THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

INNOVATION AND EVALUATION: AN EXAMINATION OF SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL PROCEDURES EMPLOYED IN THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF THE INTERPROVINCIAL SCHOOL EVALUATION PROJECT

BY

BENJAMIN JOHN SHAW

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

JANUARY, 1976

"INNOVATION AND EVALUATION: AN EXAMINATION OF SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL PROCEDURES EMPLOYED IN THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF THE INTERPROVINCIAL SCHOOL EVALUATION PROJECT"

by

Benjamin John Shaw

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation for the assistance given by several people during the various stages of this study:

To Dr. C. Bjarnason, the main advisor, for his encouragement and guidance in carrying out this study.

To Dr. J. A. Riffel, for his invaluable assistance in making documents and records available.

To Prof. C. Walley for his helpful comments and suggestions.

To Dr. N. Hersom and Dr. A. McBeath, for their assistance in validating certain portions of the study.

To my wife Janet, and two daughters Susan and Mandy, for their patience and support during this educational pursuit.

ABSTRACT

The basic purpose of this study was to examine educational innovation and evaluation through an examination of specific procedures in the design, implementation and operation of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (ISEP). The procedures chosen for examination were those which appeared to be most "successful" according to the reactions and observations of participants.

In general terms, the study attempted to consider the following questions;

1. What does the literature indicate to be important procedures necessary to maximize the chances of success of an innovation?

2. How was innovation carried out in the case of ISEP?

3. What were some of the "successful" features of the program?

4. What procedures in the design, implementation and operation of the project appear to have been most conducive to effective results in this venture?

5. What modifications in the initial design, implementation and operation of the program were necessary as a result of attempting to translate a theoretical plan of action as proposed in ISEP into a practical program?

This piece of research was done as a case study. The first question was approached through a review of the

literature. A framework of innovation was drawn up by consolidating the ideas of various writers and researchers in the field of educational innovation.

The second, third and fourth questions were considered by an examination of records and documents dealing with ISEP, as well as personal interviews carried out with selected members of ISEP. Those phases of the program which appeared to have been successful were isolated and analyzed. An attempt was then made to account for the reason(s) for their success.

The fifth question was considered by isolating and analyzing those situations where modifications in the initial plan were necessary as a result of unanticipated problems encountered.

The implications of this study are that ISEP was of definite value to the participating schools and that it may serve as a model for future innovative activities in education. Moreover, the study gave support to the policy of creating temporary short term organizational structures similar to ISEP, as a means of stimulating locally-initiated evaluation. Finally, the study indicated that educational innovations, with careful planning and personal committment from those involved,can occur, but are more likely to be successful if careful attention is given to the organizational procedures employed in the design, implementation and operation of the innovative activity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Under increasing pressure to perform particular roles and to meet changing needs, educational institutions often change. This change may consist of adopting new programs, adding new courses, or shedding old policies. Too often, however, change tends to be a piecemeal response made to pressures, rather than a balanced, considered development in the light of a well-defined set of goals. Planning, which in its mature form should anticipate crises, often ends up being simply a reaction to a crisis. Too often, planning has tended to be a revision of various structural aspects of a system, rather than an attempt to deal with the more difficult question of how the system is operating.

There are many reasons why educational institutions must be concerned with the change process. Recent years have seen demands by society for an improvement in schools, educators and the products of the educational system. Many writers and researchers cite the launching of the first man-made satellite by the Soviet Union in 1957 as a major cause of the concern for improved educational facilities. Even critics such as John Goodlad refer to the years 1957-1967 as

the "education decade."[1]

The present dissatisfaction which many students express toward the educational system is another element in the concern for innovation. Today, many people in our schools are pursuing programs in which they find little success or challenge. Even the most optimistic person would find it difficult to argue that the "more tangible rewards of diplomas, degrees, and jobs cause many learners to tolerate rather than to be enthusiastically involved in the learning enterprise."[2]

Another circumstance that emphasizes the acceleration of educational change is the obvious intellectual and cultural disparities which exist between the populations which different schools serve. Although many would argue that innovations occur most readily in the already advanced schools, and therefore widen the gap, it is important to recognize that an era of self-renewal would benefit students in all schools. In the words of William Alexander, "If all children and youth could attend schools equal to our best, and if all could have teachers equal to our best, what a different society we might achieve."[3]

---

[1]John I. Goodlad, M. Frances Klein and others, Behind the Classroom Door (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970), p. 113.

[2]William M. Alexander, "The Acceleration of Curriculum Change," Perspectives on Educational Change, ed. Richard I. Miller (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 342.

[3]Ibid., p. 343.

Educators have responded to these demands for renewal in a variety of ways. New efforts to reform educational programs in various subject fields have been initiated. A great deal of time and effort have been expended in the study of such matters as the structure of the disciplines, the discovery method, educational television, team teaching, upgraded programs and other modifications of the educational system.

Another response has been the involvement of many outside agencies in the field of education. Dr. Frank Keppel, who states that ". . . the business of education is too important to be left to professional educators,"[4] probably never suspected the degree to which sociologists, economists, social psychologists, business men and industrialists would turn their attentions to the schools.

Other educators have responded to demands for renewal by turning their attention to the design of models for innovation, the preparation of materials and equipment to facilitate new programs and the organization of inservice programs to prepare teachers to handle these programs. New methods of training teachers, new university courses and new methods of professional development for teachers on the job have been off-shoots of this strategy.

---

[4]Emil J. Haller, Strategies for Change (Toronto: Dept. of Educational Administration, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968), p. 8.

A program designed to facilitate the ongoing professional development of teachers was undertaken recently in Western Canada. Known as the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (ISEP), it was a response to growing demands from both teachers and administrators for more effective evaluation of school programs. Although the overall objective of ISEP was to develop a framework describing procedures which school staffs could adopt to evaluate educational programs in schools, the program was actually to serve two purposes--to provide assistance to schools and to provide research in the area of evaluation.

Structurally, the program operated at three levels:

1. An interprovincial organization which was set up to establish policy for the project, and to coordinate interprovincial activities.

2. Three provincial organizations which were set up to establish policies for each province, and to coordinate activities within the province.

3. Individual school organizations, which defined their own evaluation project, determined the degree and nature of involvement by their own staff, and carried out their own evaluation.

I. THE PROBLEM

The basic purpose of this study was to examine educational innovation and evaluation through an examination of specific procedures in the design, implementation and opera-

tion of ISEP. The procedures chosen for examination were those which appeared to be most "successful" according to the reactions and observations of participants.

