) and enlightenment (PSI). It appeared
that the SEA was indulged and that the PSI were deprived. During argumentation the SEA used the power configuration to limit the issues under discussion, to reduce conflict by clarifying demands, in most cases refusing to negotiate or permit a consensual discussion format. During the invocation phase the SEA controlled the outcomes through the approval or disapproval of the PSI proposals, and controlled the total process through information control.

During the entire process the influence of the field educators was the primary coalition which was indulged and the PSI perspective was deprived (Lasswell, 1971). The entire process saluted values related to a more pragmatic approach and rejected those related to PSI programs emphasizing research, or the character development of persons in policy management position.

During the invocation phase the faction appearing to have most influence (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) was the small PSI, the only sub-group to formally organize itself in their approach to the SEA meetings. The small PSI perceived that through organizing themselves that they had the ability to impact the process. The medium and large PSI did not perceive that they had the
power, influence, or ability to impact the process through the SEA monthly meetings. The successful PSI perceived their mission primarily to utilize the SEA mandates as a window of opportunity in order to completely reconceptualize their programs. The unsuccessful PSI were especially concerned with and challenged the pragmatic, field experience focus and were more aggressive in expressing the need for an experimentation and/or a research focus.

From the perspectives of the SEA, the small, medium, and large PSI, the successful and unsuccessful PSI, the assessments were legitimate (accurate), and each group perceived the situations differently according to the manner in which they constructed their own social realities. In some instances these perceptions limited the scope of realizable change that could be accomplished (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

During the invocation phases the SEA afforded little access to the decision-making process (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) probably in order to control and facilitate the changes that the SEA felt were important. In relation to the SEA and their monthly meetings, the participants fulfilled the role as a delegate of his/her PSI (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).
Depending on the internal social realities (Paris and Reynolds, 1983), the ideologies of the PSI representatives spanned all the paradigms (from the functionalist, interpretivist, radical humanist, and radical structuralist).

**Radical Structuralist - Procedures**

The SEA had in place a standards revision process (for both administrator and teacher training) that was familiar in all the PSI education programs in Ohio. These processes (for standards revision of administrator and teacher training programs) continued over many years. As soon as the administrative process went into implementation, the invocation phase of the teaching process was in the invocation phase and the cycles continue throughout the years with the SEA monitoring, timing, and the initiating of every phase. This process of PSI standards revision has a structural design of normative incrementalism and could be used to introduce radical structural change (Pava, 1980). The SEA wanted the alteration of certain premises in administrative programs (greater emphasis on pragmatic approach, extensive field experience, using faculty outside of education). This SEA emphasis resulted in
the PSI developing proposals in compliance to mandates, and to that end the SEA goals were achieved.

The subgroups within the initiation and prescription phases felt free to construct their futures within the purview of SEA approval. In the invocation phase the SEA dominated the monthly meetings (eliminating any type of self-organizing tendency). Because of the SEA domination of the process the PSI had great difficulty combating dominance (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

A united educational community (Emery and Trist, 1973; Kledel, 1978; Trist, 1977a) did not emerge (and there was a question as to the viability of the positive influence of such an environment).

A major complaint of the interviewees was that there was a lack of reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, and involvement of all relevant parties (Havelock, 1973). As to reciprocity, there was a breakdown in the transfer of information between phases and within the invocation phase (especially with the unsuccessful PSI). This one-way relationship (Havelock, 1973) tended to breed
dependency and inhibit the initiative of the PSI to help themselves.

The openness to new ideas in SEA meetings was expected only from the PSI and that openness depended entirely on the individual PSI social reality. The successful PSI used the process to totally reconceptualize their programs exhibited the elements of openness such as being receptive to new ideas, having an active desire for self-renewal, willing to share new ideas with others, possessing an active eagerness to seek out new ideas, openness to listen to the problems of others, and an openness to give authentic feedback to each other.

There was extensive criticism from the interviewees as the realistic expectations (Havelock, 1973) of the SEA (that the mandated changes in administrative training programs would address the problems rampant in the schools). The SEA was not perceived as providing a valuable resource which will solve problems and provide the client with a significantly improved state of affairs (Havelock, 1973). The SEA structure had a definition of roles but lacked clarity in working procedures and did not elucidate on expected outcomes (Havelock, 1973). With
respect to equal power, the appearance of change was brought about by the compliance of the weaker partner (PSI) without the commitment necessary for lasting effectiveness (Havelock, 1973). Several interviewees frustrated with the SEA indicated that the programs were only on paper and that it was debatable whether they would ever actually be implemented. The perception of threat to the PSI was tangible, especially with those that were unsuccessful (in some cases the threat was so extensive that the interviewees felt that their legitimacy, authority, and philosophy of post secondary education had been undermined).

As to the confrontation of differences (Havelock, 1973), the PSI did feel that they could talk with the SEA frankly regarding what disturbed them about their relationships. Suspicions of hidden motives was not frankly discussed, and fears of exploitation were not brought out in the open. As to the Involvement of all relevant parties (Havelock, 1973), many interviewees knew the specific PSI were not invited to participate in various phases and this served to alienate those institutions (this was a direct correlation with those PSI that were unsuccessful). Another disturbing element in Involvement of relevant parties was that
communications for the monthly SEA meetings were not sent to the educational administration faculties, and some of the PSI did not understand the value and importance of those meetings and therefore there was a haphazard approach to attendance and relaying information back to their faculties.

The SEA did not size up the relationship (Havelock, 1973) by doing five things: they should have built an inside-outside team, worked out a strategy for initial encounters, identified the qualities of the ideal relationship, identified and developed strategies for overcoming any danger signals, and specified mechanisms to maintain the relationship.

There were at least five points of internal dialectic that emerged through conflicts (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) between the social power bases (between the SEA and the PSI). There was the contradiction in the SEA's service vs. enforcement. The SEA provided the mechanism for the field to impact on training programs and provided the mechanisms for the PSI to change programs vs. the mandate to close programs unless the PSI listened. Another contradiction that emerged was that of the appearance of a democratic change process vs. a highly SEA dominated structure.
There was a contradiction as to the SEA's role as disseminator of information (recommendations) from previous phases vs. the role of focusing the mandates to incorporate only the SEA philosophy and vision. Another contradiction appeared in the arena of whether the SEA wanted to develop an accountability or maintenance function with the field and with the PSI vs. whether they actually wanted an excellence orientation involving risk-taking with the field and the PSI. Another distortion was the relationship of a theory and research emphasis, or a liberal arts vs. pragmatic emphasis, field experience oriented administrative training program. These were never discussed during the invocation phase.

The points of external dialectic that emerged through conflicts (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) between the power bases included cooperation vs. competition modes among PSI, the extent to which their programs were based on theory vs. practice, and the powerful vs. powerless PSI.

The core tendencies (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) that appeared included the SEA maintaining strict control of the process in each phase, the PSI interpreting and developing the proposals the best way
they could given their internal social realities. The entire structure and process appeared to be designed to reinforce the status of the SEA (contingency combinations were not permitted because that would have reduced the power of the SEA). The SEA's strict control over every phase shaped and channeled actual realization of the changes? The interviewees significantly disliked the fact that all 17 PSI programs would be very similar and many persons suggested that experimental programs should be mandated. This suggestion was an emerging factor that could bring alternative arrangements to view.

The interviewees felt that the field educators had more impact on the process and that concomitantly the SEA mandated more of a pragmatic approach (requiring specific courses in law, finance, business management, and extensive field experience). There were two major challenges to the pragmatic orientation, that being a research based program and/or a liberal arts based training emphasis. Again, the consistent recommendations from the interviewees included the necessity for experimental programs incorporating each of these approaches.
A success of the phase was identified as the mechanism the SEA used effectively when working with multiple PSI. The SEA used a system with a degree of normative incrementalism that incorporates continuous adaptive planning (Pava 1980). In the case of both the SEA and the PSI, the question might be to what degree can actual radical structural change be incorporated into a change process exhibiting a structural design symptomatic of normative incrementalism? Some PSI interviewees view the SEA processes of symbolic change as a simple containment effort on behalf of the social system. This same system could be used as a vehicle for radical change.

Timing

Timing was a factor reinforcing the maintenance of the status quo (Havelock, 1973). Many interviewees suggested that the mandates be waived for the development and implementation of experimental programs. They also suggested that the SEA concentrate its efforts in other areas such as teacher and administrator academies, school-community relations, and business and industry linkage.
Level Four: Invocation Phase with PSI as Change Agent

**Functionalist - Goals and Objectives**

Concept statements related to the sociotechnical systems model were on target when referring to three elements. Related to interviewing, identification of effectiveness goals and criteria for each interviewee was necessary in order to identify perspectives and sources of tension and conflict.

The data from the majority of interviewees (Pattern A) supported the theory that they believed the goals and objectives were clear (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967), and that they made use of the SEA's legitimization (Drucker, 1978) to change the program in order to allow the PSI to function successfully as change agent.

There was a clear separation of the interviewees on the basis of the successful or unsuccessful PSI (Pattern B) in that the successful PSI felt the goals were clear and articulateable and that they knew how their program changes fit into the entire picture. The unsuccessful PSI thought the goals were unclear and did not have knowledge of the entire process or of how their proposals would fit into the picture.
 Unlike interviewees of the unsuccessful PSI, those interviewees of the successful PSI (Pattern B) knew the internal PSI client system thoroughly (Trist, 1979B; Havelock, 1973). They understood the leaders, the influentials, the gatekeepers, the norms of the college and university governance structure, the community, and the forces that would stand to oppose program change. The addition to theory would be that it was important for the PSI to be able to exert power over and within these factions to the degree that they are able to successfully promote their views (addition to concepts).

The degree to which the PSI perceived the need for change and have through various mechanisms made the process their own was a factor related to the extent of actual change in the program. Their initial relationship to the change process was a factor related to success (Havelock, 1973).

Interviewees in Patterns A, B, and C confirmed that the use of heterogeneous groups (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Trist, 1981) in developing the proposals was a success of the phase. The successful PSI made
sure to maintain a degree of heterogeneity in including several educational coalitions in their proceedings.

Trist (1979B) has indicated that the degree to which multiple stakeholders had maximum input and discretion in designing and choosing the path of change would correlate to the degree of satisfaction with the process. This was supported in the data through Patterns A and B (majority and successful PSI).

In this study, a critical issue regarding the separation of the successful from the unsuccessful PSI was whether the PSI were included or excluded from previous phases where critical decisions were made as to proscribed changes in programs. Furthermore, despite the fact that the process might take 6 to 8 years, the PSI faculties implementing the program were more successful if they had participated in all phases of the change process. According to Trist (1979B) the implementer’s ownership of the project is related to the actual change that the new program will create.

While the successful PSI had cohesive coalitions that dealt with proposal development, the unsuccessful PSI usually had a single faculty member who by default was the only person present to write the proposal, and
In one case the proposal was written the week before it was due.

Pattern B (PSI that were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development) was most evident throughout the Level 4 data (PSI as change agent). The PSI that were initially successful did the following:

a) they structured and designed their goals, tasks, and timelines with appropriate job specification and level of difficulty (Hackman, 1976),

b) they regulated themselves (Hackman, 1981; Kledel, 1978; Trist, 1981) using consensual processes and encouraged emergent leadership,

c) they identified their major obstacles (people and structure) and controlled them, (addition to theory)

d) they used both flexible and mechanistic styles depending on the job specification and the need to control turbulence (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981),

e) their success was related to their ability to integrate the invocation with other phases (Ackoff and Emery, 1972; Sommerhoff, 1969),

f) they embraced the ability to completely change their programs (Hackman, 1981),

g) they developed a polity that stabilized and broadened the foundation of the process (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Emery and Trist, 1972; Kledel, 1978; Trist, 1977a),

h) they developed an internal coalition agreeing on goals, vision, design, and structure (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981), and

i) if there were style, paradigm, of frame clashes, they found a way to resolve them either through compromise or deutero-learning (Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981).

Managing interdependence (Van de Ven, 1981) was a weakness in that information flows were interrupted
among units and people. A critical problem (Hackman, 1981) was that the deans of the colleges of education were the recipients of all correspondence regarding meetings, critical information, etc., and that the education administration faculties (especially of the unsuccessful PSI) did not know that the SEA was in the midst of changing the education administration standards. The successful PSI found ways to secure accurate information on time. The unsuccessful PSI struggled with this problem throughout the process. This issue was related to the problem of being excluded from previous phases. Although deans of education of various colleges were invited to participate in various phases, these persons were not the implementers, nor did some of them bother to inform the education administration faculties that they were involved in the process.

Some of the PSI did not understand the value and importance of the SEA meetings, and therefore there was a haphazard approach to their attendance and relaying information back to their faculties.
Functionalist - Timing

The majority of interviewees (Pattern A) felt that the timelines (Havelock, 1973) for the invocation phase was a strength of the process in that it forced the successful PSI to organize and move quickly (over the period of one year) to develop a proposal. Some interviewees felt that if the SEA did not maintain the pressure of time constraints that they would not have been as effective at organizing themselves. The majority felt that one year was a sufficient amount of time to develop their proposals.

Regressive behavior (failure to fully adopt new program, continuing to use the old) was mentioned by many interviewees, but not in conjunction with process timelines (Havelock, 1973). Rather, reversion to the old program format, was more related to internal PSI dynamics.

During the phase the PSI acted as internal or external change agent. Those PSI that were successful in initial proposal development (Pattern B) successfully alternated between internal and external agent at appropriate times. Those PSI that were
unsuccessful were not able to function or adapt to the changing circumstances.

Radical Structuralist - Goals and Objectives

With respect to the four theories within the division of goals and objectives with the PSI acting as the change agent within their respective institutions, there was clear separation of the data within patterns. Among the majority of interviewees (Pattern A) and the successful PSI (Pattern B) supported each of the four theories. The unsuccessful PSI did not conduct themselves according to these theories.

The successful PSI used the goals and objectives not only to critique the status quo (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), but they used them as an opportunity to radically alter their programs. Their goals and objectives were designed to initiate disequilibrium and then to establish a new equilibrium (Bukharin, 1965) that challenged the existing philosophy of their programs. There were legitimate mechanisms for the expression and aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy (Paris and Reynolds, 1983) with emphasis on faculty cohesion, emergent leadership, and consensus. The widespread belief that school policy
problems were tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis (Paris and Reynolds, 1983) produced a driving force that was required to radically alter programs.

As discussed under the division of actors, the successful faculties as a unit had to be composed of older and well-established members. These successful faculties as a unit had to have the confidence to exert power over and within the macro-system. To the extent that even one of these factors was missing, the PSI did not consider altering their program. If the above internal PSI factors were missing, it was found that the goal during invocation was to simply update the syllabi of a few courses.

Radical Structuralist - Actors

According to Lasswell’s (1971) value categories, the PSI were operating from the category of enlightenment. It continued to appear that the SEA (power category) was indulged and that the PSI were deprived. During the invocation phase, even with the PSI as change agent, the SEA controlled the outcomes through the approval or disapproval of the PSI proposals. Because the PSI were required to develop
their proposals in specific ways with the inclusion of certain elements, the influence of the field educators continued to be the primary coalition which was indulged. Even with the PSI in control, the entire process continued to salute values related to a more pragmatic approach and rejected those related to administrative programs emphasizing research, or the character development of persons in policy management position.

From Patterns A, B, and C (majority, successful or unsuccessful, and size) the actors constructed their own reality; their perceptions determined the scope of realizable change within their domain. Given the same information from the SEA, after attending the same meetings for all PSI, the individual PSI heard and comprehended differently depending upon their respective social realities. The PSI with less turbulent internal environments embraced the opportunity for radical change. The less healthy PSI interpreted the SEA mandates as destruction for their administrative training programs.

Although the PSI that seriously intended to alter their programs were selective as to who accessed the
decision-making process (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), they did permit access from other coalitions (field administrators, educational organizations, etc.) and from other ideologies (Paris and Reynolds, 1983).

**Radical Structuralist - Procedures**

Some PSI interpreted the instructions of the SEA to mean that they were to alter radically (completely reconceptualize) their programs, while other PSI believed that they were to make minor adjustments in their current programs. The extent to which the programs were radically restructured depended more on the inclination of the individual PSI (their energies, acceptance, leadership, support services, organizational ability, ethos, etc.). The generated knowledge that actually enabled a change in the process for certain PSI and not others was entirely dependent on their respective internal social realities.

As to the developmental tendencies guided by the external dialectic (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), some PSI were already committed to a particular position (i.e. a masters degree with research orientation, or ethos that demands that all college programs concentrate on developing a better persons through self understanding
and a liberal arts background). Most of the PSI continued to resist the pragmatic approach with heavy emphasis on field experience. Given these tendencies, the successful PSI still found ways to incorporate their institutional philosophy within the SEA mandated changes. The unsuccessful PSI became locked into a view of destruction of their existing program.

As to the internal dialectic, because of the power of extraneous distraction some PSI had great difficulty combatting dominance. For one PSI no individual was able to take charge of the process. For another PSI there was the absence of support personnel or mechanisms to write the proposals. For other PSI they dealt with the absence of faculty through retirement, death, or foreign assignment. These were only a few internal problems affecting some of the unsuccessful PSI in this study. The core tendency (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) for these PSI was to attempt to survive.

With certain PSI there were internal contradictions emerging through various power bases (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). These conflicts manifested themselves as internal turmoil (the dean in conflict with the department and individual faculty members,
Internal faculty conflict, domain wars with other departments). Also some individual PSI made negative responses to a well-managed initial encounter effort (not sending representatives to critical meetings, not relaying information back to faculties, or not having a consistent contact person between the SEA and the faculty).