Specific questions which guided the research were:

1. What does the literature indicate to be important procedures necessary to maximize the chances of success of an innovation?

2. How was innovation carried out in the case of ISEP?

3. What were some of the "successful" features of the program?

4. What procedures in the design, implementation and operation of the project appear to have been most conducive to effective results in this venture?

5. What modifications in the initial design, implementation and operation of the program were necessary as a result of attempting to translate a theoretical plan of action as proposed in ISEP into a practical program?

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Since there is already a large volume of written material on educational change processes, it is important at this time to justify the inclusion of one more piece of work.

Essentially, there are three reasons for undertaking this study:

In the first place, most of the literature deals with the need for change, while offering very little help in terms

of how this change can best be accomplished. Emil Haller, in his book Strategies for Change, indicates that,

> . . . the vast majority of written work is essentially hortatory in nature--it exhorts the school to 'change,' to 'keep up,' and so on, while furnishing little if any guidance to the practitioner as to how change is accomplished.[5]

Through a review of the literature pertaining to innovation, this piece of work will attempt to bring together much of the current thinking on how change can best be accomplished.

A second reason centres around the concern of many writers in the field that too often the change process fails to reach completion. J. A. Riffel speaks of this problem when he states:

> Securing approval for an acceptable plan and seeing it through to implementation are two very different things; in fact, it is between these two stages that the planning process most often breaks down.[6]

This study will attempt to deal with this problem by examining categories of interest in facilitating change based on a review of the literature in that field.

Finally, it has been stated that the majority of present day research deals with why things fail, while very little deals with why things succeed. If future administrators can learn about innovation by examining successes as well as failures, this study may provide some small amount of help to educational leaders who wish to introduce change in the

---

[5] Ibid., p. 2.

[6] J. A. Riffel, Education Planning Reexamined (Edmonton: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971), p. 8.

future.

III. ASSUMPTIONS

This study will be based on the following assumptions;

1. That it is possible to study the procedures involved in the design, implementation and operation of a particular program by means of documents, records, interviews and recordings.

2. That valuable research findings can be gained as readily from an examination of the successful features of a program as can be gained from an examination of its unsuccessful features.

IV. DELIMITATIONS

This study was confined to an examination of ISEP from the inception of Phase 1 (Planning and Initiation) in 1972 until the completion of Phase 3 (Dissemination), which terminated with the publication of the ISEP report in 1975.

Due to constraints of time and resources, it was decided to confine this study to the influence of selected procedures in the design, implementation and operation of the ISEP program, chosen on the basis of their relevance to administrative practices. Consequently, the major thrust in this study centered around an examination of organizational procedures employed at the interprovincial and provincial level of organization.

V. LIMITATIONS

A single approach to this study was used, that of the case study based on personal interviews, combined with evidence gathered from documents, records and tape recordings. Outcomes of this study were postulates based upon experience and perceptions, rather than statistically supported phenomena.

All factors that would normally be limitations in a study involving the gathering of data from documents, records, interviews and recordings applied to this study.

The element of subjectivity involved in selecting items for the proposed framework for innovation was a further limitation. The writer attempted to overcome this problem by selecting those items which most authors agreed upon as being important components for successful innovative activity.

A final limitation was the inherent lack of objectivity due to the fact that the information gained came largely from documents, records or interviews with people directly connected with the program. The writer attempted to overcome this problem by comparing what an individual said took place with what the records, documents and recordings indicated actually occurred.

VI. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The Interprovincial School Evaluation Project: An action-oriented, developmental project, designed to encourage and assist selected schools in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in evaluating specific phases of their

school programs.

Procedures: A series of determined, step-by-step methods which are used in the achievement of a desired goal.

Design: A plan of the structural form that a program is intended to take.

Implementation: The process of putting an idea into actual practice; the act of putting a plan or program into practical effect.

Innovation: "Any creative and risk-taking process by which new ideas, values, standards, methods or procedures are conceived, developed, introduced, and/or followed up for the purpose of meeting certain existing or possible future needs";[7] a deliberate, specific change which is thought to be more operative in accomplishing a desired goal.

Planning: "A systematic, step-by-step method and process of defining, developing and outlining possible courses of action to meet existing or possible future needs, interests or problems."[8]

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This report is divided into six chapters. Chapter One consists of the introduction and the statement of the problem. Chapter Two, comprising a review of the literature, proposes

---

[7] Ivan S. Banks, The Dictionary of Administration and Supervision (Los Angeles: Systems Research, 1971), p. 65.

[8] Ibid., p. 92.

a framework of innovation, based on an examination of current writings and research findings in the area of educational innovation. Chapter Three discusses the methodology of the study.

Chapter Four is a description of ISEP, from the time of the beginning of Phase 1 (Planning and Initiation), until the end of Phase 3 (Dissemination). Chapter Five consists of an examination of selected procedures employed in the design, implementation and operation of the program. This examination will consider the strengths and weaknesses of the procedure, but the main thrust will be on the strengths. This approach is based on the premise that, in organizational analysis, as much can be learned from a critical examination of success as from analysis of failure. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the apparent reasons for these successes.

Chapter Six is a summary of the study. It consists of an examination of modifications that were necessary as a result of attempting to translate a theoretical plan of action into a practical program. The chapter also contains conclusions derived from the analysis done during the study, on the basis of which recommendations are made.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will propose a framework of innovation based on a consolidation of ideas from a number of writers and researchers in the field. This eclectic approach is followed in an attempt to consolidate the experiences, beliefs and research findings of many people in this area, and thereby avoid some of the weaknesses found in many present day models of innovation.

Based on a synthesis of ideas of different writers and researchers in the field of educational innovation, the following steps are considered important in a framework of innovation, and therefore will be discussed in more detail.

The Establishment of Operational Principles

- The creation of an atmosphere that facilitates change.
- Facilitation of communication.
- Flexibility.
- Political awareness.
- Opportunities for involvement.

Awareness of a Need for Change

Preparation for Change

- The commitment of a core staff to a change.
- The establishment of goals.

The Development of a Specific Proposal

Conceptualizing a range of alternatives.

Exploration and choice of alternatives.

Planning for Implementation

Budget considerations.

Establishing an organizational structure.

Preparation of participants.

Program Operation

Allowing for flexibility.

Stabilizing the innovation.

Disengagement.