The openness to new ideas (Havelock, 1973) depended entirely upon the social reality of the individual PSI. Some PSI used the process to totally reconceptualize their programs and exhibited elements of openness such as being receptive to new ideas, having an active desire for self-renewal, willing to share new ideas with others, possessing an active eagerness to seek out new ideas, openness to listening to the problems of others, and an openness to give authentic feedback to each other. The faculty of the unsuccessful PSI did not express their views in such proactive terms. In the successful PSI a united educational community did emerge (Emery and Trist, 1973; Kiedel, 1978; Trist, 1977A), a by-product of the process being faculty cohesion. The unsuccessful PSI did not develop faculty cohesion.
Radical Structuralist - Timing

For the successful PSI the time frame of one year was sufficient. For the unsuccessful PSI, given the internal dynamics, many years would not have been sufficient time. The timing was not a factor reinforcing the maintenance of the status quo (Havelock, 1973).

The suggestion from the majority of the interviewees (Pattern A) was that non-traditional programs needed to be piloted. What was interesting is that two of the smallest PSI were in the process of developing the capability of a year-by-year incremental change incorporating the existence of non-traditional programs within the purview of the SEA mandates.

Summary of the Concepts from the Functionalist and Radical Structuralist Paradigms

Introduction

In all cases the concepts were present from one perspective or another. Some concepts were absent according to which view of the study was considered. For instance, data that support the presence of concept
F (if heterogeneous groups were a strength or a weakness) of the functionalist paradigm did not appear at level three, but did appear at level four. One of the advantages in exploring concepts from a variety of levels is that the concepts are not dismissed just because a certain perspective or sub-division had not been examined.

In this section is a critique of the concepts from both the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms. Graphic presentations are incorporated in the discussion of both paradigms. The graphic presentations show all the concepts and whether there was data support that concept from different perspectives such as SEA as change agent - pattern A.

For the functionalist paradigm the graphic presentations are found below in Figures 17, 18, 19, and 20. For the radical structuralist paradigm the graphic presentations are found below in Figures 21, 22, 23, and 24. The horizontal axes of Figures 17 - 24 are related to the specific concepts from the two paradigms. The vertical axes of these figures and the same:
SEA - A refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern A - interviewees from five of the seven PSI indicated that this concept was important in the process.

SEA - B refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern B - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development.

SEA - C refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern C - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were large, medium or small.

SEA - D refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern D - a separation of the data with respect to an emergent pattern that occurred with interviewees of PSI #2, 3, 4, and 5.

SEA - P refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern P - whether at least one interviewee referred to this concept.

PSI - A refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern A - interviewees from five of the seven PSI indicated that this concept was important in the process.

PSI - B refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern B - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development.

PSI - C refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern C - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were large, medium or small.

PSI - D refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern D - a separation of the data with respect to an emergent pattern that occurred with interviewees of PSI #2, 3, 4, and 5.

PSI - P refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern P - whether at least one interviewee referred to this concept.

The discussion is followed by a listing of the specific concepts under discussion and graphed along the horizontal axes within the figures.
Functionalist Paradigm - Goals and Objectives

Figure 19 (Functionalist Paradigm - Goals and Objectives) below shows how functionalist concepts A, B, and C indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

Goals and Objectives
A. Were the goals and objectives of the time period clear, articulateable? (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967)
B. Was there evidence that the participants knew how their task fit into the total picture? (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967)
C. What is the institutional ethos reflected in the technological and administrative rationale, the source of legitimation, and the relation to power configuration? (Drucker, 1978)

According to Figure 19, the data supported concept A in six of the ten patterns, whereas, concept C was least supported in the patterns.

In the division of goals and objectives the following should occur:
A. Add the analysis of the presence of hidden agendas. If the interviewees perceive the presence of hidden agendas, their attitude toward that agenda could affect their willingness to comply with the change agent’s mandates. Even if the changee agrees with the hidden agenda, the suspicion of the change agent’s motives could effect the process negatively.
B. Add a section on the importance of understanding and clarifying the premises for the specific change. If the premise for change is invalid it is highly possible the process will not be successful.
C. Add a section on the importance of projecting implications. The research and development
departments of private industry cannot afford to change products or services without a comprehensive outline of anticipated implications. Educational coalitions appear to ignore consistently implications of change programs.
Figure 19: Functionalist Paradigm - Goals and Objectives

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Functionalist Paradigm - Actors

Figure 20 (Functionalist Paradigm - Actors) below shows how functionalist concepts D, E, F, G, and H indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

Actors

D. What are client's systems norms? (Trist, 1979b, 1981; Havelock, 1973)
E. What is the initial relationship from the change agent perspective? (Havelock, 1973)
F. In what ways were the heterogeneous groups a strength or weakness for the process? (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Trist, 1979b, 1981)
G. Did the multiple stakeholders have maximum input? (Trist, 1979b, 1981)
H. What are people's effectiveness goals and how do they affect the process? (Herbst, 1974; Van de Ven, 1981): Is everyone satisfied? (Emery, 1974, 1976); Is satisfaction related to control?

According to Figure 20, the concept having most importance in this section was concept G (whether multiple stakeholders had maximum input). Concept E was least supported of all the five theories in this section.

In the division of actors the following should occur:

Add a section on the importance of the actors to be able to exert power over and within their environments. This study has demonstrated that many factors related to the internal dynamics of the educational coalition affects the social reality that the coalition constructs.
Figure 20: Functionalist Paradigm - Actors

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
**Functionalist Paradigm - Procedures**

Figure 21 (Functionalist Paradigm - Procedures) below shows how functionalist theoretical perspectives I through S indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

### Procedures

I. Each phase had different goals, tasks, performance standards, evaluation criteria and therefore different structures and designs should have developed to perform unique functions. (Hackman, 1976)


K. What are the critical points in the process that most affect goal achievement? How could they be reinforced? (Hackman, 1981)

L. How was interdependence managed (information flows among units/people and methods to resolve conflict)? (Van de Ven, 1981)

M. At times the change agent exhibits a flexible style, at other times, a mechanistic style. (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981)

N. What is the degree of success of the process? Is this related to the change agent's ability to articulate and integrate the phases? (Ackoff and Emery, 1972; Sommerhoff, 1950, 1969; Trist, 1981)

O. How have individuals and groups accepted of innovation? (Havelock, 1973)


Q. Have any of the social aggregates created during the process developed a polity? Has this polity broadened and stabilized the foundation of the process? (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Emery and Trist, 1973; Kledel, 1978; Trist, 1977a)

R. Is the entire educational coalition of Ohio in agreement with goals, philosophy, vision of change agent, and does the design, structure, decision process follow concomitantly? (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981)
S. Is there a style clash, a paradigm clash, a frame clash between the change agent and the Implementers? (Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981)

According to Figure 21, the concepts having most importance in this section were concepts I (whether appropriate procedures were used to attain the objective), L (how interdependence was managed), and O (how individuals and groups accepted the innovation). The least supported was concept P (which PSI supported the process and why).

In the division of procedures the following should occur:

A. A challenge to existing theory would be that in the SEA decision-making process, the change agent (whether it be the SEA or the PSI) must be able to control other coalitions if they are to successfully initiate change. Without this ability, chaos would result.

B. Havelock's (1973) discussion of hidden motives within the division of procedures should be linked directly the section on goals and objectives as stated above.
Figure 21: Functionalist Paradigm - Procedures

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts’
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figure 22 (Functionalist Paradigm - Timing) below shows how functionalist concept T was supported by the data.

Timing

T. If the length of the process is a factor relative to successes or failures of the process, how could changing the timing make the process more effective? (Havelock, 1973; Trist, 1981)

According to Figure 22, the length of the process was a factor relative to the success or failure of the process.

In the division of timing the following should occur:

Havelock (1973) indicated that regressive behavior such as failure to fully adopt the new program and the continuance of the use of the old program is related to the restriction of the timelines. This study suggests a challenge to Havelock in that the regressive behavior is more related to internal problems of the changee. It could be argued that because of internal problems the timelines presented difficulties which affected the regressive behavior. This would be disproved in that no extension of timelines would have improved the chances for success for some PSI. However, an improvement in internal conditions while maintaining the same timelines would have improved chances for success.
Figure 22: Functionalist Paradigm - Timing

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Goals and Objectives

Figure 23 (Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Goals and Objectives) below shows how radical structuralist theoretical perspectives A, B, C, and D indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

Goals and Objectives
A. Are the goals and objectives designed to critique the status quo? (Burrel and Morgan, 1979)
B. Are the goals and objectives designed to initiate disequilibrium and then to establish a new equilibrium? (Bukharin 1965)
C. How legitimate are the mechanisms for the expression and aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy? (Paris and Reynolds, 1983)
D. Is there a widespread belief that policy problems are tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis? (Paris and Reynolds, 1983)

According to Figure 23, the data supported concept B in seven of the ten patterns, whereas, concepts A, C, and D were supported in five or six of the patterns. There was no addition to concepts in this area.
Figure 23: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Goals and Objectives

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Actors

Figure 24 (Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Actors) below shows how radical structuralist concepts E, F, G, and H indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

E. Did Lasswell's (1960, 1971) value categories, indulgences, or deprivations have any effect on the process?
F. How do the actors perceive the power of the respective coalitions in the ability to impact the process? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
G. Who has access to the decision-making process: (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
H. What ideology(ies) are the actors (functionalist, interpretivist, radical humanist, radical structuralist) (Paris and Reynolds, 1983)

According to Figure 24, the data supported all the concepts in the actors sub-division in seven of the ten patterns. There was no addition of theory in this area.
Figure 24: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Actors

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figure 25 (Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Procedures) below shows how radical structuralist concepts I through R indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

Procedures
I. Does the generated knowledge actually enable a change in the process, in social realities?

J. Are the subgroups within each phase free to construct their futures? 1. Are they self-organizing? Do they result in thorough changes in the organization?

K. How are the developmental tendencies guided by the dialectic?

L. Has an united educational community emerged with no single dominant coalition? How to structure the process so that it does emerge? (Emery and Trist, 1973; Kiedel, 1978; Trist, 1977a)

M. To what extent was the ideal relationship achieved? (reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, involvement of all relevant parties)? (Havelock, 1973)

N. What are the elements standing in contradiction to each other? the social conjunctures within the total context? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

O. What is the internal dialectic (contradictions and/or distortions) emerging through conflicts between the social power bases? between theory and practice? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

P. What is the external dialectic emerging through conflicts between power bases? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

Q. What are the core tendencies? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

R. How do the various interests groups and power bases actually impact the process? How could the balance be changed? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
According to Figure 25, the data supported all of the concepts in the procedures in at least five of the ten patterns.

There was one addition to the concepts in this area:

Add the emphasis on the necessity of a single dominant faction (the SEA) in order to initiate and coordinate change within the PSI.
Figure 25: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Procedures

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Timing

Figure 26 (Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Timing) below shows how radical structuralist concepts S and T indicated along the horizontal axis were supported by the data.

Timing
S. Is timing one of the factors reinforcing the maintenance of the status quo? (Havelock, 1973)
T. How could timing be altered to allow the most non-traditional forms to awaken, be fully explored, piloted, and evaluated? (Havelock, 1973)

According to Figure 26, the data supported concepts in at least five of the ten patterns. There was no addition of concepts in this area.
Figure 26: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - Timing

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Graphic Summary of Concepts

Figures 27, 28, and 29 below show how all functionalist concepts A-T indicated along the horizontal axis were supported within different patterns. Figure 26 shows those same concepts but only from the perspective of level three - SEA as change agent. Figure 27 shows those concepts but only from the perspective of level four - PSI as change agent.
Figure 27: Functionalist Paradigm - All Divisions

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figure 28: Functionalist Paradigm - SEA as Change Agent

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figure 29: Functionalist Paradigm - PSI as Change Agent

Horizontal Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figures 30, 31, and 32 below show how all radical structuralists concepts A-T indicated along the horizontal axis were supported within different patterns. Figure 31 shows those same concepts but only from the perspective of level three - SEA as change agent. Figure 32 shows those concepts but only from the perspective of level four - PSI as change agent.
Figure 30: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - All Divisions

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figure 31: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - SEA as Change Agent

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Figure 32: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - PSI as Change Agent

Horizontal Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
Vertical Axis: Patterns within the Data
Summary of Data Patterns Identified in the Study

In order to examine the prevalence of specific patterns in the study the graphic presentations were altered by swapping the vertical and horizontal axes and by assigning each concept a value of two points. Figure 33 below identifies the functionalist concepts A-T along the vertical axis. Figure 34 below identifies the radical structuralist concepts A-T along the vertical axis. Both Figures 33 and 34 share the same horizontal axis - the identification of patterns withing the data. For Figures 33 and 34 the legend of the horizontal axis is as follows:

- S - A refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern A - interviewees from five of the seven PSI indicated that this concept was important in the process.
- S - B refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern B - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development.
- S - C refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern C - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were large, medium or small.
- S - D refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern D - a separation of the data with respect to an emergent pattern that occurred with interviewees of PSI #2, 3, 4, and 5.
- S - P refers to level three, SEA as change agent, pattern P - whether at least one interviewee referred to this concept.
P - A refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern A - Interviewees from five of the seven PSI indicated that this concept was important in the process.

P - B refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern B - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development.

P - C refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern C - a separation of the data with respect to whether the PSI were large, medium or small.

P - D refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern D - a separation of the data with respect to an emergent pattern that occurred with interviewees of PSI #2, 3, 4, and 5.

P - P refers to level four, PSI as change agent, pattern P - whether at least one interviewee referred to this concept.
Figure 33: Functionalist Paradigm - All Patterns

Horizontal Axis: Patterns within the Data
Vertical Axis: Functionalist Concepts
Figure 34: Radical Structuralist Paradigm - All Patterns

Horizontal Axis: Patterns within the Data
Vertical Axis: Radical Structuralist Concepts
It is interesting to note the absence of the emergent pattern (PSI 2, 3, 5, and 6) from both the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigm at level four (PSI as change agent), but a strong presence of this pattern in both paradigms at level three (SEA as change agent). This suggests that PSI 2, 3, 5, and 6 had very similar convictions regarding the SEA decision-making process at level three with the SEA as change agent, but that they shared few commonalities as to how they functioned internally (level four with the PSI as change agent).

As explained above, logic would indicate that the most supported patterns were S-P and P-P (whether the theory was present at all within the data) were the most numerous patterns in both the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms.

The next largest anticipated support was in the patterns of S-A and P-A (if interviewees in five or more PSI mentioned this theoretical perspective as important). This was only true from the radical structuralist paradigm at level four (PSI as change agent). According to Figures 33 and 34 the emergent pattern at level three (S-D) had more support in both
the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms. According to the same graphs at level three in the functionalist paradigm, pattern P-B (separation of data on the basis of whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development) appeared more dominant than S-A (majority of interviewees).

Summary

All of the theoretical concepts in both the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms were supported. The extent of the support was dependent on whether the researcher examined the theory from a certain perspective.

Chapter VII outlines how the theoretical statements would be reconfigured given the findings of this study. The next chapter also contains the implications for action at level one (all similar SEA processes), level two (SEA process 1977-1985 for the revision of administrative standards), level three (Invocation phase with SEA as change agent), and level four (Invocation phase with PSI as change agent).
CHAPTER VII
IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION

Introduction

This chapter reports the implications and findings and is divided into two divisions.

The first division is an overview of the entire study. This section includes the importance of such a study especially as it relates the historical development of the SEA, and the theoretical and methodological mechanisms utilized.

The second division is a section on major conclusions. This section includes a blending of the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms with the additions of new concepts arising from the data and the development of a checklist for PSI for predicting potential success or failure in proposal development. This section contains a division related to future implications for research and practitioners. This section also includes improvements of methodology in conducting the study leading to changes in design, organization, and format.
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Study Overview

Why This Study Is Important

There are several extensive areas in the field of organizational research that often have gone unexplored due in part to the sheer complexity observed. This study is significant in that it has offered an examination of several of these unexplored areas. This study of the SEA decision-making process includes an examination on four levels. Levels one and two involved a cursory examination of all similar SEA processes, and the specific process occurring between 1977-1985. Levels three and four offered an extensive examination of the invocation phase (1984) with the SEA as change agent and then with the PSI as change agent. By including the views of seven PSI, this study also offered an examination of multiple inner-institutional relationships of PSI in the development of their proposals.

The data were purposefully subjected to specific search patterns seeking such information as: a) whether the majority of the interviewees agreed; b) whether the data separated on the basis of success on initial proposal development; c) whether the PSI interviewees
were from large, medium, or small institutions; d) whether an emergent pattern appeared; and e) whether theory was mentioned at all.

The choice of Ohio's SEA decision-making process is significant for several reasons. First, in contrast to other states, Ohio's SEA emphasis of educational reform focuses on changing training programs of the post secondary institution (17 in this study). This process could be replicated in other states. Second, the SEA process is proto-typical in that it is very similar to previous state-wide educational reforms in Ohio and has been identified as the process that will be used for future reform. Third, systematic examinations from various perspectives may enable all stake-holders to participate more effectively in the various phases.

Development of Conceptual Bases

After an extensive review of the theoretical literature, it was apparent that most organizational theory fell within two paradigms, the functionalist and radical structuralist. Organizational theory research was also divided into two views, examining a process as
a whole and also by dividing it into phases. It was necessary to develop a combination of theoretical concepts that fit within the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms, and another that blended various views of phase theory (Havelock and Lasswell).