Evaluation

Modification and Stabilization

I. A FRAMEWORK FOR INNOVATION

The Establishment of Operational Principles

The creation of an atmosphere that facilitates change. A crucial factor in innovation is the establishment of an atmosphere in which change can take place. Robert Chin refers to this as ". . . inculcating a posture for 'changingness'--a state of readiness to change, to venture and take risks."[1] In his opinion, recent years have seen the emergence of an emphasis on ". . . unshackling the creativity of the persons

---

[1]Robert Chin, "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Change," Designing Education for the Future, No. 3, Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education, ed. Edgar L. Morphet (New York : Citation Press, 1967), p. 49.

in organization in such a way that innovation becomes possible."[2]

Jack Frymier stresses that, if a particular innovation is to succeed, there is a strong need for the central administration to be committed to change.[3] This idea is substantiated by R. J. Leskiw, who feels that administration will continue to play a vital role in encouraging and coordinating educational improvement. He speaks of the need for the administrator to create a climate in which change can occur.[4] The importance of the administrator is also emphasized by Corbally, Jensen and Staub, who state that it is not the role of the school principal to develop goals and policies, but rather to set the stage so that goals and policies can be developed.[5]

Leo Hilfiker refers to the importance of the atmosphere of the system's organizational climate. In a survey conducted among professional educators in the state of

---

[2] Ibid., p. 50.

[3] Jack R. Frymier, "From Now to Tomorrow," A School for Tomorrow, ed. Jack R. Frymier (Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973), p. 291.

[4] R. J. Leskiw, "Educational Improvement--a Joint Responsibility," Achieving Educational Improvements, ed. W. Glyn Roberts. (Calgary, Alberta: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1971), pp. 25-26.

[5] John E. Corbally Jr., H. J. Jenson and W. Frederick Staub, Educational Administration: The Secondary School (2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965), p. 50.

Wisconsin, Hilfiker reports that, "The long term success of a school system's innovative efforts may be due, to a greater degree than previously suspected, to the social-psychological state of the system's organizational climate."[6] His findings indicate that there is a significant relationship between a school system's innovativeness and, the degree of openness and trust as perceived by the professional personnel of the system. However, this openness and trust does not always occur. Carl Rogers, in working with the total educational system of the Order of the Immaculate Heart in Los Angeles (which included a college, eight high schools and fifty elementary schools) reports:

> One generalization which might be made is that we found that the degree of resistance and non-acceptance of the experience almost directly correlated with status. It seems that the higher the status of the individual, the more fearful he is of an experience in which he might reveal himself personally to his collegues or find it necessary to work out some of his interpersonal relationships with them.[7]

Victor Balridge and Robert Burnham, also looking at organizational climate, surveyed the superintendents of 184 school districts in Illinois. They conclude that

> . . . a large, complex school district with a turbulent, changing and heterogeneous environment is probably much more innovative than a

---

[6]Leo R. Hilfiker, "Factors Relating to the Innovativeness of School Systems," The Journal of Educational Research, LXIV, No. 1, p. 27.

[7]Carl Rogers, "Self-Directed Change for Educators," Preparing Educators to Meet Emergency Needs, ed. Edgar L. Morphet and David T. Jesser (New York: Citation Press, 1969), pp. 61-62.

> small, simply organized district with a relatively stable, homogeneous environment.[8]

According to their research, two of the advantages of large size are the increased likelihood of a critical mass of participants to generate a demand structure, and enough specialized experts to encourage innovative behavior.[9]

Facilitation of communication. Marcelle Lawler emphasizes the importance of communication when she writes:

> The healthy school organization in which strategies for considering the introduction of an innovation [SIC] must have open, regularized, honored channels for communicating vertically and horizontally with all staff. 'Communication' includes not only sending messages, but receiving messages. Many healthy, face-to-face, study, exploration and discussion sessions are characteristic of effective communication systems.[10]

Most writers agree with this need for systematic lines of communication which encourage feedback. Havelock states that,

> To the extent that there is a transfer of information, there should be a transfer both ways, from agent to client and client to agent.[11]

---

[8] J. Victor Baldridge and Robert Burnham, The Adoption of Innovation: The Effect of Organizational Size, Differentiation, and Environment (Palo Alto, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1973), p. 27.

[9] Ibid., p. 27.

[10] Marcella R. Lawler, "Guidelines for Developing Strategies for Introducing Planned Curricular Innovations," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 38.

[11] Ronald G. Havelock, The Change Agent's Guide to

In his opinion, "One way relationships tend to breed dependency and inhibit the initiative of the client to help himself."[12] Hayward stresses that

> . . . the educational planning unit should have established systematic lines of communication throughout the educational system, so as to facilitate participation and 'feedback' in the planning process.[13]

In his opinion, the establishment of lines of communication can be simplified by means of clear cut lines of supervision within the operating organization.[14] Baldridge and Burnham, as a result of their previously cited study, also emphasize the need for two-way communication:

> Consequently, an organization desiring innovation could promote that process by opening channels of communication between itself and its client environment. For example, serious innovation has often occurred when community control advocates have gained enough power to have significant input into school districts.[15]

Communication, to be effective, must exist at all stages during the change process. Matthew Miles speaks of

---

Innovation in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973), p. 55.

[12] Ibid., p. 55.

[13] Beresford Hayward, "The Implemented Educational Plan," Educational Planning, ed. Don Adams (Syracuse: Center for Development Education, Syracuse University, 1964), p. 95.

[14] Ibid., p. 96.

[15] J. Victor Baldridge and Robert Burnham, op. cit., p. 28.

the need to improve communication before change is begun.[16] Emil Haller, on the other hand, feels that the most important source of communication should be feedback concerning goal achievement once the change process has been carried out.[17]

Flexibility--Fred Hechinger suggests that ". . . different types of change may call for variations in strategy."[18] In the same vein, Richard Miller states that, "Too often educators do not develop specific strategies of change for specific types of innovations."[19] Robert Chin lists four implications for variations in procedures in attempting change:

1. It is apparent that the different procedures for effecting change are geared for special users.

2. The preference for a particular strategy for effecting change seems to lie in our various biases in seeing the educational system as 'people processes,' technical processes, or processes centred around things and materials.

---

[16]Matthew B. Miles, "Innovation in Education; Some Generalizations," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 652.

[17]Emil J. Haller, Strategies for Change (Toronto, Ontario: Department of Educational Administration, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968), p. 46.

[18]Fred M. Hechinger, quoted in Alice M. Miel, "Developing Strategies of Planned Innovation," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 157.

[19]Richard I. Miller, "Some Observations and Suggestions," Perspectives on Educational Change, ed. Richard I. Miller (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 368.

3. The selection of an approach does depend upon some assumptions about the nature of the problem, of change and of changing. If a gap of knowledge is diagnosed as the major problem, the tendency is to remedy that directly. On the other hand, if a lack of creativeness is sensed, then procedures designed to encourage innovativeness are utilized.

4. The analysis of strategies of changing are more or less infused with the analyses of the value judgements.[20]

However, educational planning must not only allow for different strategies to be applied to individual situations, but must also allow for adjustments to take place during the change process.

> Educational planning takes place in a dynamic contest which requires the system to make adjustment to changes in its environment.[21]

Mary Queely emphasizes the need for

> . . . a tolerance for disruption and adjustment in the early days of implementation.[22]

Frymier, while acknowledging the need for careful thought and conscentious planning, also speaks of the necessity for flexibility and willingness to change, based on a ". . . thoughtful examination of pertinent facts assembled in terms of plans that were made."[23]

---

[20]Robert Chin, op. cit., p. 368.

[21]J. A. Riffel, Educational Planning Reexamined (Edmonton, Alberta: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971), p. 120.

[22]Mary A. Queely, "Nongrading in an Urban Slum School," Innovation in Mass Education, ed. David Street (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969), p. 88.

[23]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 298.

Political Awareness--The role of politics in education is viewed by most writers as a fact of life. Haywood states that ". . . the educational plan must be framed within the bounds of what is politically possible, if it is to be implemented."[24] Hartley indicates that, because education is publicly funded, it is only natural that it must enter the arena of politics if it is to gain support.[25]

C. E. Beeby points out that, because of the very nature of the planning process, most decisions have political overtones:

> . . . some 'political' elements enter into almost every phase of the planning process in the sense that a choice of priorities at any level normally involves vested interests, material or intellectual, and some degree of tension between the proponents; and that in the resolution of this tension, compromise, personalities, and pure logic are liable to be inextricably intertwined.[26]

Riffel expresses an even stronger belief in the impact which the political process has on determining the final outcome of an educational program. In his opinion

> . . . the initial question in distinct planning cycles are seldom decided on the criteria of rationality; they are unavoidably political and the conduct

---

[24]Beresford Hayward, op. cit., p. 88.

[25]Harry J. Hartley, Educational Planning--Programming--Budgeting (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 15.

[26]Michael Kelly, "Educational Planning from a Teacher's Point of View," Comparative Education, VIII, No. 2, ed. A. D. C. Peterson (Oxford, England: Carfax Publishing Company, September, 1972), p. 88.

> of this political activity sets the tone of the following stages of the planning cycle.[27]

Ralph Kimbrough concurs with this line of thinking. He alleges that changing educational policy requires effective political activity. In his opinion, the traditional political-administrative dichotomy is no longer considered possible or desirable by many education authorities.[28]

Political awareness is basically an awareness of the power structures that operate within the community that the change agent must deal with. Most writers and researchers identify two major groups of people who are in power positions in the field of education. The first of these groups consists of those who hold direct power over the change agent. They include such people as superintendents, principals, board members and legislators. The second group, made up of students, parents and community members, hold indirect influence.

Perhaps no individual holds as powerful a position within a school system as the principal. Riffel writes that:

> The administrator sets the tone of the school. It is unfortunate that this assertion has become a cliche, for it is an important fact with profound implications for knowledge utilization and innovation in education. In terms of day-to-day practices, the leadership and support of the administration may be

---

[27] J. A. Riffel, op. cit., p. 15.

[28] Ralph B. Kimbrough, "Community Power Systems and Strategies for Educational Change," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 80.

> the single most important determinant of innovative activity in the school.[29]

R. O. Nystrand regards the principal as crucial to the successful implementation of any innovation. Nystrand emphasizes the idea that if the principal is to become an ally, he must not only be sold on the idea, but must also understand it thoroughly.[30] Shiman and Liberman caution that

> . . . instructional innovations that look different frequently involve teachers in community reaction and make them dependent on principal support . . . .[31]

If the principal will be required to support the program publicly, it would seem only natural that he should be committed to the program, and also be very knowledgeable about it.

Havelock points out that the change agent, if he is to be successful, must be able to answer the following three questions:

1. Who are the most powerful and influential people in the community?

2. How do these people usually react to innovation in the community? (Are they conservative or progressive?)

---

[29]J. A. Riffel, "Renewal in Manitoba Education: Toward an Approach to Research and Development," Manitoba Journal of Education, IX, No. 1, ed. J. A. Riffel (Winnipeg, Manitoba: The Manitoba Research Council, January, 1974), p. 26.

[30]Raphael O. Nystrand, "The Impact of Community Action Programs Upon School Systems," Innovation in Mass Education, ed. David Street (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969), p. 145.

[31]David A. Shiman and Anne Lieberman, "A Non-Model for School Change," The Educational Forum, XXXVIII, No. 4, ed. Jack R. Frymier (Columbus, Ohio: Kappa Delta Pi, The Ohio State University, May, 1974), p. 444.

3. How can these people be approached and influenced to endorse the change effort?[32]

Opportunities for involvement--Harry Hartley indicates that non-involvement in policy making could result in a dysfunctional school system. He advocates establishing a wide base of participation in program development by including students, teachers, principals, central administrators, school board members and personnel from supporting services.[33] Corbally, Jenson and Staub also point out the need for administrators to involve their staff in all phases of program development. They state that one of the axioms of administration is that those who will be affected by a policy should have a voice in the development of that policy.[34] Carl Rogers expresses his opposition to the idea of change being imposed upon schools or their members.[35]

> It is not that there has been a lack of plan for change in our educational systems. There have been many such plans--indeed a surplus. But nearly always these have been attempts to bring change in from the outside and such efforts have been largely futile.[36]

---

[32]Ronald G. Havelock, op. cit., p. 46.

[33]Harry J. Hartley, op. cit., p. 11.

[34]John E. Corbally Jr., H. J. Jenson and W. Frederick Staub, op. cit., p. 51.

[35]Carl Rogers, op. cit., p. 73.

[36]Ibid., p. 58.