This blending was critical to the study and now for future research. The conceptual framework across paradigms was necessary because the functionalist paradigm focuses on socio-scientific reality to explain order and patterns, assumes a scientific, universal, external standard to measure social order, and the natural science tools are to be used to impose order and regulation. The functionalist paradigm is criticized in that it does not address conflict, change, deviancy and is biased in that it examines only structural elements. The addition of the radical structuralist paradigm addressed these deficiencies.

Burrell and Morgan (1979) have indicated the sociotechnical systems theorists (Hackman, Trist, Keldel, Pava, Sommerhoff, Ackhoff, Emery) rarely attempt to analyze two levels of work systems or evaluate the interplay and trade-offs occurring within the levels. In this study the works of these theorists
were critical in developing the concepts and interview schedule, and those same concepts were then used in examining the SEA as the change agent (Level Three), and then the PSI as change agent (Level Four).

Burrell and Morgan have also suggested that there is a major problem related to the organizational assessment theorists (Van de Ven, Delbecq, Warren, Argyris). Organizational assessment does not measure the relations of informal groups and quality relationships. By combining sociotechnical systems and organizational assessment models the concepts of the functionalist paradigm were developed.

In contrast to the functional paradigm, the radical structuralist paradigm focuses on ever-evolving conflictual patterns creating crises and catastrophic change leading to the eventual destruction of outmoded social structures. Both of these natures (functionalist and radical structuralist) are inherent within all organizations and need to be examined in conjunction with each other. From the radical structuralist paradigm, Althusser remains the theorist of choice with the works of Paris and Reynolds serving as the actual bases for many questions.
In developing a conceptual framework for the phases the predominant concepts used came from Havelock and Lasswell. Havelock was most useful in building concepts, probably because Havelock's work pertains specifically to educational systems. A problem occurring with Havelock was that he did not envision a peer review phase, and therefore, theory had to be generated for that element using a number of theorists and data from this study. Lasswell was important within the radical structuralist paradigm also. The assumption used in this study was that Havelock and Lasswell were primarily grounded in the functionalist paradigm but made incursions into the radical structuralist paradigm.

Development of Methodological Bases

In order to complete this study there had to be an integration of a variety of methodologies specifically designed for examining the SEA's decision-making process. A qualitative case study design was used.

The first task was to develop and use a conceptual framework to develop a battery of concepts (Appendix A) endemic to the study. From the battery of concepts an interview schedule was developed.
The second task was to design multiple interview waves permitting the data to be collected and verified through successive interviewing and by documentation from a variety of sources. The interview target categories were designed to assess the influence of the size of the institution and the influence of whether the interviewees came from PSI that had been successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development. The interview protocol included informing the interviewee by phone, mailing an interview schedule, and then scheduling an interview session during which audio taping occurred. Within two weeks transcriptions of the taped interviews were typed.

The third task was to design data collation techniques. Data reduction charts were developed using actual interviewee phrases. Paraphrasing was used to reduce data to similar phrases and to chart data. The paraphrasing was separated as to whether it referenced the SEA as change agent, the PSI as change agent, and as to the phase in the process. The data were again separated by identifying responses from: a) the interviewees of five or more PSI; b) by whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal
development, c) by size (large, medium, and small); d) by an unanticipated emergent pattern; and e) whether any interviewee referred to the concept. Multiple data sources were used to facilitate the use of several explicit triangulation techniques.

The fourth task was to develop a data presentation technique whereby the data were present according to the concepts found within each paradigm.

The fifth task was to develop a method to categorize the discussion of levels three and four within multiple themes (particularistic, holistic, longitudinal, and qualitative). For this a series of graphic presentations were used.

The sixth task was to formulate a critique of the concepts. That called for the identification of existing theoretical concepts that were supported at levels three or four. It necessitated the identification of data supporting concepts excluded in the initial design.

Major Conclusions

This study examined a top/down system of moderate radical change with limited resources. As a critique
of Burrell and Morgan, just because a concept is not currently used as part of either the functionalist or the radical structuralist paradigms does not mean that those concepts cannot be applied from that perspective. Listed below is the recombined concepts blending the existent functionalist and radical structuralist perspectives with the inclusion of new conceptual elements (explained in Chapter VI) generated from this study. The following is a summarization of the study written as prescriptive general theoretical perspectives.

**Prescriptive General Theoretical Perspectives**

**Goals and Objectives**

A. The goals and objectives are to be clear and articulateable.

1. There should be widespread belief that policy problems are tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis.
2. The goals and objectives should be designed to critique the status quo.
3. The goals and objectives should be designed to initiate disequilibrium and then to establish a new equilibrium.
4. The institutional ethos reflected in the technological and administrative rationale should match the source of legitimation and the relation to power configuration.

B. Consensus must occur on:

1. The validity of the premises guiding the innovation (new theory).
2. The implications arising from these changes (new theory).
3. The evaluation procedures linked to the success of each phase and the process to be used (new theory).

4. If there is a perception of hidden agendas, frank and open discussion must be used to clarify the issues (new theory).

C. The participants should know how their task fit into the total picture.
   1. Implementers should have experience in similar SEA processes.
   2. Implementers should have worked on all previous SEA phases of current process.

Actors

D. System's Norms
   1. The outside change agent must be knowledgeable of, and inside change agent must be able to exert power within or over of the client's systems norms (university governance structure, support services personnel, internal and external faculty, the dean, etc.) (new theory).
   2. An assessment should be made of the initial relationships from the change agent perspective. If these need to be improved, it should be done before the phase begins.
   3. Lasswell's value categories, indulgences, or deprivations will have an effect on the process.

E. Who Accesses Decision-Making Will Affect the Process. The following should be considered:
   1. The actors’ ideology(ies) (functionalist, interpretivist, radical humanist, radical structuralist).
   2. Heterogeneous groups as a strength or weakness.
   3. Multiple stakeholders having maximum input.
   4. Participants' effectiveness goals - satisfaction related to control.
   5. Actors perception of the power of the respective coalitions in the ability to impact the process.

Experience Levels
   1. Implementers should have experience in similar SEA processes.
   2. Implementers should have worked on all previous SEA phases of current process.

Procedures

F. Structure and design
   1. Each phase should be developed to achieve the
different goals, tasks, performance standards, to successfully meet the evaluation criteria.

2. The change agent needs to assure the uninterrupted flow of information to the eventual implementers.

3. The change agent needs to use either a flexible or mechanistic style appropriately. (Mechanistic in maintaining timelines and clear instructions, flexible in exploring avenues of departure that would achieve the same end result.)

4. The degree of success of the process is related to the change agent’s ability to articulate and integrate the phases.

5. The generated knowledge should enable a change in the process, in social realities.

6. A united educational community should emerge with a healthy balance between and among the dominant coalitions. In order to avoid chaos, a single dominant coalition must control the structure for innovation providing for the growth and balance of weaker coalitions (challenge to existing theory).

G. Group Regulation

1. Group regulation should include the strong leadership of at least one individual, consensus modes for decision making, cohesion of the changee, and allow for emergent leadership. There should be legitimate mechanisms for the expression and aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy.

2. How individuals and groups have accepted of innovation will be related to the success of the process.

3. The entire educational coalition of Ohio should be in as much agreement as possible with the goals, philosophy, and vision of the change agent. The design, structure, and decision process should follow concomitantly.

4. Social aggregates created during the process should develop a polity. This polity should broaden and stabilize the foundation of the process.

5. If there is a style, paradigm, or frame clash between the change agent and the implementers,
there should be an attempt made to resolve these issues before proposals are developed.

6. The subgroups within each phase should be free to construct their futures. They should be self-organizing. The success of the process should be reflected in thorough changes in the organization.

7. The ideal relationship can be achieved (reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, involvement of all relevant parties).

H. Issues. The change agent should:

1. Identify and attempt to control (new theory) the core and developmental tendencies (contradictions and/or distortions) guided by the internal and external dialectic emerging through conflicts between power bases.

2. The change agent should identify and reinforce the critical points in the process. The success of the process is related to the ability of the change agent to successfully operate within the environment (power with or over the university governance structure, the support services personnel, the internal and external faculties, the dean, etc.) (new theory).

Timing

I. The length of the process should be appropriate since it is usually a factor relative to successes or failures.

J. If timing is one of the factors reinforcing the maintenance of the status quo, alter it to facilitate the most non-traditional forms to awaken, be fully explored, piloted, and evaluated.

Predictive Checklist for PSI Successful Proposal Development

A more detailed examination of the invocation phase revealed that the PSI successful in initial
proposal development had traits in common, and that the PSI that were unsuccessful did not share those traits.

The recombination of concepts involved the inclusion of new elements into existing theory and the development of a checklist for the PSI that would be predictive of success in initial proposal development.

The checklist below was developed as a result of the separation of the data on the basis of whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in proposal development. Originally it was believed that a simple listing of the strengths and weaknesses of the process would yield the information that would separate the successful from the unsuccessful PSI. This was not the case because the PSI had no idea why they were successful or unsuccessful, or which other PSI were successful or unsuccessful, or which PSI were having any difficulty in proposal development. The PSI had minimal communication with each other and no information as to how their own internal dynamics were different from any other PSI. Although some PSI identified strengths and weaknesses of the process, this information also fell into categories of actual
separation of data as to which PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development.

In developing a check list related to the theories that separated the PSI who were successful from those that were unsuccessful in initial proposal development, the data from the study indicates that there were nine major categories for success, three in each of the divisions of goals, actors, and procedures (no separation on this basis occurred in sub-division of timing).

Based on the history of this process these are the elements for successful PSI proposal development. These should be generalizable to situations where sub-units are competing for common resources.

Goals and Objectives
1. The successful PSI believed that:
   A. Policy problems are tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis.
   B. The phase objective was to critique the status quo of the existing education administration training program.
   C. Their goal was to initiate disequilibrium and then to establish a new equilibrium.
2. They questioned the implications arising from these changes and identified the lack of evaluation procedures as critical problems of the process.
3. They understood how their task fit into the total picture because:
A. Members of the faculty had experience in similar SEA processes.
B. Members of the faculty had worked on previous SEA phases of current process.
C. In some cases faculty members were panelists in the peer review phase.

Actors
4. The faculty of the successful PSI as an inside change agent was able to exert power within or over of the their environment, specifically:
   A. University governance structure.
   B. Support services personnel to handle coordination and proposal preparation.
   C. Coordination of internal and external faculty.
   D. The office of the dean.

5. The successful PSI faculties felt that success of the process depended on the:
   A. Necessity of input of multiple stakeholders, especially the implementers.
   B. Participants' effectiveness goals and that their satisfaction was related to control.

6. The successful PSI constructed a common social reality:
   A. The faculty's perception of the power of the respective coalitions impacted the process. They believed that in their own way they were developing the very best possible education administration training program.
   B. Experience levels of the faculties were a factor. The successful faculties had members who had experience in similar SEA processes and who had worked on previous SEA phases of the current process.

Procedures
7. The successful PSI used a structure that assured the uninterrupted flow of information to the eventual implementers (in spite of the fact that all information went through the deans).

8. The successful PSI maintained specific elements of group regulation.
   A. Group regulation included the strong leadership of at least one individual, consensus modes for decision making, cohesion of the entire faculty, and encouragement of emergent leadership. There were legitimate mechanisms for the expression and
aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy.
B. How the faculty (individuals and group) embraced of innovation was related to the success of the process.
C. The faculties within the phase felt free to construct their futures. They were self-organizing and developed extensive timelines. The success of the process was related to thorough changes in the organization.
D. The ideal relationship within the faculties was achieved (reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, involvement of all relevant parties).

9. The successful PSI expressed concern for specific issues.
A. They identified and attempted to control to the best of their ability the core and developmental tendencies (contradictions and/or distortions) guided by the internal and external dialectic emerging through conflicts between power bases (theory vs. practice, research vs. liberal arts vs. pragmatic training, impact of program changes on all graduate education programs, etc.).

2. As change agents they identified and reinforced the critical points in the process. The success of the process is related to their ability to successfully operate within their college environments (power within or over the university governance structure, the support services personnel, the internal and external faculties, the dean, etc.).
Implications for Research

**Necessity to Increase the Examination of Multi-level Processes using the Equilibrium and Conflict Paradigms**

**Methodological Rationale for Improvements in This Study**

The extensive time-consuming analysis required in this qualitative study was necessary in order to discover the many issues surrounding such a phenomenon. It is only now that the development a statistical instrument could be undertaken that would capture and reflect those issues.

It is the recommendation of this researcher that qualitative methods should be used in the initial examination of similar decision-making processes in order to discover and surface the major issues. This should be followed by a statistical survey. Throughout this study one of the most significant elements supporting qualitative methodology was that in many cases only one or two interviewees throughout the entire study knew of information the critically affected the process. This information would never have surfaced with a statistical survey.
For additional research on this topic, a survey should be developed that could be statistically analyzed, and this survey should contain a qualitative segment for additional comments. The original study was entirely qualitative, with interview transcripts reduced to paraphrasing, and then frequencies logged. The capability of statistical analysis would reduce the time, energy, and the possible error factor prevalent in the original study. The qualitative segments would permit additional information to emerge that could lead to new issues and/or new additions to theory. The survey would contain an integration of concepts compiled from those that are to be found in every phase and those for the specific phases. The surveys would be given to the participants at the end of each phase in a SEA meeting.

The same conceptual framework would be used with the addition of the new concepts not mentioned in the original design but arising from the study. It would also be important to develop the survey language with SEA assistance in order for their personnel to conduct, statistically analyze, and ultimately utilize the information from the survey.
Both the SEA and PSI could quickly assess and modify areas identified within the prescriptive checklist. The original design of this study did not lend itself to this application.

The original design of this study used only seven of the PSI involved, but 17 would not be a formidable number if statistical analysis was used. There should be one meeting for the survey examining the SEA as change agent and another meeting for the survey examining the PSI as change agent (perhaps one in the morning and one in the afternoon) with one representative (hopefully the faculty member most knowledgeable of the process) from each PSI. Due to the complexity of the conceptual sets, two meetings would be required to inform the participants of the explanations behind the survey elements category by category.

This was a top/down model for change. The relative success of various decision-making processes should be examined for their effectiveness and elements of lasting change by comparing several types of change models (top/down, bottom/up, and mutual adaptation).
Originally, the study examined the relations between and within the SEA and PSI. This study helped to discover other important agencies having significant effects on the process. Improvements in the study would be to include a focused examination of a) the SEA’s Educational Advisory Commission which reviewed the final documents of each committee and probably altered mandate development between phases, b) the PSI governance structures whose organization and rules either facilitated or hindered program changes, and c) the effect of the rulings of the Board of Regents in the restrictions as to PSI operations.

Application Using Existing Data

The same design could be used to view the patterns arising within the data. Those would include SEA as change agent and then PSI as change agent with a) pattern A - majority of responses; b) pattern B - PSI successful or unsuccessful; c) pattern C - PSI size; d) pattern D - any emergent pattern, and e) pattern P - theory was present.

Generally speaking the conceptual base is extensive regarding the development of successful decision-making processes. Unfortunately for
education, the existing concepts are rarely used in process evaluation.

Practitioners need to incorporate into existing theory the new concepts developed in this study.

A checklist has been developed that would enable an assessment of elements leading the predictions as to chances of PSI successfully developing proposals.

Implications for the Continuation of the Process

Implications for Action at Level One - All Similar SEA Processes

The SEA certification process is cyclical and alternates between the focus of teacher training and administrator training. Since the processes continues indefinitely, implications for action have been developed for the subsequent processes and are included in the dissertation.

Goals

The goal should remain the same; the SEA should continue to be the organization that organizes the various educational coalitions to improve teacher and administrators. The objectives should be broadened in that there should also be emphasis on pre-service
aptitude testing, in-service workshops, academies, etc. A critical assessment of the premises of prior objectives should be undertaken. The SEA premises that should be questioned are: a) whether a highly prescriptive, pragmatic program is the best approach, b) whether all PSI teacher/administrator programs should be similar or whether the educational community profit by extreme program diversity, or whether the liberal arts and research foci should be eliminated at the graduate level in education.

**Actors**

Regarding actors, not only do the key persons have to have knowledge and cooperate with the SEA, but the eventual implementers (PSI faculty) need to be involved in each phase of each process. The logistics may be a problem (especially including all PSI having teacher training programs) but the extent to which this can be resolved will facilitate the process. Perhaps the certification processes could have parallel committees throughout the phases with one of the committee being members of the PSI faculty who will eventually change their programs to meet the mandates.
Instead of having four separate ad-hoc committees in discrete phases who disband after their sub-goals have been achieved, the SEA could have a single committee through the entire process, staffed with experts from heterogeneous disciplines. This would permit the PSI to be included in the process from the beginning.

**Procedures**

Phases have worked well in the past and probably should continue. Technical assistance is currently excellent in initiation and prescription phases, but needs to improve during invocation and peer review. The committee structure at the initiation and prescription phases contain elements of democratic processes with emergent leadership from the actors in which the SEA serves as facilitator and this structure should be incorporated into the invocation and peer review phases also.

**Timing**

Timing should be shortened. The extensive research phase (which previously tied up from 1-4 years) could be an on-going element of the SEA and/or some selected PSI (that is, if any PSI still have a
research program). Prescription and invocation should take about one year each. The peer review should take less than a month. Longer time periods (7-10 years, some suggest 10-15 years) should be allowed for the PSI to thoroughly implement the changes.