McGregor emphasizes that participation cannot be used as trickery or gimmickry.[37] In his book The Human Side of Enterprise, he refers to the success of the Scalon Plan, a system which provides an opportunity for every member of an organization to contribute ideas, as well as physical effort, toward the improvement of organizational effectiveness. Under the terms of this plan, the individual, in his own work setting, is given the opportunity to propose ideas, participate in their evaluation and receive recognition if they work out.[38]

There appear to be at least two basic reasons why involvement is beneficial. In the first place, if participants are involved in program development, resistance to change is often lowered.

> The classic research of Coch and Finch (1948) indicated that by involving staff in the development of change plans, resistance to that change could be greatly reduced.[39]

M. D. Fantini, looking at attempts at reform within teacher education programs, warns that reform would not be accepted unless the basic parties of interest participated in the

---

[37]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), p. 138.

[38]Ibid., p. 113.

[39]H. David Hemphill, "A General Theory of Innovativeness," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XIV, No. 2 (Edmonton, Alberta: Committee on Educational Research, University of Alberta, June, 1968), p. 106.

reform process.[40] Chin writes that, "High concentration of power in the hands of the change agent does not seem to lead to effective change."[41]

A second advantage of participant involvement centres around the increased worker effectiveness due to the Hawthorne Effect.

> For many years certain students of organizational processes have extolled the improvement in morale and worker effectiveness that accompanies high rate of peer group interaction and the heavy involvement of people in decisions that bear directly on the work they perform. These writers have contended that when groups actually are given the authority to make and implement decisions that are significant for them they make these decisions effectively, responsibly and enthusiastically.[42]

Bennett concurs with this line of thinking. In his opinion, if people have not shared in creating the goals which are to be accomplished through change, it will be difficult for them to develop the interest and energy necessary for effective program implementation.[43]

---

[40]Mario D. Fantini, "Patterns for Reform in American Teacher Education," Interchange, IV, No. 2-3 (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973), p. 30.

[41]Robert Chin, op. cit., p. 52.

[42]Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon and Robert R. Weigman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 9.

[43]Thomas R. Bennett II, The Leader and the Process of Change (New York: Association Press, 1966), p. 37.

John Goodlad, speaking of the challenge facing the schools in the seventies, sums up the need for meaningful involvement in educational change when he states:

> It will be challenging because only the most carefully planned and conducted comprehensive change involving the collaboration of legislators, teachers, parents, the children themselves is going to bring us through, I think, the educational crisis we are now facing.[44]

Awareness of a Need for Change

John Goodlad is one of the foremost advocates of the necessity for educators to be in tune with the needs of the system. He developed what he refers to as a Responsive Model for Innovation. One of the basic premises of this model is that change, to be effective, must enter a school because that school is responsive to its problems and to its needs. Therefore, the school becomes the basic unit for change, and the problems identified by the people in that school become the focus of the change process.[45] Ultimately, the goal is to reach the point where the people within that school will become self-renewing. i.e., will affect their own changes.

---

[44]Opinion expressed by John I. Goodlad, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California in Los Angeles, in an address ("The Challenge of the Seventies"), Produced by Charles C. Wall and Ronald Kidd, Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972. (Audiotape).

[45]Opinion expressed by John I. Goodlad, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California in Los Angeles, in an address ("Models for Change"), produced by Charles C. Wall and Ronald Kidd, Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972. (Audiotape).

However, a survey which Goodlad and his associates conducted in sixty-seven schools in fourteen major population centres throughout the U.S.A., indicated that only four of the sixty-seven schools had a "critical mass" of teachers at work on the problems which they identified as existing within their school.[46]

Like Goodlad, most writers identify the awareness of a need for change as an important point in any innovative activity. Wolf and Fiorino indicate that most changes are prompted by a dissatisfaction with existing programs, and a desire to expand current practices.[47] Frymier indicates that an awareness that some aspect of a program or practice is not achieving the originally intended purposes is typically the first phase of a change effort.[48]

Events outside the classroom often trigger a re-examination of educational needs. Brickell indicates that the rate of educational innovation in the United States more than doubled following the launching of the Soviet Sputnik in

---

[46]Opinion expressed by John I. Goodlad, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California in Los Angeles, in an address ("The Resistance of Schools to Change"), produced by Charles C. Wall and Ronald Kidd, Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972. (Audiotape).

[47]Henry C. Johnson Jr., "Some Reflections on Educational Reform," The Educational Forum, XXXVIII, No. 1, ed. Jack R. Frymier (Columbus, Ohio: Kappa Delta Pi, The Ohio State University, November, 1973), p. 81.

[48]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 285.

1957.[49] Fantini, looking specifically at reform in teacher education programs, indicates that the major cause of institutional change is ". . . change in the marketplace."[50] Ecological problems, energy problems and changing life styles are among those influences which have lead to the development of new school programs within recent years.

Preparation for Change

The committment of a core staff to a change. Researchers in the field of innovation sometimes refer to a "critical mass" of people wanting change. The number of people required to form a "critical mass" is a variable, dependent upon such factors as the size of the school, the complexity of the innovation to be undertaken and the resistance to change within the school and larger community. Goodlad, in the study sighted above, indicates that this "critical mass" is often not available.[51] On the other hand, Haller, in a study conducted among elementary school teachers in a large metropolitan

---

[49]H. David Hemphill, "A General Theory of Innovativeness," Alberta Journal of Educational Reform, XIV, No. 2 (Edmonton: Committee on Educational Research, University of Alberta, June, 1968), p. 108.

[50]Mario D. Fantini, op. cit., p. 29.

[51]Opinion expressed by John I. Goodlad, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California in Los Angeles, in an address ("The Resistance of Schools to Change"), produced by Charles C. Wall and Ronald Kidd, Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972. (Audiotape).

school district in Ontario in 1968, discovered that ". . . the large majority of teachers favored the introduction of more new practices."[52] The key to educational innovation may lie in translating the desire for new practices into commitment to develop these practices.

Shiman and Liberman emphasize the idea of a core group of staff members working on a particular innovation. They feel that it is rare for the whole school to participate in a change process right from the beginning.[53] Rolland Jones also expresses the idea of a team approach.[54]

One of the requirements for translating a wish for change into active involvement is effective leadership. Frymier states that, "In almost every change venture in education, one person leads the way."[55] Leskiw, in discussing the need for leadership, indicates that change would be a long time in coming if absolute reliance was placed on the grass roots approach. He indicates the necessity for someone to take over the leadership role if good intentions are to result in action.[56]

---

[52]Emil J. Haller, op. cit., p. 41.