**Evaluation**

The PSI need knowledge of the specifics of what proposals and programs should look like during the invocation phases. Currently there is no evaluation model built into the processes. The PSI need to know specifically the elements of the on-site evaluations of programs, the types of long term evaluations of programs that occur after the student has graduated, and which other assessments will be conducted through the SEA.

**Addition of Peer Review Phase**

An emergent issue was the presence of the peer review phase which will be added to every similar SEA decision-making process in Ohio. Since none of the literature contains references to such a phase it is important to begin creating a conceptual model for assessing such a phase. Since the addition of the peer review phase has become common place in various social
process models unrelated to the SEA and education, it is necessary that theory should catch up to practice.

Peer Review (New Elements Related to Phase Division)
A. How were the committee members selected and assigned to different units.
   Why were they selected and assigned in this way?
   Why did people serve on the peer review panel?
B. Criteria for Judging proposals:
   How did they weight the components of the proposals?
   Did they link it to the broader scheme of improving schools or just to come up with the best education administration program?
C. Impact:
   How much impact did individuals have on the team, the process?
   How much impact did the team have in total decisions?
   How much impact did the peer assessment have on the process?
   Did the SEA override any peer review decisions as to acceptance of the proposal? If so, what rationale was used to do so?
D. How was the peer review process related to the whole process?

Implications for Action at Level Two - The SEA Administration Certification Process (1977-1985)

The following is a list of recommendations from interviewees regarding the administrative certification process (1977-1985).

Those elements of the process that should be maintained include:
Goals and Objectives

1. The SEA should continue to try to improve Ohio's administrators through this type of process.

2. The SEA should be the educational body responsible for PSI program revision process because it is the most independent of all agencies.

3. The SEA should be more powerful in PSI program revision than it currently is.

4. The SEA should continue to maintain positive relationships with the PSI.

Procedures

1. Many publics should be involved in the decision-making process.

2. The SEA should continue to provide the excellent technical assistance during the prescription and peer review phases, and should extend it to the invocation and peer review phases.

3. Ohio has a process that has elaborate machinery already in place that offers a maximum of democratic input from thousands, centrally coordinated by the SEA, terrific technical assistance capability. It should be institutionalized and done like clockwork, meaning that with periodic reviews and fine tuning it could be evolutionary in nature and make some real changes. (Mincy)

4. The SEA should continue to pressure for improvement of the PSI programs. If the SEA doesn't, the PSI will continue to plod along in their own comfortable programs and will rarely change on their own accord.

Other

1. The Entry Year Program is an excellent idea and should be extended to include a two or three year period. Again, there should be developed an instrument to assess administrative growth.

Those elements of the process that should be changed include:
**Goals Objectives** Clarification should occur as to:
1. Whether the goal should be to produce administrators to serve the community or the profession.

**Actors**
1. Since the PSI faculties are the eventual implementers, every PSI should have a representative participating in each phase of the process. This could be accomplished by organizing parallel committees with one committee comprised entirely of PSI faculty members.
2. Weak actors in the process should become stronger. Those include school systems, professional associations, superintendents, unions, social activists, PSI students, and teachers.
3. Power system clashes that should be controlled and/or resolved include private vs public PSI, SEA vs PSI control of curriculum, large vs small PSI competition for students, PSI vs schools over control of Entry Year Program, legislator vs courts vs private sector in control of education, pressure on SEA from school districts to certify on emergency bases.

**Procedures**
1. There should be evaluation models incorporated throughout the process. These models should evaluate PSI programs, follow students after graduation, identify excellent and poor administrators throughout the state, and determine which programs produce the excellent administrators. The current evaluation surveys of administrators give information regarding programs of the 1960's and early 1970's, not of the 1980's.
2. Programmatic issues that arose and should be resolved include:
   A. The problem of building a program when the mandates lacked the evaluation criteria.
   B. Philosophical shifts of SEA affects PSI programs dramatically.
   C. Pragmatism vs research vs liberal arts focus.
   D. Elimination of electives means the program is too structured. The curriculum is in a straight jacket with no leeway to develop new programs as needed.
E. If the field experiences are so important, the SEA should provide the funding for it. The PSI is best organized to develop the individual, not develop good treasurers, personnel evaluators, etc.. The administrator often learns more during the first year on the job than in all the training at the PSI.

F. With emphasis on the requirement to obtain a masters degrees in their field of certification, and with the increased requirements in education administration there will be a significant change in student population in PSI programs and persons eventually certified as administrators. Because of the program conflicts between education programs there will be significant cuts in education administration. With the increase of the equivalent of a MA degree in education administration, there will soon be a shortage of administrators, and those that are certified will be those who can afford both the time and money for the new program. These may not be the best individuals for administration and persons who may be good potentials may be excluded because of the time and money involved. The new administrators may come to represent only the upper or middle classes.

G. There is a need to recruit better potential students by establishing pre-enrollment and early assessment tests.

H. Establishing low faculty/student ratios and curtailing the extensive use of part time faculty impacts primarily on the small PSI.

I. Graduate teacher and administrator courses should have a significant amount of overlap in order to provide better communication between these elements.

J. The same representatives should be on the SEA advisory committees for both teacher and administrative certification programs.

K. The SEA and the colleges of education should identify points of overlap for teacher and administrator graduate programs.

3. SEA premises that were questioned and should be resolved include:
A. The SEA emphasis on technical training is unsound. The program is too technical. Administrators are technically competent, but not philosophically competent. The SEA should be more responsive to the research rather than to the field or to constituents.

4. The SEA should identify a variety of the best administrative programs in the United States, share this information with the PSI, and allow them to develop a variety of pilots. The SEA could identify the best administrators and then determine the elements of a program that would train for that perspective.

5. The SEA should focus on other ways to improve administrators including in-service training, administrative academies, management and leadership institutes, and allow districts and professional organizations to train administrators. In this way the technical training could be provided by other means.

6. Some school districts have employed consultants such as Jerry Bellon, University of Tennessee, whose job is to translate the cutting edge of educational research into action plans for school districts. The PSI could continually be involved in this process, keeping current while providing this information to the field.

7. Influence of the permanent advisory commission serving the State Board of Education and changing mandates should be fully assessed. Accurate reports of changes of this commission within phases should be assessed. This would alleviate a lot of anger directed at the SEA because individuals thought that SEA personnel had made changes in the mandates and had engineered the entire process.
8. The SEA's Entry Year Program's emphasis on success is unsound. Some administrators simply should not succeed. The field, not the PSI should determine who succeeds. To create a good administrator one needs success and positive job experiences, and the EYP does not create a good administrator.

9. CEUs (continuing education units) should be required of all administrators.

10. The field needs continual PSI assistance to help them with perspective and application of theory.

11. Use the state inspection system to identify poor administrators and promote ways to remove incompetent administrators. From the state level promote an attitude of expecting administrative excellence.

Timelines

1. A weakness was that the administrative standards revision took so long. There was an air of expectancy after the Initiation phase and a long waiting period before the next period began. The SEA should conduct research and monitor information (for instance develop a three-pronged Crisis report every seven years) so that the Initiation phase could be eliminated. The Prescription phase was delayed by SEA funding and State Board approval of the standards.

2. The SEA should not begin PSI program evaluation too soon, but rather they should give the PSI time to develop a student population. If program evaluation occurs too often, only minor changes result. The SEA should wait at least seven or more years to evaluate the PSI program.

Implications for Action at Level Three – Invocation Phase with SEA as Change Agent

Functionalist – Goals and Objectives

The goals or objectives of the SEA to improve Ohio's administrators should continue as the focus with clear and well-articulated mandates. There were some
problems with the goals and objectives in that a major undercurrent of skepticism was mentioned when interviewees responded to the question regarding hidden agendas.

There was a shift of power in favor of the SEA, taken from the PSI. One of the greatest strengths was that the SEA assumed responsibility for standards revision (as opposed to placing the coordination of this objective within the purview of PSI, professional organization, or school districts). The SEA should assume a more definitive role in the implementation and evaluation phases.

The PSI need the legitimacy from the SEA to make slight alterations in programs. Legitimacy is needed to convince internal faculty members to take a more serious look and the entire administrative preparation program as well as to span their previous boundaries beyond their own departments or even colleges.

There is still a question as to the effectiveness of one of the objectives, that being the shift in the premises with a greater emphasis on field experience both during administrative training and during the first year on the job.
Functionalist - Procedures

The elements of structure that were very effective included use of a familiar, consistent, logical method of standards revision. Improvement should occur in the realm of participants knowing how their task fit into the total picture (improve knowledge transfer from previous phases), or whether to simply modify the old program or to totally reconceptualize. The SEA should stress the importance of sending consistent representatives to SEA meetings to take information back to the faculties. Representatives of every PSI should be included in all phases of the process.

The structure brought the PSI together for discussion of problems arising from program development and this communication should have been extensively expanded. The area of technical assistance should be improved by returning calls, corresponding directly with active participants in invocation (not deans), acknowledging receipt of all proposals (such as Entry Year Program), indicating altered plans or timelines in writing as well as verbally. A balance in the nebulousness of guidelines is needed. For some PSI the nebulousness led to close scrutiny of current PSI
programs, leading eventually to total program reconceptualization (for other PSI it enhanced frustration tremendously).

The SEA should identify points of flexibility before hand. If the participants were more familiar with the work of previous phases, perhaps this would have alleviated this problem.

Some interviewees who were in previous phases indicated that the recommendations of previous committees were ignored. Most interviewees indicated that they knew that consistently some PSI had been invited to participate in previous phases and committees while other PSI had not been invited. Not only did this cause alienation between the SEA and certain PSI, but some interviewees felt that if they had a more participatory role, they would have been privy to a better understanding as to actual proposal development. Many interviewees suggested that all faculties of educational administration should be included in all phases. In order for the participants to respect the theory behind the changes, it is preferable for the SEA to accurately report the recommendations of the various phases, rather than
disguise their own philosophy by claiming that these mandates were a synopsis of recommendations from many publics participating in a democratic process. The integrity of the SEA is at stake whenever they decide to alter the recommendations of previous phases.

The SEA should send the information on meetings, guidelines, and changes directly to key representatives designated by each PSI faculty. They should not rely on the office of the dean to transfer critical information.

With respect to the person to person contact with every PSI, the SEA should legitimize and reinforce the decision to change, provide needed information and assistance, and to applaud and/or reward the effort.

The SEA should possess a greater appreciation of the role of professors. If this were done the group discussions could have accomplished five objectives:

1. The SEA could have increased the feeling of safety/willingness to take risks by encouraging pilots.
2. They could have helped the individual PSI move toward a commitment to change.
3. They could have legitimized feelings of doubt about the PSI ability to carry out the program.
4. They could have given the PSI more of an opportunity to move toward consensus.
5. They could have given the potential adopters the feeling that they had freedom to say yes or no.
As to the monthly meetings conducted by the SEA, these events should have been designed as an enjoyable experience, should leave all participants with some new learning of ideas, problems findings, solutions, skills, should lead to diffusion of learning, should lead to subsequent self-training, self-practice back home, should lead to the multiplication of itself (participants initiate similar meetings for others), and should lead to more permanent linkage among individual members and the groups that the PSI represent.

One article in the literature review indicated that the adoption process (in this case invocation) should contain six steps: awareness (to determine if subject is willing to move to second stage), interest (active information seeking), evaluation (mental trial of the innovation), trial (individual uses innovation on small scale), adoption (on basis of post-trial evaluation - accept or reject). All of these steps should occur. One of the more frequent suggestions as to changes in the process was to utilize the PSI as sites for program experimentation.
The SEA should have used key people as stepping stones to accomplish four tasks. The first should be to introduce innovation to core of innovators who would try it out, become sophisticated in its use, and demonstrate it to others. The second should be to work with concerned community (in order to co-opt resisters). The third should be to inform the leaders in order to sound out reactions of potential resisters. The fourth would be to allow leaders to lead the way to acceptance by the rest of the system.

**Implications at Level Four - Invocation Phase with PSI**

As Change Agent

A predictive checklist has been developed in this chapter based on the data from this study. The PSI could use this checklist to examine the internal dynamics and in a proactive manner provide for changes within the faculties that would improve their chances of success in Initial proposal development.

**Summary**

There appears to be little research on decision-making processes such as the one described in this study, and yet such processes are frequent, the results of which dramatically change our workplace, our lives.
Although research of such processes entails the incorporation of the views of many theorists and the application of those perspectives at macrosystems levels, this is necessary to study such phenomenon. It is also necessary that theoretical application does not begin with words and end with words, but that theory leads to tangible results that will improve such processes.
APPENDIX A
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Conceptual Framework Used for Analysis in the Functionalist Paradigm in This Study

Goals and Objectives
A. Were the goals and objectives of the time period clear, articulateable? (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967)
B. Was there evidence that the participants knew how their task fit into the total picture? (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967)
C. What is the institutional ethos reflected in the technological and administrative rationale, the source of legitimation, and the relation to power configuration? (Drucker, 1978)

Actors
D. What are client’s systems norms? (Trist, 1979b, 1981; Havelock, 1973)
E. What is the initial relationship from the change agent perspective? (Havelock, 1973)
F. In what ways were the heterogeneous groups a strength or weakness for the process? (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Trist, 1979b, 1981)
G. Did the multiple stakeholders have maximum input? (Trist, 1979b, 1981)
H. What are people’s effectiveness goals and how do they affect the process? (Herbst, 1974; Van de Ven, 1981): Is everyone satisfied? (Emery, 1974, 1976) Is satisfaction related to control?

Procedures
I. Each phase had different goals, tasks, performance standards, evaluation criteria and therefore different structures and designs should have developed to perform unique functions. (Hackman, 1976)
K. What are the critical points in the process that most affect goal achievement? How could they be reinforced? (Hackman, 1981)
L. How was interdependence managed (information flows among units/people and methods to resolve conflict)? (Van de Ven, 1981)
M. At times the change agent exhibits a flexible style, at other times, a mechanistic style. (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981)

N. What is the degree of success of the process? Is this related to the change agent's ability to articulate and integrate the phases? (Ackoff and Emery, 1972; Sommerhoff, 1950, 1969; Trist, 1981)

O. How have individuals and groups accepted the innovation? (Havelock, 1973)


Q. Have any of the social aggregates created during the process developed a polity? Has this polity broadened and stabilized the foundation of the process? (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Emery and Trist, 1973; Keldel, 1978; Trist, 1977a)

R. Is the entire educational coalition of Ohio in agreement with goals, philosophy, vision of change agent, and does the design, structure, decision process follow concomitantly? (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981)

S. Is there a style clash, a paradigm clash, a frame clash between the change agent and the implementers? (Trist, 1981; Van de Ven, 1981)

Timing

T. If the length of the process is a factor relative to successes or failures of the process, how could changing the timing make the process more effective? (Havelock, 1973; Trist, 1981)

Conceptual Framework Used for Analysis in the Radical Structuralist Paradigm in This Study

Goals and Objectives

A. Are the goals and objectives designed to critique the status quo? (Burrel and Morgan, 1979)

B. Are the goals and objectives designed to initiate disequilibrium and then to establish a new equilibrium? (Bukharin 1965)

C. How legitimate are the mechanisms for the expression and aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy? (Paris and Reynolds, 1983)

D. Is there a widespread belief that policy problems are tractable and should be subjected to inquiry and analysis? (Paris and Reynolds, 1983)
Actors
E. Did Lasswell’s (1960, 1971) value categories, indulgences, or deprivations have any effect on the process?
F. How do the actors perceive the power of the respective coalitions in the ability to impact the process? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
G. Who has access to the decision-making process? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
H. What ideology(ies) are the actors (functionalist, interpretivist, radical humanist, radical structurallist) (Paris and Reynolds, 1983)

Procedures
I. Does the generated knowledge actually enable a change in the process, in social realities?
J. Are the subgroups within each phase free to construct their futures? 1. Are they self-organizing? Do they result in thorough changes in the organization?
K. How are the developmental tendencies guided by the dialectic?
L. Has an united educational community emerged with no single dominant coalition? How can one structure the process so that it does emerge? (Emery and Trist, 1973; Kiedel, 1978; Trist, 1977A)
M. To what extent was the ideal relationship achieved? (reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, involvement of all relevant parties)? (Havelock, 1973)
N. What are the elements standing in contradiction to each other? the social conjunctures within the total context? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
O. What is the internal dialectic (contradictions and/or distortions) emerging through conflicts between the social power bases? between theory and practice? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
P. What is the external dialectic emerging through conflicts between power bases? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
Q. What are the core tendencies? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
R. How do the various interests groups and power bases actually impact the process? How could the balance be changed? (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)
Timing
S. Is timing one of the factors reinforcing the maintenance of the status quo? (Havelock, 1973)
T. How could timing be altered to allow the most non-traditional forms to awaken, be fully explored, piloted, and evaluated? (Havelock, 1973)

Discussion of the Development of the Conceptual Framework Combining the Functionalist and Radical Structuralist Paradigms.

Introduction
The development of Appendix A was critical for establishing the foundation of the entire study. By combining concepts of organizational and phase theorists (functionalist, radical structuralist, Havelock, and Lasswell) into a list of concepts under two paradigms, it was easy to extract from this extensive list the concepts related to various levels of the study (i.e. total process, individual phases, invocation phase with SEA as change agent, invocation phase with PSI as change agent). This design assisted the author in identifying elements that needed to be included in the Interview schedule (Appendix B) and the Interviewer’s Probe (Appendix C) that might have been excluded, and facilitated analysis by providing predictive variables for the study. This format for Appendix A also facilitated the examination of whether concepts were supported or unsupported depending upon whether there was general consensus, or whether the PSI were successful or unsuccessful in initial proposal development, whether the size of the PSI made a difference, whether there was an emergent pattern arising from data analysis, or whether the concept was mentioned by at least one interviewee.

This Appendix includes the theoretical base related to development of the conceptual framework.

Interdependence between Systems
A framework was needed that permitted the researcher to examine the interdependence between the various systems within organizations and at the same time permitted explanations that combined structural, group, and individual frameworks (Pugh 1981). Using an overall conceptual framework linking various phases with specific attention to reciprocal feedback loops reinforces the concept of organizational analysis that
moves beyond simple identification of structural characteristics or the effects of individual actors (Pugh et al. 1969). A study is strengthened by employing a framework that examines both system constraints and individual action by looking at the interplay between systems (Pugh and Hinings 1976, 175-176).

Any study of complex social systems needs to clearly define the "contexts and structural reference points that identify the functional subsystems in which behavior occurs (Parsons 1960). Parsons and Smelser (1956) and Katz and Kahn (1978) argued that organizations must perform three functions to survive: the technical functions of production, the managerial function of coordinating, and the institutional functions. The technical functions of production are designed to achieve task-instrumental goals of Parsons and Smelser (1956) and of Katz and Kahn (1978). The technical functions also serve to identify the nature of the work and the ways in which units and positions are organized to do their work. The organizational literature most related to work groups or units would be Grimes, et al. (1972), Hrebiniak, (1974), Van de Ven and Delbecq (1974), and Hackman and Suttle (1977).

The managerial functions of coordinating include controlling and procuring resources for the performance of technical functions (Parson and Smelser, 1956; and Katz and Kahn, 1978). When their occurs a discussion of managerial functions, the literature separates into two camps. Crozier (1964), Blau and Schoenherr (1971), Pugh et at. (1968), and Galbraith (1977) typically define managerial functions as structural elements designed for coordination and control, measurable through identifying differentiation, departmentalization, and administrative overhead. Another way to look at managerial functions is from the social network perspective similar to the manner of Tichy (1973) and Roberts and O'Reilly (1979). They indicate that premature closure is avoided by locating pockets of resistance and drawing them out. Their focus is on processes of resources and information flows, and on patterns of coordination and control. They indicate that these are functions of coordination, control, and procurement.
The institutional functions included formulating, legitimizing, and governing the domain of the organization in relation to the larger social system of which the organization is a part (Parsons and Smelser, 1956 and Katz and Kahn, 1978). Van de Ven (1981) outlined the institutional functions, indicating that those functions were principally concerned with "selecting the charter of the organization in terms of its role in society, the products or services it delivers, and the target populations and markets it services, and legitimizing this corporate domain and the contributions of the organization to the larger social system of which it is a part" (Van de Ven, 1981).

For the purpose of this study, the sections on tasks and interactions in Appendix A and interactions in Appendix B were correlated as questions from the above perspective.

Models within the Study

Sociotechnical Systems Model

The model of organizational design and behavior that has theoretical elements integrated into this study is Trist's (1981) sociotechnical systems. The elements of this model suggest that organizational performance is related to the degree to which the technical and social aspects of a system are complementary and co-existing entities, facilitating environmental adaptation. Imbedded in this notion is that a system's culture (SEA's history), values (what the SEA attends to and what it ignores), and modes of orientation and operation (developments of and within previous committees), create roles (organization of standards change and normative behaviors that can only be understood within an environmental context.

According to Hackman (1981) the sociotechnical systems theorists rarely attempt to analyze two levels of primacy work systems (individual PSI), whole organization systems (PSI in SEA meetings), and macrosocial systems (Ohio's schools) as Trist has proposed. One difficulty in elevating any study to the macrosocial systems level may be the sheer complexity of providing any type of vehicle that effectively frame and delimits the study's macrosocial environment.

The predominant focus of this study, the invocation phase of the SEA process, has elements of
macrosocial theory incorporated throughout every primacy work group, every phase, every critical decision path, and predominantly in the final product, the changes of curricula in 17 post-secondary institutions. One mechanism that the author used was to shift frames of reference for the SEA role. Reality, being a socially constructed phenomenon, can therefore be multi-faceted depending on the uses of different frames of reference for role behavior.

At other times the author used a frame of description and analysis that defines the role of the SEA as the titular head of a single organization. In this perspective of reality, the SEA functions as an internal change agent facilitating a single organization’s productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness. This role would be similar to the manner in which a superintendent’s steering committee might strategically manage and initiate change within their school district. This steering committee naturally assumes the leadership role within the school district by virtue of the fact that they are the only people in the district that see the whole picture. The SEA at certain times naturally assumes the leadership for its district by virtue of the fact that no other educational coalition has the strategic perspective, or legislative responsibility, mandate, or authority to serve in that capacity. The significant difference between the domains of the superintendent’s steering committee and the SEA is that the SEA’s “district” happens to be the entire state of Ohio.

This role of SEA as leader of a single organization composed of all educational coalitions in Ohio can best be observed through understanding from the historical perspective of how Ohio has institutionalized a periodic innovation process that is designed to improve the Ohio educational system by one technique, that of altering the curricula in PSI. The role of the SEA as titular head can best be seen in the author’s analysis of the total process, for it is the SEA who initiated, designed, implemented, and monitored the entire change process.

In summary, use of the elements of Trist’s sociotechnical systems model analyses of the characteristics of the SEA’s process related to the social, the technical, and the sociotechnical
combination yields predictive variables. According to this type of analysis, the SEA has taken advantage of some opportunities, while it has ignored others. Identification of those variables which can be enhanced, according to Trist’s model, should lead to improvement of the process.

The role of the change agent, in this case the SEA, from the perspective of new paradigms suggests that the change agent should assume the role of a contributor to the process of co-learning, providing an environment designed for multiple networking that is fluid and relatively unbounded (Trist, 1981; Hackman, 1981). This would create a system that is maximally self-designing and self-managing.

As a critique of the sociotechnical systems model Hackman (1981) suggested that application of the sociotechnical systems (STS) approach has had several drawbacks in the past. The first is that rarely do researchers analyze anything on the macrosystems level. The design, methodology, and even the subject of this study (the process of changing administrative standards) thoroughly incorporate and lend themselves to macro system analysis. Second, previous (STS) researchers have rarely made systematic evaluations of the interplay and tradeoffs occurring within the levels; rather, their unit of analysis has proceeded from the total organization perspective. This study incorporates three levels of analysis: by phase, by total process, and by macrosocial effect. Third, many researchers have chosen to identify only one set of factors that may facilitate or hinder the process. By choosing to analyze the SEA process from two paradigms (functionalist and radical structuralist) this study incorporates multiple perspectives of the process.

Organizational Assessment Model

The third model is Van de Ven’s (1981) organizational assessment framework. Embedded in this model is the use of analysis techniques that predict and explain a system’s performance by relating it to its organizational structure and environmental constraints or opportunities. The use of Van de Ven’s model provides a simultaneous, yet alternative, perspective to the sociotechnical system model.

With organizational assessment (OA) the researcher analyses components of context, structure, and process
at four levels. For the purpose of this study, these have been reduced to three levels including each phase, relationships between each phase, and the overall organization. Attention needs to be focused on the various organizational units and then integrated into a hueristic synopsis.

From the substantive perspective, organizational assessment utilizes substantive and procedural strategies for reducing the complexity of analysis. The substantive strategies include analyzing the organization through two combined frames. The first frame is associated with types of performance programs as identified by March and Simon (1958). Those performance programs are systematized, discretionary, and developmental programs. The discretionary mode was not considered for this study.

Analysis of the systematized mode helps to ascertain the thought structure, the values and norms, and the deep culture or the ethos of the organization that guide consistent patterns of responses in relation to the perceptions of itself and its role with other organizations. Warren (1971: 67-68) has suggested that this institutional ethos "is reflected in the technological and administrative rationales of organizations, the source of their legitimization, and their relation to power configurations." The developmental mode is identified as the program used to handle various issues. In this study each phase had specific goals, a time limit, a set of norms and expectations. According to Delbecq and Van de Ven (1971) and Van de Ven and Delbecq (1974) the developmental mode is team intensive, temporary, and focused on specific solutions through techniques of creative problem solving.

One of the premises the OA has incorporated is that an organization's decisions have been made regarding domain, production function, and organization design. The domain of the SEA includes improving education through working with all educational coalitions in Ohio, but especially the ones over which they have control by legislative mandate, in this case the PSI. The production function is not applicable to this study from the perspective of the SEA, but may be a consideration from the perspective of the PSI. The organizational design is quite interestingly handled by
the SEA with incorporation of institutionalized change processes that activate well-regulated, highly formalized, structured committee involvement.

Through the perspective of organizational assessment, an implication for this study might be that instead of having four separate ad-hoc committees in discrete phases who disband after their sub-goals have been achieved, the SEA could have a single committee through the entire process, staffed with experts from heterogeneous disciplines. This would permit the PSI to be incorporated in the process from the beginning. Interviewees might suggest such alternative structure to the process.

Regarding the total process, there has been a great deal written to suggest that the more active the participants are in self-assessment and the corrective processes, the more receptive they will be to adoption of solutions (Argyris, 1968; Bass, 1971; Bennis et al., 1962; Delbecq, et al., 1975; Filley et al., 1976, Van de Ven, 1981).

Along this same line, Van de Ven (1981) issues two warnings. One is that the planners cannot be separated from the doers, or the planning from the implementation; the second is that change is incremental and a long, slow process.

As a critique of the organizational assessment model, the major weaknesses of organizational assessment lie in those areas that are not measured, the relations of informal groups and quality of relationships. Through analysis from the sociotechnical systems model as well as through the perspectives of the radical structuralist paradigm, these weaknesses are overcome.

Havelock’s Model

After a comprehensive review of the history of the SEA and a preliminary review of the documents, the author decided that the SEA’s institutionalized decision-making process closely paralleled Havelock’s (1973) recommended stages for implementing innovation. Havelock extensively reviewed education decision-making.
the questionnaire helped the researcher identify the relationship(s) existing and emerging among the various educational coalitions. The second was diagnosis (from pains to problems to objectives). The third was acquiring relevant resources. The fourth was choosing the solution (during this period a needs assessment was developed, viable alternatives were surfaced and negotiated, and the "best" solution was chosen). The fifth was gaining acceptance (during this phase the implementers were made aware of the adoption and they began to design the innovation to fit their own circumstances, in this study, the individual was the post-secondary institutions). The sixth was stabilizing the innovation and generating self-renewal (during this phase continuance, evaluation, and redesign of the innovation became entirely the responsibility of the implementers).

In this study, Havelock's model was used to help identify the various relationships with the individual educational coalitions through the different phases. At various points throughout the process the clients changed, necessitating changes in procedures for working with different key people, norms, and in larger social environments.

Havelock has suggested various issues to consider regarding the management of initial encounters: friendliness, familiarity, rewardingness, and responsiveness. The ideal relationship incorporates elements of reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations, reward systems, equal power, minimum threats, confrontation of differences, and involvement of all relevant parties. He also suggested danger signals and ways to assess the relationships. The strengths and weaknesses of a change process can be identified through applying Havelock's model.

Lasswell's Model

Lasswell's decision process model has been integrated throughout the study as the primary basis of divisions and sub-divisions within the study.

Theoretical Perspectives as They Are Related to Concept Development

The presentation below begins first with the discussion of the theoretical bases used to generate a multitude of concepts. Then a listing follows of
concepts related directly to those theoretical bases. It was decided that phrasing the concepts as questions would facilitate an immediate reference to this study. The concepts written in outline form were generated from the works of Havelock (1973). Havelock has specialized in studies of education reform using social process model, thus facilitating immediate applicability to study.

Theoretical Bases of Study

Theoretical Bases Related to Goals and Objectives of the Functionalist Paradigm

Sociotechnical Systems Model

Although there may be extreme goal clarity during each phase, there may be absolutely no agreement on the total organizational goal. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) have indicated that the degree to which the domain is complex, and the extent of loosely coupled divisions between phases (in this case) in the domain foster the separated evolvement and perspectives of organizational goals and norms of behavior. Van de Ven (1981) has suggested that, "as overall domain complexity increases, macro-decisions about the production function and organization design problems become increasingly nonrational, while micro-decisions within divisions tend to be more rational." Each of the individual phases may have operated with maximum efficiency. However, the interdependency between phases through resource flows may reflect varying norms and goals, may be unrelated and possibly detrimental to the entire process. One of the items on the questionnaire specifically requested information on resource flows. Analysis of the various answers should indicate to what extent differing norms and goals between phases have occurred in this study.

Why can the state department do what it does? What are the various perceptions of the SEA? Are they correct? Given the SEA mission (democratic, alternative seeking), do they actually operate according to the stated mission which is supposed to be consistent with the ethos? Is there some discrepancy between mission and ethos? If this discrepancy were minimized would the process move more efficiently, effectively, or more slowly? These questions are answered through analyzing the degree of consensus of
respondent remarks within each phase and through the entire process.

Effectiveness goals and criteria need to be identified for each respondent in order to identify their perspective and to explain why their answers to certain questions might vary from those of other people reporting on the same phase. Differing goals may be the source of tension or conflict and therefore identification of the source of the problem could aid in resolution. There is a specific item on each questionnaire designed to elicit this information.

Organizational Assessment Model

What are the perspectives of the total process? To what extent is each perspective consistent within phase, between phase, with SEA intention (the actual design)? Slight differences of opinion should appear, but if drastically varied views of the total process, or ignorance thereof is evident, this might identify a weakness that can be remedied. A specific question regarding the goals of each phase and the total process were asked of every interviewee, as well as what they perceived as the hidden agendas.

The institutional ethos defines and clarifies the actual role that the State Board of Education has played historically and in the change process be analyzed. Drucker (1978) has suggested that the institutional roles of boards and their degree of impact on the organization has received too little attention. This study included an analysis of the State Board of Education's role in the process.

Summary

The above theoretical bases are relation to the theoretical perspectives under Goals and Objectives (Questions 1-3).

Theoretical Bases Related to Actors of the Functionalist Paradigm

Sociotechnical Model

A reason to create heterogeneous groups would be to develop "matrices whose members have partly overlapping skills, and networks of mainly specialist skills constituting a new basis for the effectiveness... creating organizational units of considerable robustness, which compose micro-societies having intra-group, and aggregate relations with a whole operations
task" (Trist, 1981). The degree of heterogeneity could be identified either as a strength or a weakness, depending on which elements of the SEA operations one was analyzing.

During the initiation phase some type of selective development (Trist, 1979b) should occur in which an optimum path of change to be pursued was identified. The degree to which multiple stakeholders had maximum input and discretion in designing and choosing the path of change would correlate to the degree of satisfaction with the process.

Keidel (1978) has referred to the emergence of an organizational community bonded by an organizational ecology (Emery and Trist, 1973; Trist, 1977a) in which, because of mutual interdependence, no single coalition is capable of controlling the others (similar to Ohio’s educational coalitions). Due to the interdependency and common forces of environmental turbulence more organizations, by necessity, are designing change through a large-scale social systems model incorporating cooperation and collaboration. Rather than incorporating a bureaucracy paradigm which traditionally leads to totalitarian design, an inter-organizational collaboration reflecting participative, democratic principles is needed.

**Organizational Assessment Model**

How could the inter-dependencies (resource and information flows) between phases be improved? If it is found that certain PSI were extremely hostile, it could have occurred possibly because "everyone" in all of the other phases knew what was going on except them. How could that hostility be diffused? How could the process be structured so that the implementers, the PSI, could have a greater commitment to the process from beginning to end?

In the exploration of effectiveness goals, one of Van de Ven’s (1981) suggestions was that researchers make themselves aware of the various perspectives of effectiveness goals that people have from different levels and stakeholder groups. Knowledge of this facet of the study will prohibit the perspective from being myopic, help to identify the different or conflicting goals, and permit the researcher to identify sources of conflict and areas where more extensive partisan mutual adjustment needs to occur.
Effectiveness goals and criteria need to be identified for each respondent in order to identify their perspective and to possible explain why their answers to certain questions might vary from other people reporting on the same phase. Differing goals may be the source of tension or conflict and therefore identification of the source of the problem could aid in resolution. There is a specific item on each questionnaire designed to elicit this information.

Summary

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Actors (Questions 4-8).

Theoretical Bases Related to Procedures - Tasks of the Functionalist Paradigm

Sociotechnical Model

Rarely is attention given to the inter-relationships between individuals and groups. According to Hackman (1981) "cohesive groups have considerable capacity to exploit individual members in the interest of collective goals, or to suppress their personal aspirations and compromise their personal integrity, or generate so much freedom that anarchy reigns." In this study, integrated into the questionnaire are queries specifically related to how the group regulated itself, how it remembered to keep learning, and how the structure of the process could have been improved.

Usually researchers frame their analysis of organizational structure from an environmental and technological perspective. Hackman (1981) has suggested the the researcher begins by identifying the points in the process that most dramatically affect the achievement of the goals of the organization. By identifying the key variances, the organization can then support and establish more technical reinforcement for those critical areas that most affect achievement. This is precisely the goal of this study, to identify from multiple perspectives the critical areas affecting achievement, and to suggest ways in which the process might be improved.