[53]David A. Shiman and Anne Liberman, op. cit., p. 443.

[54]Rolland W. Jones, "It's a Team Responsibility," Achieving Educational Improvements, ed. W. Glyn Roberts (Calgary: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1971), p. 4.

[55]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 286.

[56]R. J. Leskiw, op. cit., p. 17.

The establishment of goals--The establishment of clearly defined, and where possible, measureable goals, is a major prerequisite for meaningful educational change. Frymier refers to this as a process of understanding "where we are now" and "where we ought to go."[57] Robinson indicates that the essential concern should be "what we want done."[58] Giles and Foster,[59] Hartley,[60] and Teal and Reagen[61] all emphasize the need to establish clear goals.

However, when establishing goals, it is necessary to look not only at the learner, but also at the environment in which he is operating.

> As the pace of social change has quickened and become more turbulent, shortening the time available for response and often aggrevating long-standing educational concerns, it has become more apparent that better social forecasting, at least of the main problems, is essential if the tendency to plan education in an ad hoc manner is to be overcome.[62]

---

[57]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 279.

[58]Norman Robinson, "Success and Failure in Two Planned Interventions in British Columbia Schools," Achieving Educational Improvements, ed. W. Glyn Roberts (Calgary: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1971), p. 82.

[59]Frederic T. Giles and Clifford D. Foster, Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972), p. 12.

[60]Harry J. Hartley, op. cit., p. 17.

[61]Stanton M. Teal, Gerald M. Reagan, "Educational Goals," A School for Tomorrow, ed. Jack R. Frymier (Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973), p. 38.

[62]J. A. Riffel, Education Planning Reexamined (Edmonton: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971), p. 95.

Lawler discusses re-examining and redesigning goals in terms of educational advances, the changing nature of the learner and the changing nature of society.[63] Havelock speaks of starting with the pain, or the need as the client feels it, but still dealing with the learner as a system supplied with a continuous flow of new input from the larger environment.[64]

Many authors refer to the need to establish both short- and long-term goals. Lawler writes of the need to keep in mind ". . . the short-range progress of the student as well as the long-term goals of the innovation."[65] Goldberg indicates that

> . . . both the short-and long-range goals of an innovation must be clearly delineated and their achievement as well as their interrelationship studied before schools can have a sound basis on which to decide whether or not to accept or reject the new procedures.[66]

Related to the establishment of goals is the establishment of a focal point of change. Many educators tend to develop large, complex programs. Although this may be acceptable at the onset, programs must eventually zero in on a particular area which is to be changed. Riffel refers to this

---

[63]Marcella R. Lawler, op. cit., p. 36.

[64]Ronald G. Havelock, op. cit., p. 64.

[65]Marcella R. Lawler, op. cit., p. 33.

[66]Miriam L. Goldberg, "Evaluation of Innovation," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 33.

as the "principle of successive delimitation."[67]

The Development of a Specific Proposal

Conceptualizing a range of alternatives--One of the first steps in developing a proposal for change should be the conceptualization of a range of alternatives. According to Matthew Miles, this process should begin with two questions--"Were there any previous attempts along these lines?", and "Did we look at any of these previous attempts?"[68] Gordon Mackenzie states that, "Unless a change is conceptualized in some form and advocated, it cannot occur on a planned basis."[69] Chin emphasizes that:

> A serious question in the field of planned change is the need for more theorization. I do not think that we shall be able to make advances in understanding techniques for effecting change unless we continuously conceptualize the issues.[70]

Havelock feels that this process could be approached from three different ways. The first possibility would be to

---

[67]J. A. Riffel, "Renewal in Manitoba Education: Toward an Approach to Research and Development," Manitoba Journal of Education, IX, No. 1, ed. J. A. Riffel (Winnipeg: The Manitoba Educational Research Council, The University of Manitoba, Jan. 1974), p. 25.

[68]Matthew B. Miles, "Educational Innovation: The Nature of the Problem," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 20.

[69]Gordon Mackenzie, "Curricular Change; Participants, Power and Processes," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles, (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 417.

[70]Robert Chin, op. cit., p. 54.

identify the problems. A second way would be to identify the opportunities (areas of strength and maximum potential). A third way would be to look upon the client as a system, made up of elements that are supposed to work together to achieve a common goal.[71] Regardless of the sources of these solution ideas, it is important to develop more than one alternative. A range of alternatives would give the client a greater freedom of choice, and the opportunity to make rational and meaningful decisions.[72]

It is often advantageous to identify some initial starting point, a desired end point, and, on the basis of these, to develop a theoretical path that leads from the initial to the terminal point. Herman Kahn and his colleagues at the Hudson Institute developed a system, known as scenario writing, in which they set up a logical but hypothetical sequence of events whereby a system might be moved from some chosen beginning point to an end point. The procedure then becomes one of outlining the steps required to reach a certain point, as well as identifying some of the critical choice points which may occur along the way.[73]

Exploration and choice of alternatives--Another important step in the change process consists of exploring

---

[71]Ronald G. Havelock, op. cit., p. 64.

[72]Ibid., p. 104.

[73]J. A. Riffel, Education Planning Reexamined (Edmonton: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971), p. 102.

the range of alternatives, and choosing from them the one that is most appropriate. However, this is not always a matter of choosing the one that is educationally most sound. Cost, ease of adaptability and the degree to which a proposal improves upon the current practice are all factors that must enter into the final selection.[74] Chin indicates that, "Solutions must incorporate a choice of values . . . ."[75]

Havelock, writing of the exploration and choice of alternatives, stresses that, "This is the most creative and interesting task in the process of change, but a task that most change agents know little about."[76] He suggests that the following four steps are essential in the final selection of an alternative:

1. Deriving implications from research.
2. Generating a range of solution ideas.
3. Feasibility testing for benefit, practicality and diffusibility.
4. Adaptation.[77]

Havelock is not the only author who emphasizes the idea of feasibility. Haller points out the need for the

---

[74]W. C. Wolf, Jr. and A. John Fiorino, "Some Perspectives of Educational Change," The Educational Forum, XXXVIII, No. 1, ed. Jack R. Frymier (Columbus, Ohio: Kappa Delta Pi, The Ohio State University, November, 1973), p. 81.

[75]Robert Chin, op. cit., p. 54.

[76]Ronald G. Havelock, op. cit., p. 97.