The degree to which an organization exhibits the mechanistic, authoritarian structure, the less it can absorb and reduce environmental turbulence (Trist, 1981). Organizations can build into their structure
the adaptive edge facilitating flexibility, interdependence, and interdependence which help control the turbulence, complexity, and uncertainty. The SEA process may exhibit various degrees of flexible style or the mechanistic style during various phases. Identifying, and either reinforcing or changing these styles, might improve the process from the perspectives of the SEA and the internal PSI relations.

One mechanism a change agent can use effectively when working with multiple factions is a degree of normative incrementalism that incorporates continuous adaptive planning (Pava, 1980). In the case of the both the SEA and the PSI, the question might be to what degree can actual radical structural change be incorporated into a change process exhibiting a structural design symptomatic of normative incrementalism?

If, as Sommerhoff (1950, 1969) suggests, the social and technical sub-components of each phase are consciously and fully integrated into the goal of the entire process, there should be reported a feeling of harmony and success from all interviewees. However, as Ackoff and Emery (1972) have warned, the co-producers of the outcomes are achieving distinctive and disparate sub-component goals in each phase that are comparable or understood in viewing the total process, and not in comparing one phase with another. "The distinctive characteristics of each must be respected or else their contradictions will intrude and the complementarities will remain unrealized" (Trist, 1981). The degree to which the SEA has fully articulated and integrated the total process goal through each phase should parallel the degree of joint optimization and success.

Heterogeneous groups or committees with participants having multiple memberships from a larger perspective lessens the danger of over-investment described by Churchman and Emery (1966). The social aggregate thus created develops a polity whose power is related to consensual decision-making, thereby broadening and stabilizing the foundation of the process. If these persons of such diverse perspectives can reach consensus and take action, whatever argument they make is much more powerful. At times during the process the SEA created such an environment by power of appointment to committees. At other times, relatively
homogeneous groups were responsible for phases of the process. This could be an area that exhibits both strengths and weaknesses.

Trist (1981) suggests that to reduce impact of the existing adversarial machinery a parallel organization needs to bind these coalitions in a collaborative mode where the design, structure, decisions, and actions are concomitant with the goals, philosophy, and vision of the unified conglomerate.

The SEA may be operating from a style of interdependency and cooperation, whereas, the ultimate implementers, the PSI, may have institutionalized the mechanistic, bureaucratic style. Style differences may result in unintended conflict. Maccoby (1976) has suggested that the old paradigm incorporates a technological perspective that is replete with routinization, specialization, fragmentation, and competition. "The new paradigm follows joint optimization with people as resources to be developed, optimum task grouping with flexibility to meet extensive external environmental variance, cooperation, collaboration, mutual nurtured interdependency incorporating a mission with purposes of society" (Trist, 1981). If there exists a conflict between paradigms, then mechanisms might be employed to understand and eventually unify those perspectives.

Whenever choices are being made, there is some type of value system in operation which creates and maintains "a certain kind of organizational world through the choice we make" (Hackman, 1981). Different frames of analysis should explain the different value structures, their dominance in the process, sources of actual and potential conflict, and procedures that either alleviate or heighten those conflicts.

Organizational Assessment Model

Rational action is correlated to the degree to which everyone agrees upon what the ends should be. In this case, throughout the entire process the agreed upon result was to create better schools through changing administrative standards. How was this premise agreed upon? During any of the phases, was there any challenge to the basic premise, of how to best affect this change?

During each phase of this study there were identified different goals, task difficulty,
performance standards, evaluation criteria, resource environments, and as a result, different structures or organizational designs should have developed that would permit each phase to perform its unique task or function. Depending upon which phases are analyzed, different patterns of interdependency, coordination, and control should result because each phase is organized in a different relative environment. At the level of total organizational analysis, people from different phases, or different levels of interviewees, should have varying perspectives as to how the whole process functions, and yet, to the degree that the overall mission has been clearly identified, there should occur some consistent picture of the process.

Within the developmental mode the team utilizes a decision mechanism that involves either judgmental or bargaining strategies (Thompson and Tuden, 1959). Van de Ven (1981) suggests that this is a vehicle used to effectively manage conflict, especially among powerful coalitions.

The actual structure of the committee is an interesting variable that Hackman (1976) explored. He has suggested that by altering the design of jobs and units, an organization can maximize various heterogeneous components either by decreasing job specialization or by staffing the unit with heterogeneously chosen experts. An implication for this study might be that instead of having four separate ad-hoc committees in discrete phases that disband after their sub-goals have been achieved, the SEA could have a single committee through the entire process staffed with experts from heterogeneous disciplines that develop a consistent cognitive map of the entire process.

The design/structure of the phase or work unit should match the function that it was to perform, the goals that were to be obtained. Could the phase be designed more effectively to attain the same goal? Specific questions regarding reasons for successes and failures were asked of every interviewee.

According to Van de Ven (1981) the developmental mode is team intensive, temporary, and focused on specific solutions through techniques of creative problem solving. Within this mode the team utilizes a decision mechanism that involves either judgmental or
bargaining strategies. What strategies were used and why? Could it have been more effective to use other strategies? Did this mode address the conflicts and power contests among competing participants as Van de Ven had suggested it would? The questionnaire for each respondent contains a specific item relating to critical issues, conflict, conflict management, and resolution.

The more active the participants are in self-assessment and the corrective processes, the more receptive they will be to adoption of solutions. Therefore the degree to which each institution felt they were a part of the process should be correlated to the degree to which they adopted the solutions.

After the programs are analyzed, one of the next elements considered for analysis is the type, degree, and method of interdependency between the phases. Van de Ven (1981) would suggest that "coordination and control processes to manage this interdependence are accomplished with various forms of information flows among unit personnel and the methods used to resolve conflicts." His resource flows include the actual work, materials, and personnel services that are facilitating communication between the phases, while the information flows would be identified as actual communications transferred through written reports, memos, personal discussions, group meetings, etc.

The interdependency and flows between phases should be different because of different relative environments. Are the flows different? Are the existing flows maximally effective? Was each phase viewed with a tunnel vision that did not permit them to see alternative paths?

What are the perspectives of the total process? To what extent is each perspective consistent within phase, between phase, with SEA intention (the actual design)? Slight differences of opinion should appear, but if drastically varied views of the total process or ignorance thereof, is evident, it might identify a weakness that can be remedied. A specific question regarding the goals of each phase and the total process were asked of every interviewee, as well as what they perceived as the hidden agendas.

Effectiveness goals and criteria need to be identified for each respondent in order to identify
their perspective and to possibly explain why their answers to certain questions might vary from those of other people reporting on the same phase. Differing goals may be the source of tension or conflict and therefore identification of the source of the problem could aid in resolution. There is a specific item on each questionnaire designed to elicit this information.

Rational action is correlated to the degree to which everyone agrees upon what the ends should be. In this case, throughout the entire process the agreed upon result was to create better schools through changing administrative standards. How was this premise agreed upon? During any of the phases, was there any challenge to the basic premise, of how to best affect this change?

Havelock's Model

In this study Havelock's Stage One has helped identify the various relationships with the individual educational coalitions through the different phases. At various points throughout the process the clients change, necessitating changes in procedures in working with different key people, norms, and larger social environments. The relationship with these coalitions vary dramatically from being very good to almost open hostility. At various time throughout the process the SEA acts as an internal and/or external change agent.

In interactions the best way to manage initial encounter is to examine the issues of friendliness, familiarity, rewardingness, and responsiveness.

Summary

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Procedures (Question 31).

Theoretical Bases Related to Procedures - Interactions of the Functionalist Paradigm

Sociotechnical Systems Model

Trist (1981) suggests that several issues must be addressed at some time during the invocation phase. The first is that the change process of the nature of this study requires paradigm shifts that challenge basic assumptions and values of the PSI, forcing them into Bateson's (1972) deuto-learning, the frustrating, frightening, and sometimes hated process
of having to learn through experience. Deutero-
learning may be the most uncomfortable manner in which
a PSI faculty is forced to shift paradigms. Intellectu-
alizing the process may be of value for
hindsight; however, first-hand experiences whereby the
implementers can identify and experience the patterns
of validity necessitating and driving the change
process are much more valuable for inducing paradigm
shifts as opposed to intellectualizing.

The second Trist issue is that the innovation and
implementation should be most well received by those
PSI whose faculties and internal and external
environments are most stable (Hackman 1981). Those
faculties would be most receptive to multi-level,
multi-focused paradigm shifts, whereas, less stable
environmental circumstances would foster reluctance.
Knowing each of the 17 PSI may not have the same state
of environmental stability, might suggest that the SEA
should develop alternative timelines and varying
degrees of technical assistance that would be made
available to individual institutions.

The third Trist issue is realization that the
degree to which the implementers own the project is
related to the actual change that the new program will
create. The degree to which the PSI have perceived the
need for change and have through various mechanisms
made the process their own would be related to the
extent of actual change in the program. An alternative
to implementing SEA mandates might be to allow what
Trist (1981) calls thematic facilitation whereby
individual PSI identify, design, implement, evaluate,
and redesign innovative projects with programmatic
themes developed within the purview of the SEA.
Maximum flexibility in process structure leads to
feeling of ownership and commitment that are critical
to the success of the project (Hackman, 1981).

Organizational Assessment Model

According to Van de Ven (1981) during the
initiation phase there should be some development of
similar patterns evolving historically through which
the origins and emerging changes in philosophy and
goals of an institution can be traced. Knowing the
historical background of the institution (in this case
the SEA) allows the researcher to understand better how
processes may have become so institutionalized that the
original flexibility may have been lost. This study includes an extensive narrative on the background of the SEA.

During each phase the greater the degree of active negotiations between the various committees and the SEA, the better the results should be.

Havelock's Model

Havelock identified the mechanisms used during the diagnosis phase (initiation phase in this study) in making good diagnoses as those involving identifying problems, opportunities, understanding client systems, making a diagnostic inventory, collaborating on a diagnosis, and identifying diagnostic pitfalls. In this study Havelock’s Stage I has helped identify the various relationships with the individual educational coalitions through the different phases. At various points throughout the process the clients change, necessitating changes in procedures in working with different key people, norms, and larger social environments. The relationship with these coalitions vary dramatically from being very good to almost open hostility. At various times throughout the process the SEA acts as an internal and/or external change agent.

In Havelock’s Stage III is outlined how to acquire the relevant resources to assess the problem. Havelock’s Stage IV (prescription phase in this study) is focused on choosing the solution and contains ways in which to derive recommendations from the research, to generate a range of solution ideas, and to test feasibility, and assess adaptability.

In Havelock’s Stage V (invocation phase in this study) the issues of how individuals and groups accept innovation, how change agents can communicate more effectively, and maintaining program flexibility is outlined.

Because Havelock’s work extensively detailed the operations within phase, the great majority of the questions generated that pertain to specific phases with the questions from the sociotechnical and organizational assessment models sprinkled among Havelock’s categories.
Summary

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Procedures - Interactions (Questions 9-39).

Theoretical Bases Related to Timing of the Functionalist Paradigm

Sociotechnical Systems Model

Sociotechnical change is a long-term process in itself. With added complexity of many educational associations and 17 PSI, the magnitude of change is not only magnified but diffuse and pervasive, eventually affecting every school in the state. The length of the process might be a contributing factor related to the relative successes or failures of the entire process as well as impacting each of the phases.

Trist (1981) suggests that the following issues regarding timing must be addressed during the invocation phase. First, that each of the PSI would have a time period and methods of mourning the passage of the old program which is idiosyncratic only to that institution. That novelty will stir paranoid anxieties and regressive behavior should be anticipated on the part of those institutions most severely affected. The SEA’s timelines, incorporation of multiple stakeholders, tone of technical assistance conferences, etc. either assist or hinder the institution in accepting those changes. Second, the invocation and implementation should be most well received by those PSI whose faculties have internal and external environments that are most stable (Hackman, 1981). Those faculties would be most receptive to multi-level, multi-focused paradigm shifts, whereas, less stable environmental circumstances would suggest existence of reluctance. Knowing that each of the 17 PSI may not have the same state of environmental stability, might suggest that the SEA develop alternative timelines and varying degrees of technical assistance that would be made available to individual institutions. The situation is complicated further in that the individual faculties themselves may not be able to assess the degree of environmental turbulence surrounding them, and therefore may not initiate an assistance request for SEA involvement, or if assistance is requested, the faculty may not know the extent, degree, or type of
assistance that is needed. Perhaps only the SEA is in a position to assess the situation most accurately.

At times the SEA acted as an external force, a change agent having extensive impact on the various educational coalitions, especially the PSI in Ohio, by virtue of legislative mandate. The SEA as a single entity, as an external change agent is evident in the role that it assumes during all phases, but is most dramatically apparent during initiation and invocation phases. The most extreme external agency role was assumed during invocation, partially because of the 17 PSI (macro-social environments) do not, and maybe never will, permit the SEA to be identified as internal to the process.

Havelock's Model

There are advantages and disadvantages in acting as both inside and outside change agent. Havelock developed an outline to examine those relationships.

Summary

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Timing (Questions 40-41).

Discussion of the Theoretical Bases for the Concepts from the Radical Structuralist Paradigm

Introduction

The focus of the radical structuralist paradigm is on radical change and not regulation. According to Althusser (1969) one can understand the totality by examining the forces shaping the subcomponents with special attention to the conjunctures and the structure in dominance. Burrell and Morgan (1979: 345) indicate that, "the logic of Althusser's position, in effect, calls for a case-study method of analyzing particular 'conjunctures', each of which is unique, for only in this way can our knowledge of history be developed." The theoretical models outlined below emphasize the importance of the conjunctures and the forces for change.

Theoretical Bases Related to Goals and Objectives of the Radical Structuralist Paradigm

Radical structuralism focuses on a critique of the
status quo and the conflictual nature of social actions. It acknowledges a plurality of political, philosophical, and sociological dimensions.

Bukharin (1965) referred to society in terms of the conditions of equilibrium, the disturbance of equilibrium, and the re-establishment of equilibrium. He maintained that without harmony and cooperation as the foundation of relations between systems that chaos would ensue.

Paris and Reynolds (1983, p. 263) referred to the development of a self-improving polity and indicate that:

In practice, it is unreasonable to expect this condition to be satisfied unless there are mechanisms for the expression and aggregation of citizen views and their conversion into policy and unless these mechanisms are widely acknowledged as legitimate. ... liberty of thought and expression is necessary for the development of rational ideology ... there must be a widespread belief that policy problems are tractable and are properly subjected to inquiry and analysis.

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Goals and Objectives (Questions 1-4).

Theoretical Bases Related to Actors of the Radical Structuralist Paradigm

Most of the questions in this category were developed from the Lasswellian view (further explained in Chapter IV).

In both the functionalist and the radical structuralist paradigms, there is little emphasis on the role/nature of the person, rather the emphasis is on the actors as representatives of their respective coalitions. However, in the radical structuralist paradigm emphasis is on how the actors perceive the power of the respective coalitions in the ability to impact the process.
Paris and Reynolds (1983: 268-269) indicate that an actor of the process may be acting solely as a representative of his/her constituency and may have no opinion or conflicting opinions as to the issues at hand.

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Actors (Questions 5-9).

Theoretical Bases Related to Procedures of the Radical Structuralist Paradigm

Most of the questions in the procedures section is from the work of Havelock (1973) and are found in greater detail in The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Like Lasswell, Havelock is in both the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms.

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Procedures (Questions 10-20).

Theoretical Bases Related to Timing of the Radical Structuralist Paradigm

Timing can be a factor in the maintenance of the status quo. Given the press of deadlines the PSI did not have time to question the premises of the mandated changes or their effects on student population changes, or internal PSI conflictual elements.

The above theoretical bases are related to the theoretical perspectives under Timing (Questions 21-22).

Concepts of the Functionalist Paradigm

Goals and Objectives
1. Were the goals and objectives of the time period clear, articulateable? (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967)
2. Was there evidence that the participants knew how their task fit into the total picture? (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967)
3. What is the institutional ethos reflected in the technological and administrative rationale, the source of legitimization, and the relation to power configuration? (Drucker, 1978)

Actors
A. Directly work with whom?
B. Groups with whom client works:
   1. Relating to the Client system
      What are norms of the client systems?
      Who are the leaders?
      Who are the influentials?
      Who are the gatekeepers?
      With whom do you choose to work?
   2. Relating to larger social environment:
      What are the norms of the community?
      Who are the influentials of the community?
      What is the community like?
      What percent of forces are devoted to outside effort?
5. What is the relationship at very beginning from the change agent perspective? (Havelock, 1973)
   A. If good relationship:
      1. Does client view former relationship as positive?
      2. Could the relationship be improved?
      3. Have intervening events muddied the waters?
      4. Would the client have erroneous expectations of change?
   B. If uncertain relationship:
      1. Have previous problems been corrected?
      2. Were new images/new expectations built?
      3. Did the client alter prospects of success?
6. In what ways were the heterogeneous groups a strength or weakness for the process? (Churchman and Emery, 1966; Trist, 1979b, 1981)
7. Did the multiple stakeholders have maximum input? (Trist, 1979b, 1981)
8. What are people's effectiveness goals and how do they affect the process? (Herbst, 1974; Van de Ven, 1981)
   A. Is everyone satisfied? (Emery, 1974, 1976)
   B. Is satisfaction related to control?