[77]Ibid., p. 97.

the recommendation to be feasibile within the existing structure.[78] Miel feels that it is necessary to make a careful study of the innovation itself in order to get a full picture of the requirements of a particular alternative.[79]

Mentally working through each alternative is a significant step involved in the final selection of an alternative. Frymier writes that,

> Once several ways of doing things have been described, it then becomes the responsibility of those interested in change to 'think through' the possibilities carefully and completely.[80]

Hyrnyk speaks of exploring the available options, and then selecting the one which promises to be most efficient and effective in filling the need.[81] Havelock stresses that, before selecting a specific alternative, the change agent should determine whether the proposed innovation will actually provide the promised benefits, if it will perform reliably, if the client can meet the dollar human cost, and whether the client has the staff to operate the innovation successfully.[82]

---

[78]Emil J. Haller, op. cit., p. 48.

[79]Alice M. Miel, "Developing Strategies of Planned Innovation," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 159.

[80]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 290.

[81]N. P. Hyrnyk, "Professional Accountability," Achieving Educational Improvements, ed. W. Glyn Roberts (Calgary: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1971), p. 144.

Leskiw regards the choice of a final alternative as a five stage process. He indicates that the person interested in change should:

1. Search out all possible alternatives.
2. Decide upon one specific one.
3. Pilot it through the test period.
4. Assess the degree of worth.
5. Decide what alterations must be made before that particular choice is to be adopted.[83]

Planning for Implementation

Budget considerations--Riffel states that:

> Planning requires an awareness of available resources and competing priorities. In education, the demand for resources is usually higher than the supply, and funds for the implementation of all programs which seem necessary generally cannot be found. Further, there is an opportunity cost associated with appropriations, since the amount spent on one program limits the amount available for other programs.[84]

Failure to take a hard look at the available resources and projected costs of a proposed program increase the chances that the program will not reach the stage of institutionalization. Hechinger points out that the failure to make realistic cost estimates and provide the necessary financial support

---

[83] R. J. Leskiw, op. cit., p. 32.

[84] J. A. Riffel, Education Planning Reexamined (Edmonton: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971), p. 67.

is a factor common to most planning.[85] Lawler emphasizes not only the need for short term budgeting, but also the need to plan for long term budgeting if the school is to adopt and institutionalize the change.[86]

Accountability is presently exerting a noticeable influence on educational programs. Leskiw warns that,

> The next few years will see an increasing emphasis placed on accountability, particularly in sectors farthest removed from the source of money.[87]

Hartley stresses the necessity of integrating curriculum planning with financial administration.[88] Parnes writes that educational needs are relative not only to goals, but also to economics. In his view, if the economic plans for a country call for a stock of highly trained manpower with specific levels of education, then the schools must regard this as a "need" within their system.[89]

---

[85]Fred M. Hechinger cited in Alice M. Miel, "Developing Strategies of Planned Innovation," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 157.

[86]Marcella R. Lawler, op. cit., p. 37.

[87]R. J. Leskiw, op. cit., p. 23.

[88]Harry J. Hartley, op. cit., p. 1.

[89]Herbert S. Parnes, "Assessing the Educational Needs of a Nation," Achieving Educational Improvements, ed. Don Adams (Syracuse: Center for Development Education, All University School of Education, Syracuse University, 1964), p. 50.

Anderson and Lauwerys write that financial allocations are fundamentally instruments used to determine priorities.[90] However, this does not imply that flexibility should not be considered when establishing these priorities. Paul Mort indicates that, if an innovation is devisible so that it can be adopted on a partial, flexible basis, the obstacle of cost becomes less formidable.[91]

Hyrnyk raises the point that a financial commitment to a particular program represents ideological commitment to the program by the funding agency.[92] Frymier warns of the danger of school boards simply approving proposals that outside agencies are willing to fund. In his opinion, the board should be willing to allocate additional funds as an indication of their commitment to that particular program.[93]

The presence of available funds can also act as a stimulus for innovation. The "education decade" from 1957-1967 which John Goodlad referred to was largely a result of funds

---

[90]Gary J. Anderson and Joseph A. Lauwreys, "Altering the Structure of Teacher Education: A Case Study from Atlantic Canada," Interchange, IV, No. 2-3, ed. Andrew Effrat (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973), p. 88.

[91]Paul Mort, "Research: An Overview," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 265.

[92]N. P. Hyrnyk, op. cit., p. 291.

[93]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 289.

made available to education by the federal government of the United States.[94] Leggatt states that, "The availability of funds sometimes may exercise significant pressure for innovation on school administrators."[95]

Dwayne Huebner sums up the importance of careful budgetery considerations when he writes: "Curriculum change is not simply a matter of theory or value or ideology, but is also a matter of hard cash."[96]

Establishing an organizational structure--Although there is general agreement on the need for a strong organizational structure, most writers underscore the need to allow for the diffusion of power within such a structure.

One of the basic determinants of effective organizational structure is the degree to which it allows for the effective flow of ideas. Lawler talks about the need for a structure that encourages both internal and external feedback.[97] McGregor stresses that a structure should allow

---

[94]Opinion expressed by John I. Goodlad, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California in Los Angeles, in an address ("The Resistance of Schools to Change"), produced by Charles C. Wall and Ronald Kidd, Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972. (Audiotape).

[95]Timothy Leggatt, "The Use of Non-Professionals in Large-City Systems," Innovation in Mass Education, ed. David Street (New York: Wiley-Interscience, John Wiley and Sons, 1969), p. 193.

[96]Dwayne Huebner, "Leadership Role in Curricular Change," Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, ed. Marcella R. Lawler (New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970), p. 137.

[97]Marcella R. Lawler, op. cit., p. 46.

managers to collaborate with other members of the organization in achieving the objectives of the organization, with the ultimate goal of utilizing the contributions of all human resources in order to arrive at the best decisions.[98] Leskiw warns that it is not enough to simply set up a carefully structured system. After this has occurred, each member of the group must acquire a thorough knowledge of the structure, including such things as where decisions are to be made, how they can be influenced, who has control and how this control can be altered.[99]

If organizational structure becomes too hierarchial, the possibility for effective change can be diminished. Griffiths writes that the more hierarchial an organization becomes, the less the possibility for change.[100] Hayward warns that programs which are organized on a strict vertical line may not be able to draw upon special local resources and insights.[101] McGregor sights one research study of top management which found that

> . . . 85 percent of the communications within the group took place between individual subordinates and their superior (up and down), and only 15 percent laterally between the subordinates.[102]

---

[98]Douglas McGregor, op. cit., p. 175.