Procedures- Tasks
Within Every Phase
9. Each phase had different goals, tasks, performance standards, evaluation criteria and therefore different structures and designs should have developed to perform unique functions. (Hackman, 1976)
A. Was the structure and design maximally effective? (Van de Ven, 1981)

B. Were the phases maximally designed a priori (correct heterogeneous groups, increase/decrease in job specification, level of difficulty)? (Hackman, 1976)


- What decision mechanisms were used to manage conflict (judgemental vs bargaining strategies)? (Thompson and Tuden, 1959; Van de Ven, 1981)

Between Phases

11. What are the critical points in the process that most affect goal achievement? How could those critical points be reinforced? (Hackman, 1981)

Total Process

12. How was interdependence managed (information flows among units/people and methods to resolve conflict)? (Van de Ven, 1981)

- A. What were the resource flows (work, materials, personnel services) and the information flows (written reports, memos, personal discussions, group meetings)? (March and Simon, 1958)
- B. Were the flows different, why and how could they be maximally effective? (Van de Ven, 1981)

13. At times the change agent exhibits a flexible style, at other times, a mechanistic style. (Hackman, 1981; Trist, 1981)

- A. During what periods was the change agent flexible or mechanistic?
  1. What were the flexible or mechanistic qualities?
  2. Were those qualities appropriate for that time period?
  3. What changes in those qualities would enhance the process?

- B. How have qualities of the mechanistic, authoritarian structure helped absorb and reduce environmental turbulence? (Trist, 1981)

- C. How have flexibility, interdependence, intraindependence helped control turbulence? (Trist, 1981)
D. How has the change agent structure/process created conflict and turbulence? (Trist, 1981)
E. Should the change agent be the structure to control turbulence? (Trist, 1981)
F. To what degree can actual radical structural change be incorporated into a change process exhibiting a structural design symptomatic of normative incrementalism? (Trist, 1981)

14. What is the degree of success of the process? Is this related to the SEA's ability to articulate and integrate the phases? (Ackoff and Emery, 1972; Sommerhoff, 1950, 1969; Trist, 1981)
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Questionnaire Guide for Every Interviewee

1. What were the goals/objectives of the State Education Agency (SEA) during the phase, through the whole process?
   Did you believe that there were subgoals or hidden agendas either by the SEA, coalitions or other persons? If so, what were they?
2. How was the phase organized?
   A. Structure:
      Were there committees and subcommittees? Their function? How long did they continue?
      Were external groups active during this time? If so describe how they affected the process.
   B. Timelines: What were the formal and informal timelines?
   C. Procedures: What was the process by which you reached consensus?
   D. Availability of Technical Assistance:
      What information requested/used during this phase?
      Discuss the availability and type of administrative assistance?
3. Who were the key actors both within and outside the process? Why were they key actors?
4. What were the critical issues?
   A. Why were they critical?
   B. Did conflict arise because of them?
   C. Was the conflict managed? If so how? Who? When? If not, why not?
   D. Were the critical issues ever resolved at this time? If so how?
      If not, why not?
   E. Who were the principal protagonists? Were these the same key actors mentioned in question #3 above?
5. What were the major successes during the phase? The process? (Successes could include issues, events, products, processes, personal fulfillment, social goals, etc)
   A. What caused the successes?
   B. How could the phase, the whole process be structured to continue to build on that success?

6. What were the major disappointments? (Disappointments could include issues, events, products, processes, personal fulfillment, social goals, etc)
   A. What caused the disappointments?
   B. How could the process be improved?

7. If the process were to begin again:
   A. What should be the goals/objectives of the SEA?
   B. What mechanisms would you keep, change, and/or add to achieve those goals?
   C. How would you determine effectiveness in each phase?
APPENDIX C
INTerviewer's PROBES

Interviewer's Questionnaire Guide with Identified Probes

1. What were the goals/objectives of the State Education Agency (SEA) during the phase, through the whole process? Did you believe that there were sub-goals or hidden agendas either by the SEA, coalitions or other persons?
Probes/sub-categories: Educational, Political, Financial, Sociological, Institutional, Personal, Other.

2. How was the phase organized?
A. Structure:
   Were there committees and subcommittees? Their function? How long did they continue?
   Were external groups active during this time? If so describe how they affected the process.
B. Timelines:
   What were the formal and informal timelines?
C. Procedures
   What was the process by which you reached consensus?
   Probes: 1. How were you supposed to do it?
            2. Did that work? If not, why?
            3. What other mechanism did you use to reach consensus?
D. Availability of Technical Assistance:
   What information requested/used during this phase?
   Discuss the availability and type of administrative assistance?
   Probes: 1. Was the process so constructed that only certain types of information was available to the group?
            2. What type of information was excluded from the decision process?
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3. Did either the inclusion or exclusion of information frame the problem in a myopic sense?

3. Who were the key actors both within and outside the process? Why were they key actors?
Probes: 1. Appointment (because of position)
2. Emerged as Leader
3. What were their roles in the process?

4. What were the critical issues?
A. Why were they critical?
B. Did conflict arise because of them?
C. Was the conflict managed?
   If so how? Who? When?
   If not, why not?
D. Were the critical issues ever resolved at this time?
   If so how?
   If not, why not?
E. Who were the principal protagonists? Were these the same key actors mentioned in question #3 above?
Probes: 1. Are the critical issues really sub-issues of a larger problem?
2. What forces were really at play?
3. Had most of the decisions already been made?

5. What were the major successes during the phase? The process? (Successes could include issues, events, products, processes, personal fulfillment, social goals, etc)
A. What caused the successes?
B. How could the phase, the whole process be structured to continue to build on that success?
Probe: 1. To really search for meta-success, beyond phase (societal).
2. To discover alternative mechanisms that could be used to attain the same level of success.
3. To identify the most strongest elements of the process.
6. What were the major disappointments? (Disappointments could include issues, events, products, processes, personal fulfillment, social goals, etc)
   A. What caused the disappointments?
   B. How could the process be improved?
   Probe: 1. To explore disappointments and causation due to structure, environment, personalities, etc.
          2. To identify weaknesses in process in order to identify alternative strategies.

7. If the process were to begin again:
   A. What should be the goals/objectives of the SEA?
   B. What mechanisms would you keep, change, and/or add to achieve those goals
   C. How would you determine effectiveness in each phase?

8. As the interviewer, is there anything I may have missed, any focus I should have asked about? Do you have any recommendations for inclusion in this study?
Appendix D
Phase Division

The Initiation Phase (June, 1977 - January, 1982)

Although review of the administrative standards was already an agenda item for Ohio's SEA in 1978, Mayher's (1977) newspaper article titled "Redesign Administrator Training" and Dr. Paul Hailey's (1977) response outlining the process for revision, added impetus to the Initiation phase. During the Grob Conference (October 5, 1978), the Chief State School Officer (CSSO), Dr. Walter, identified the specific areas targeted for improvement in graduate education of professional personnel. One of those areas was administrator education.

In May, 1979, Dr. Franklin Walter (CSSO) formally recognized an ad hoc advisory committee whose task was to examine administrator training standards and recommend needed revisions. This advisory committee produced three reports: a) data from practicing administrators and faculty from post-secondary institutions (PSI), b) administrative certification requirements of other states, and c) a review of the literature on administrator preparation. The final report from this committee was completed in September, 1980, and indicated that, indeed, there was a need for a modification of the existing administrative standards.

The Prescription Phase (January, 1982 - January, 1984)

Acting on the suggestions from the advisory committee in the Initiation phase, in 1981, Dr. Walter established the Administrator Certification Advisory Committee which did not meet until January 8, 1982. This committee had three tasks: a) to review the history on administrative certification, b) to develop a better understanding of the legal framework of the standards, and c) to develop an agenda for revising existing standards. The Administrator Certification Advisory Committee formed three subcommittees: a) a committee on common core graduate education requirements, b) a committee on field experiences, and c) a committee on certificate renewal and conversion.
The Administrator Certification Advisory Committee made recommendations that were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1983, to become effective September 1, 1985.

The Invocation Phase (January, 1984 - December, 1984)  
After the approval and adoption of the new administrative certification standards by the State Board of Education in 1983, the State Department of Education initiated and conducted a series of technical assistance conferences for the 17 post-secondary institutions (PSI) affected by the revisions. Those conferences were held on January 23, March 19, May 7, and August 24 of 1984. The PSI were to submit to the State Department the proposals for new administrative programs on December 1, 1984.

The Peer Review Phase (December, 1984 - June, 1985)  
A peer review panel was directed to review and constructively criticize the PSI proposals in order that the respective institutions could rewrite the proposals. During the initial review process 12 of the original 17 proposals were accepted with some requiring minor editing. By June, 1985, the peer review panel had recommended that the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission approve all 17 PSI proposals.
APPENDIX E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: PATTERN A - SEA AS CHANGE AGENT - AGREEMENT FIVE OR MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR STRENGTHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve Ohio administrators and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total process - mostly good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures, structure - mostly good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance - excellent or good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#6 MAJOR WEAKNESSES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some PSI not in each phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA should stick to decisions (too flexible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA controlled meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(closed process, inflexible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance - ineffective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New SEA regulations will change student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers-Masters in own field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- effects EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic issues arose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA process renewed tension within PSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA emphasis on technical training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unsound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI too reactive to SEA demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no dialogue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: PATTERN B - SEA AS CHANGE AGENT - WHETHER PSI WERE SUCCESSFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR WEAKNESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA procedures poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain individuals had input in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR STRENGTHS/GOALS/OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total process - mostly good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total process (procedures) - mostly good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance - excellent or good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: PATTERN C - SEA AS CHANGE AGENT - SEPARATED BY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralize power in/of SEA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHASE ORGANIZED**

| Structure: SEA meeting structure - poor | x | x | x |
| SEA meeting procedures poor | x | x | x | x |
| Technical assistance poor | x | x | x | x |
| Couldn't get answers: | x | x | x |
| Timelines given and changed | x | x | x |

**Programmatic issues**

| Philosophical shifts of SEA affects PSI program | x | x |
| SEA meeting procedures good | x | x | x |

**CRITICAL ISSUES**

| New SEA requirements will change student population | x | x | x |
| Till resolve - can't advise students correctly | x | x | x |

**Premises**

| Need pilots and assessment instruments and procedures | x | x | x |

### TABLE 4: SEA AS CHANGE AGENT - UNEXPECTED RESPONSE IN 2, 3, 5, 6 ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEA ground rules changed often</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New SEA requirements will change student population</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment cuts in education administration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment conflict with education administration, Masters, supervision</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmatic issues**

| SEA process renewed tension within PSI | x | x | x | x |
| PSI cannot change curriculum quickly | x | x | x | x |
| SEA emphasis to use external faculty - logistics poor | x | x | x | x |

**Premises**

| Evaluation model needed in the process | x | x | x | x |
| PSI too reactive to SEA demands (no dialogue) | x | x | x | x |
| SEA emphasis to use external faculty | x | x | x | x |

### TABLE 5: PATTERN A - PSI AS CHANGE AGENT - FIVE OR MORE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergent leadership</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good faculty cohesion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus to improve program (PSI pride)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/program receptive to field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5: PATTERN A - PSI AS CHANGE AGENT - FIVE OR MORE RESPONSES continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process (Great Success)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy from SEA to radically alter program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Year Program: insufficient guidelines, too little time</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much should whole college be involved</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine effect of education administration change on all programs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of students in education administration if Masters in field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6: PATTERN B - PSI AS CHANGE AGENT - WHETHER PSI WERE SUCCESSFUL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL AND OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took comprehensive look at total program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built program from ground up</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full faculty build best program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTORS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong chairs of education administration faculties/process</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs constantly kept them on task</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency leadership</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders open to criticism, open dialogue</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive Faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good faculty cohesion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus to improve program (PSI pride)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/program receptive to field</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior faculty knew all major issues</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct involvement in earlier phases</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA senior faculty—previous process exper.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior EA profs experienced in SEA process</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood idiosyncrasies of institution and avoided pitfalls</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership by default</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced faculty did most of work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one else there to do it</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURES</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-organizing process</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used sub-committees extensively</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed extensive timelines</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6: PATTERN B - PSI AS CHANGE AGENT - WHETHER PSI WERE SUCCESSFUL

| Use SEA guidelines, but our way (pride) | x | x | x | x |
| (tradition of PSI, not defensive) | x | x | x | x |
| Used SEA guideline-not "our way" | x | x |
| Turf | x | x | x | x |
| EA, Curric & Foundations = same dept | x | x | x | x |
| Exam. effect of EA change on all programs | x | x | x | x | x |
| Loss of students in education | x | x | x | x | x |
| Each PSI, should develop long range planning on this | x | x | x |
| Technical Assistance | x | x | x | x |
| Significant input of field administrators | x | x | x |
| Meetings, scheduled, highly organized | x | x | x |
| Many unresolved turf problems | x | x |
| Process (Great Success) | x | x | x | x |
| Good new program (we were creative) | x | x | x | x |
| Field administrators and advisory committee | x | x | x |
| was used extensively | x | x | x |

TABLE 7: PATTERN C - PSI AS CHANGE AGENT - SEPARATED BY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time, bulk of work done in summer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(by default, people pulled it together)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very small education administration faculties</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x+</td>
<td>x+</td>
<td>x+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need different perspectives-healthy process</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURES</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue PSI meetings, for dialogue</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive university governance structure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No turf problems</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication breakdown with education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is only on paper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine effect of education administration change on all programs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will significantly change student clientele</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMING</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late beginning in the process</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, bulk of work done in summer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(by default, people pulled it together)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PATTERN D - PSI AS CHANGE AGENT - EMERGENT PATTERN 2.3.5.6

Did not occur in section on PSI as change agent.
APPENDIX F

DATA ON INTERVIEWEES

Pat Crisi, September 17, 1985 (1977 - superintendent of Tallmadge City Schools, 197? became assistant superintendent with the SEA)

Feitler, September 17, 1985 (Professor: Kent State University as of 9/84, previously at Youngstown State) Defended Kent State's proposal during peer review.

Blough and King, September 17, 1985 (Professors at Akron University) Both were previously involved in the prescription phase. One of them chaired one of the four peer review panels. The other one had defended Akron University's proposal during peer review.

Homer Mincy, September 20, 1985 (Superintendent) On peer review served as representative of Buckeye Association of School Administrators - BASA

John Hauck, August 22, 1985 (President of Buckeye Association of School Administrators - BASA) Addressed BASA's and AASA's role during entire process. BASA was involved through committee appointment. Representatives to the phases from BASA included Charles Geoff (1977), then Paul Snyder and John Ball.

Carolyn Reed, September 16, 1985 (Elementary Principal, Canton City Schools) Possibly, she was the only field educator on both the prescription and peer review phases.

Larry Cline, August 23, 1985 (Representative appointed by Ohio School Boards Association - OSBA) He represented the lay point of view, and that of a school board member. He came from a small, local board of education, farming community, near Columbus) Served during prescription and peer review phase.
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Nancy Zimpher, August 20, 1985 (Professor in Higher Education at Ohio State University) She was not involved in administrative standards revision, but followed closely two teacher standards revision cycles (beginning 1973 and beginning 1985) Her dissertation was on a comparison of teacher education governance of three states (one being Ohio).

Randy Bobbitt, August 22, 1985 (Professor in Public Administration at Ohio State University) He served in the prescription phase on the curriculum committee which developed an outline of course requirements for each certificate.

Robert Bowers, Preliminary meeting in May, then again on August 20, 1985 (Assistant Superintendent at the SEA, in charge of entire administrative standards revision process) He was present through every phase.

Martha Dimit, August 20, 1985 (SEA staff personnel) She was the individual at the SEA most knowledgeable of the entire process. She coordinated all technical assistance during and between all SEA meetings in all phases. She did not deal directly with individual PSI questions referred to the SEA during Invocation (this was the job of Randy Flora).

Selected PSI Interviewees for the Invocation Phase

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, Virgil Blanke, Jack Culbertson, Brad Mitchell August 13-14, 1985 (Roy Larmee from OSU was mentioned often by each interviewee in the Initiation and prescription phases. He could not be interviewed because he died early in 1983 (about one month after the invocation phase began).

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY, Bill Reynolds (Ed. Admin) and Lee Charlotte (Curriculum - Teacher Education) August 16, 1985.

MIAMI, Nelda Cambron-McCabe, Jim Burchet, Ken Glass, August 21, 1985

OHIO UNIVERSITY, Crystal Gips, August 15, 1985

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY, Dillehay, September 20, 1985

XAVIER UNIVERSITY, Milton Partridge, September 7, 1985

ASHLAND COLLEGE, Stan Siders, October 7, 1985)
APPENDIX G
OHIO'S REVISED ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

Ohio's first certification laws regarding administrative training standards were written in 1935. Teacher and administrative training programs have been periodically reviewed and revised since then. A revision in administrator training in 1955, required coursework in administration and supervision. In 1972, the State Board of Education adopted the requirement for the planned field experience. The latest revision and adoption (1977-1985) represented the most extensive changes occurring since 1935. The highly prescriptive program was designed to improve administrator preparation.

Previous standards adopted by the Ohio State Board of Education in 1983, the laws required that in order to qualify for certification as an administrator, an educator had to have 27 months of successful teaching experience, a master's degree in education (verify), and to complete the administrative courses required for such a certificate at one of 17 institutions (this could be anywhere from three to six administrative courses depending on the institution). These laws can be found in what the PSI refer to as the red book (Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers adopted by the Ohio's State Board of Education).

In comparing the charts listed below (the recommended changes in standards proposed in the prescription phase on the left side and the actual standards adopted by the State Board of Education on the right side) at first one is struck with the fact that they are identical on approximately 99% of the points (with the exception that the State Board added the assistant superintendent's certificate and this certificate was entirely excluded by the prescription committee). There was a high turnover (11 of 25) in the membership of the State Board of Education while the prescription phase was meeting. Had the proposed standards been reviewed by the original State Board, the SEA staff indicated that there would not have been as many changes. However, the new State Board members,
for whatever political or personal reasons, decided to study and have an impact on the recommendations. This also added to the length of time of the process (noted in study as a weakness). As to whether the State Board utilized any outside consultants or their standing advisory committees to change the recommendations was unknown at the time of the study.

Although the State Board appeared to make only small adjustments, these had great impact on how the PSI finally developed the administrative training programs. First, the most significant change was that the State Board eliminated every elective (10-15% of course work of every certificate) recommended by the prescription committee. Second, the prescription committee advised a balance of courses among the administrative core (40%), the curriculum and instruction core (25%), and the foundations core (20%). The State Board revised this to require a broad distribution over those three areas, which could be interpreted by individual students and certain PSI to mean 15% administration, 60% curriculum, and 25% foundations. It was clear that the original critical issues from initiation through prescription phases centered around administrators being certified with very little administrative training, and the State Board’s adoption could theoretically allow this practice to continue.

Other minor changes included the addition of educational research methods and findings to the foundations core of every certificate. A change that occurred with the educational administrative specialist’s certificate included an addition to the administrative core (staff personnel services; including staff development, staff evaluation, employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management). To the superintendents’ certificates board of education - superintendent relations was added to the administrative core.

In certificate conversion to professional certificate for principals, the prescription committee suggested 15 semester hours of additional post-master’s work, whereas the State Board required only six semester hours. No waiver clauses for renewal and conversion of certificates were included in the prescription committees suggestions, but did appear in
the final adoption. For renewal of the superintendent's certificate, the prescription committee had recommended twice as many CEUs or credit hours as compared to what was finally adopted.

STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
State of Ohio
Department of Education
Division of Teacher Education and Certification
(Effective September 1, 1985)
(Presented to PSI for Proposal Development - December, 1983)

3301-21-03 ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional certificate for an elementary principal will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with forty-five semester hours (sixty-eight quarter hours) of graduate work well distributed over the areas listed in paragraphs (B) (1) to (B) (3) of this rule and with evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory teaching experience of which at least eighteen months shall have been in grades kindergarten through eight under a standard elementary teaching certificate or under a standard special teaching certificate.

(B) Program Requirements
(1) Administrative Core
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Policy planning, goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Pupil personnel services;
   (f) Staff personnel services; including staff development, staff evaluation, employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management;
(g) Political structures and public relations; and
(h) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences.

(2) Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Core
   (a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on grades kindergarten through eight; and
   (b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on teaching of reading and mathematics, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.

(3) Foundations Core
   (a) Developmental and learning theory;
   (b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
   (c) Educational research methods and findings.

Replaces: Part of Rule 3301-21-03, promulgated under: R.C Chapter 119, Rule Amplifies: 3319.22 and 3319.24

3301-21-04 SECONDARY PRINCIPAL

(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional certificate for an secondary principal will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with forty-five semester hours (sixty-eight quarter hours) of graduate work well distributed over the areas listed in paragraphs (B) (1) to (B) (3) of this rule and with evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory teaching experience of which at least eighteen months shall have been in grades seven through twelve under a standard high school teaching certificate or under a standard special teaching certificate.

(B) Program Requirements
   (1) Administrative Core
      (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution
and interpersonal relations in a purallistic society;
(b) Policy planning, goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
(c) School law;
(d) School finance and economics
(e) Pupil personnel services;
(f) Staff personnel services; including staff development, staff evaluation, employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management;
(g) Political structures and public relations; and
(h) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences.

(2) Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Core
(a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on grades seven through twelve; and
(b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on instructional methodology, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.

(3) Foundations Core
(a) Developmental and learning theory;
(b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
(c) Educational research methods and findings.

Replaces: Part of Rule 3301-21-04
Promulgated Under: R.C Chapter 119
Rule Amplifies: 3319.22 and 3319.23

3301-21-05 EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST
(A) The certificate for an educational administrative specialist will be issued in the following areas of specialization:
(1) Business Management
(2) Educational Research
(3) Educational Staff Personnel Administration
(4) Instructional Services
(5) Pupil Personnel Administration
(6) School and Community Relations
(7) Special Education (exceptional children)

(B) Provisional Certificate
The provisional certificate for an educational administrative specialist will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with forty-five semester hours (sixty-eight quarter hours) of graduate work well distributed over the areas listed in paragraphs (C) (1) to (C) (3) of this rule and with evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory teaching experience a standard teaching certificate.

(B) Program Requirements
(1) Administrative Core
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Policy, planning, goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Staff personnel services; including staff development, staff evaluation, employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management;
   (f) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences.
(2) Specialization Core - fifteen semester hours (twenty-three quarter hours) of graduate work in the area of specialization.
(3) Foundations Core
   (a) Developmental and learning theory;
   (b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
   (c) Educational research methods and findings.

Replaces: Part of Rule 3301-21-05
Promulgated Under: R.C Chapter 119
Rule Amplifies: 3319.22 and 3319.23
(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional certificate for an assistant superintendent will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with forty-five semester hours (sixty-eight quarter hours) of graduate work well distributed over the areas listed in paragraphs (B) (1) to (B) (3) of this rule and with evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position under appropriate certificate.

(B) Program Requirements
(1) Administrative Core
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Policy planning, goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Pupil personnel services;
   (f) Staff personnel services; including staff development, staff evaluation, employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management;
   (g) Political structures and public relations;
   (h) Business affairs and physical resources; and
   (i) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences.
(2) Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Core
   (a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on grades kindergarten through twelve; and
   (b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on instructional methodology, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.
(3) Foundations Core
(a) Developmental and learning theory;
(b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
(c) Educational research methods and findings.

Replaces: Part of Rule 3301-21-04
Promulgated Under: R.C Chapter 119
Rule Amplifies: 3319.22

3301-21-07 REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATE RENEWAL AND CONVERSION FOR ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL, SECONDARY PRINCIPAL, EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST AND ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

(A) Renewal for Provisional Certificate
A provisional certificate for an elementary principal, secondary principal, educational administrative specialist and assistant superintendent may be renewed at expiration by:
(1) Completion, by those who have worked in an administrative position under the appropriate certificate, of:
(a) Satisfactory administrative experience under the certificate; and
(b) An individualized entry year program (the equivalent of six semester hours or nine quarter hours of college credit) during the first year in the position; or
(2) Completion, by those who have not worked in an administrative position under the appropriate certificate, of:
(a) Satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position; and
(b) Twenty-four Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be renewed; or
(3) Completion, by those who have already renewed the certificate under paragraph (A) (1) of this rule, of:
   (a) Satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position; and
   (b) Twenty-four Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be renewed; or

(B) Professional Certificate
A provisional certificate may be converted to a professional certificate upon evidence of:
(1) Twenty-seven months of satisfactory administrative experience under the provisional certificate to be converted;
(2) Completion of an entry year program as prescribed under paragraph (A) (1) (b) of this rule; and
(3) Six semester hours (nine quarter hours) or post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be converted.

(C) Renewal of Professional Certificate
A provisional certificate may be renewed at expiration upon evidence of:
(1) Satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position; and
(2) Twenty-four Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be renewed.

(D) Permanent Certificate
A professional certificate may be converted to a permanent certificate upon evidence of:
(1) Forty-five months of satisfactory administrative experience under the certificate to be converted; and
(2) Six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be converted.

(E) Waiver Clause
Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (A) to (D) of this rule, a certificate issued to an elementary principal, a secondary principal, or an educational administrative specialist under former rules is renewable pursuant to the provisions of said former rules. Conversion to the next higher grade certificate shall require meeting the rules in effect at the time of application. An individual with a provisional administrative certificate employed as an elementary principal, a secondary principal, or an educational administrative specialist prior to the effective date of this rule may convert after the effective date of this rule such certificate to a professional certificate without completion of the entry year program if all other requirements are met.

Replaces: Parts of Rules 3301-21-03, 3301-21-04, and 3301-21-05
Promulgated Under: R.C Chapter 119
Rule Amplifies: 3319.22, 3319.23, 3319.24, 3319.25 and 3319.26

3301-21-071 SUPERINTENDENT OR LOCAL SUPERINTENDENT

(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional certificate for a superintendent and a local superintendent will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with sixty semester hours (ninety quarter hours) of graduate work well distributed over the areas listed in paragraphs (B) (1) to (B) (3) of this rule and with evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory experience in an administrative or supervisory position under the appropriate certificate.
(B) Program Requirements

(1) Administrative Core
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Board of education - superintendent relations, including policy-planning, goal setting and evaluation for educational program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Pupil personnel services;
   (f) Staff personnel services; including staff development, staff evaluation, employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management;
   (g) Political structures and public relations;
   (h) Business affairs and physical resources; and
   (i) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences.

(2) Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Core
   (a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on grades kindergarten through twelve; and
   (b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on instructional methodology, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.

(3) Foundations Core
   (a) Developmental and learning theory;
   (b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
   (c) Educational research methods and findings.

(C) Renewal of provisional certificate
A provisional certificate for a superintendent and a local superintendent may be renewed at expiration by:

(1) Completion, by those who have worked as a superintendent or local superintendent under the appropriate certificate, of:
(a) Satisfactory experience under the certificate; and
(b) An individualized entry year program for superintendents and local superintendents (the equivalent of six semester hours or nine quarter hours of college credit) during the first year in the position; or
(2) Completion, by those who have not worked as a superintendent or local superintendent, of:
(a) Satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position; and
(b) Twelve Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or three semester hours (five quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be renewed.

(D) Professional Certificate
A provisional certificate may be converted to a professional certificate upon evidence of:
(1) Twenty-seven months of satisfactory experience as a superintendent of a local superintendent under the provisional certificate to be converted;
(2) Completion of an entry year program as prescribed under paragraph (C) (1) (b) of this rule; and
(3) Six semester hours (nine quarter hours) or post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be converted.

(E) Renewal of Professional Certificate
A professional certificate may be renewed at expiration upon evidence of:
(1) Satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position; and
(2) Twelve Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or three semester hours (five quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be renewed.
(F) Permanent Certificate
A professional certificate may be converted to a permanent certificate upon evidence of:
(1) Forty-five months of satisfactory experience as a superintendent of a local superintendent under the certificate to be converted; and
(2) Six semester hours (nine quarter hours) or post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since the issuance of the certificate to be converted.

(E) Waiver Clause
Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (C) to (F) of this rule, a certificate issued to a superintendent or a local superintendent under former rules is renewable pursuant to the provisions of said former rules. Conversion to the next higher grade certificate shall require meeting the rules in effect at the time of application. An individual with a provisional administrative certificate employed as a superintendent or local superintendent prior to the effective date of this rule may convert after the effective date of this rule such certificate to a professional certificate without completion of the entry year program if all other requirements are met.

Replaces: Parts of Rules 3301-21-06, 3301-21-07
Promulgated Under: R.C Chapter 119
Rule Amplifies: 3319.22, 3319.23, 3319.24, 3319.25 and 3319.26

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
(These were the recommendations of the prescription phase that were reviewed in five regional open hearings throughout Ohio in October, 1982.)
3301-21-03 ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional certificate for an elementary principal will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with graduate work well distributed over the areas listed and with evidence of twenty-
seven months of satisfactory teaching experience of which at least eighteen months shall have been in the elementary grades under a standard elementary teaching certificate or under a standard special teaching certificate.

(1) Administrative Core (at least forty percent)
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skills related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Policy planning, goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Pupil personnel services;
   (f) Staff personnel services; including employer-employee relations, collective bargaining, and contract management;
   (g) Political structures and public relations; and
   (h) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences within the administrative core.

(2) Curriculum and Instruction Core (approximately twenty-five percent)
   (a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on primary and middle grades; and
   (b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on teaching of reading and mathematics, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.

(3) Foundations Core (approximately twenty percent)
   (a) Developmental and learning theory;
   (b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and

(4) Electives (approximately fifteen percent)
(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional secondary principal's certificate will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with graduate work well distributed over the areas listed below and with evidence of twenty-seven months of successful teaching experience of which at least eighteen months shall have been in the secondary grades under a standard high school teaching certificate or under a standard special teaching certificate.

(1) Administrative Core (at least forty percent)
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Planning, goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Pupil personnel services;
   (f) Staff personnel services; including employer-employee relations;
   (g) Political structures and public relations; and
   (h) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences within the administrative core;

(2) Curriculum and Instruction Core (approximately twenty-five percent)
   (a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on junior high and high school grades; and
   (b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on teaching of reading and mathematics, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.
(3) Foundations Core (approximately twenty percent)
   (a) Developmental and learning theory;
   (b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
   (4) Electives (approximately fifteen percent).

3301-21-05 EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST
The educational administrative specialist's certificate will be issued in the following areas:
(1) Business Management
(2) Educational Research
(3) Educational Staff Personnel Administration
(4) Instructional Services
(5) Pupil Personnel Administration
(6) School and Community Relations
(7) Special Education (exceptional children)

(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional educational administrative specialist's certificate will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with fifteen semester hours (twenty-three quarter hours) of graduate work in the area of specialization for which the certificate is sought and with evidence of twenty-seven months of successful teaching experience a standard teaching certificate and with graduate work well distributed over the following areas:
(1) Administrative Core (at least twenty-five percent)
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Planning, including goal setting and evaluation for school program and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences within the area of specialization and/or the administrative core.
(2) Foundations Core (approximately fifteen percent)
   (a) Developmental and learning theory;
   (b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and
(3) Electives (approximately ten percent)

3301-21-07 REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATE RENEWAL AND CONVERSION FOR ELEMENTARY: PRINCIPAL, SECONDARY PRINCIPAL, EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST AND ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

(A) Renewal for Provisional Certificate
A provisional elementary principal's, secondary principal's, or educational administrative specialist's certificate may be renewed at expiration in one of the following ways:
(1) Completion of an entry year seminar (six semester hours or nine quarter hours of graduate credit) during the first year in an administrative position and evidence of satisfactory experience under the certificate; or
(2) Completion, by those who have not worked under the certificate or who have already renewed it under 3301-21-06 (A) (1), of twenty-four Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines and evidence of satisfactory experience in a teaching, supervisory or administrative position.

(B) Professional Certificate
A provisional certificate may be converted to a professional certificate upon evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory administrative experience and upon evidence of completion of fifteen semester hours (twenty-three quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in professional education, including the entry year seminar or related disciplines,
(C) Renewal of Professional Certificate
A provisional certificate may be renewed at expiration upon evidence of satisfactory administrative experience and upon evidence of completion of twenty-four Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines.

(D) Permanent Certificate
A professional certificate may be converted to a permanent certificate upon evidence of forty-five months of satisfactory administrative experience under the professional certificate and upon completion of six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines.

3301-21-071 SUPERINTENDENT OR LOCAL SUPERINTENDENT

(A) Provisional Certificate
The provisional superintendent's and local superintendent's certificate will be issued to the holder of a master's degree with sixty semester hours (ninety quarter hours) of graduate work well distributed over the areas listed below and with evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory experience in an administrative or supervisory position under the appropriate certificate.

(1) Administrative Core (at least forty percent)
   (a) Administrative theory and practice, including the skill related to school organization, management, leadership, uses of computer technology, conflict resolution and interpersonal relations in a pluralistic society;
   (b) Planning, including goal setting for school program, staff and pupil achievement;
   (c) School law;
   (d) School finance and economics
   (e) Pupil personnel services;
   (f) Staff personnel services; including employer-employee relations,
(g) Political structures and public relations;
(h) Business affairs and physical resources; and
(i) Two planned, supervised and evaluated field experiences.

(2) Curriculum and Instruction Core (approximately twenty-five percent)
(a) Curriculum theory and program development with emphasis on grades kindergarten through twelve;
(b) Instructional leadership, including emphasis on the teaching of reading and mathematics, diagnosis of learner needs and prescription of appropriate instructional strategies, and uses of computer technology.

(3) Foundations Core (approximately twenty percent)
(a) Developmental and learning theory;
(b) Historical, philosophical or social foundations; and

(4) Electives (approximately fifteen percent)

(C) Renewal of provisional certificate
A provisional superintendent's or local superintendent's certificate may be renewed at expiration in one of the following ways:
(1) Completion of an entry year seminar (six semester hours or nine quarter hours of graduate credit) during the first year in an administrative position as a superintendent or a local superintendent and evidence of satisfactory experience under the certificate; or
(2) Completion, by those who have not worked under the certificate or who have already renewed it under 3301-21-07 (B) (1), of twelve Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education units or four semester hours (six quarter hours) of post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines since and evidence of satisfactory administrative experience.
(D) Professional Certificate
A provisional certificate may be converted to a professional certificate upon evidence of twenty-seven months of satisfactory experience as a superintendent of a local superintendent under the provisional certificate to be converted and upon evidence of completion of an entry year seminar and of six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines.

(E) Renewal of Professional Certificate
A professional certificate may be renewed at expiration upon evidence of satisfactory administrative experience and upon evidence of completion of twenty-four Ohio Department of Education approved continuing education unit or six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines.

(F) Permanent Certificate
A professional certificate may be converted to a permanent certificate upon evidence of forty-five months of satisfactory experience as a superintendent or a local superintendent under the professional certificate to be converted and upon evidence of six semester hours (nine quarter hours) of additional post-master's credit in educational administration or related disciplines.
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