[99]R. J. Leskiw, op. cit., p. 26.

[100]Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 434.

[101]Beresford Hayward, op. cit., p. 95.

[102]Douglas McGregor, op. cit., p. 228.

Preparation of participants--John Goodlad proposes the idea that, although many teachers are busily engaged in a wide variety of in-service activities, their pedagogy is not being updated, nor are the problems which they perceive in their schools being remedied. In his opinion, there are two major things that must be done:

> First, teachers must be held accountable for acquiring the new skills they need within a structure that provides and pays for such opportunity. Just a little contemplation reveals that, in this country, schooling is the largest industry that does not provide for the systematic updating of its personnel at the cost of the enterprise.
>
> .....
>
> Finally, our exploration revealed that teachers simply are not exposed to exemplary models of schools or pedagogy. They seek to non-grade, team teach, and individualize instruction while possessing only the vaguest insights into the nature and actual conduct of such classes. Preoccupied with managing a class all day, teachers have little opportunity to observe alternative procedures.[103]

Matthew Miles,[104] W. G. Roberts[105] and N. P. Hrynyk[106]

---

[103]John I. Goodlad, M. Frances Klein and Associates, Behind the Classroom Door (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970), p. 108.

[104]Matthew B. Miles, "Innovation in Education; Some Generalizations," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 653.

[105]W. Glyn Roberts, "In Search of How," Achieving Educational Improvements, ed. W. Glyn Roberts (Calgary: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1971), p. 110.

[106]N. P. Hyrnyk, op. cit., p. 144.

are among those who agree with the need for sufficient preparation for those involved in a particular change.

The form in which this training will take place, and also the length of time devoted to it, will vary according to the nature and complexity of the change being undertaken. Frymier suggests summer workshops, regular inservice meetings, college courses and individualized training sessions as possible ways in which training could be provided. He feels that training should begin two to six weeks prior to the beginning of the school year, but that it should also occur during the year when problems arise.[107] Griffiths writes that teachers involved in innovative projects should be trained in the areas of openness, trust and equalitarianism.[108] Roberts cites an example in which the school board in Peterborough, Ontario, in planning an innovation for grades 4, 5 and 6, agreed to release all participating teachers for a minimum of one, two-hour period each week, so that group planning could take place.[109]

Program Operation

Ronald Havelock, in his book The Change Agents' Guide to Innovation in Education, makes several suggestions for

---

[107] Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 292.

[108] Daniel E. Griffiths, op. cit., p. 473.

[109] W. Glyn Roberts, op. cit., p. 104.

improving the operation of a new program. The following section on program operation is a synthesis of some of his ideas on ways in which the operation of an innovative program can be improved.

Allowing for flexibility--Havelock writes of the wisdom of examining objections which the client has, and then granting concessions accordingly. By doing this, there remains the likelihood that the major portion of the plan will still be accepted. However, by attempting to downplay the client's objections, the change agent runs the risk of either alienating the client, or having him abandon the total program.

Havelock speaks of the need for "shifting gears," depending on the readiness of the client. If the client is more sophisticated than expected, or if the agent has over-anticipated the amount of resistance, it may be necessary to increase the tempo. On the other hand, if the innovation cannot be adapted as readily as originally planned, it may be necessary to slow down. On occasions, if more pressure and more hard salesmanship would only increase the resistance, it may be most appropriate to simply back off.

A third factor in allowing for flexibility which Havelock suggests consists of adopting an open ended collaberative strategy with the client. This collaboration not only allows the client to get involved and motivated, but also nurtures the concept that the client is willing and able to innovate on his own initiative.

Stabilizing the innovation--Although the idea of stabilizing the innovation is important, it must be carried out with caution.[110]

> A sophisticated consumer accepts innovations only so long as they benefit him more than competing innovations. Thus, stabilization should only be partial, never total. The client should retain the flexibility and the freedom to discontinue an innovation when something better comes along.[111]

However, built into any program must be the opportunity for the client to internalize the process, so that the new program will be maintained as long as desired.[112] Havelock lists six basic requirements for insuring the continuance of a program;

1. The client must feel that there is something to be gained through use of the innovation.

2. The innovation should eventually become a part of the everyday life of the client, so that it can be used without undue effort.

3. Provision must be made for the time and money necessary to operate the program.

4. There should be allowance for reinspection and re-evaluation of the innovation over a period of time. This need not be a rigorous and detailed measurement, but rather an objective inspection and re-appraisal. Ideally,

---

[110] Ronald G. Havelock. op. cit., pp. 129-131.

[111] Ibid., p. 136.

[112] Ibid., p. 133.

it should be performed by someone not personally involved in the innovation.

5. Because breakdowns and misapplications are bound to occur, there must be some sort of maintenance system built into any innovative program. Since the change agent cannot predict when a breakdown will occur, and cannot remain on the spot indefinitely, this maintenance purpose should be provided by someone trained for this purpose.

6. The client will be more apt to continue using the innovation effectively if allowance is made for him to reshape it to meet changing needs.[113]

Disengagement--Havelock stresses the importance of disengagement of the change agent from the innovation. In his opinion, the two key questions that are important in regard to disengagement are determining when disengagement should occur and how it should be brought about.[114] In answer to the first question, Havelock writes:

> You can begin to think about disengagement when you start to show signs of internalization of the innovation or preferably, when you see signs that self-renewal capacity is beginning to build. There are three basic conditions which allow withdrawal on happy and honorable terms; (a) there is good evidence that the originally diagnosed problem is on its way to solution; (b) the innovation has been

---

[113] Ibid., pp. 134-135.

[114] Ibid., p. 139.

> accepted by the leadership and is beginning to diffuse rapidly among other system members; (c) there is evidence that the system is generating a self-renewal capacity.[115]

In terms of how disengagement should occur, Havelock writes that the change agent should think through with the client how to carry on without his assistance. Nevertheless, complete termination is neither necessary, not advisable, as the change agent should be available for emergency help at any time.[116]

Evaluation

In the past, many incidents have occurred in which educators have supported, and even enthusiastically endorsed, educational programs which have later proven to be unsound. Consequently, it is not surprising to find that one of the most commonly stressed areas in the innovative process is that of evaluation. Frymier speaks of the value of observational devices and assessment procedures.[117] Haller discusses the necessity of a systematic and comprehensive research program at the building level.[118] Giler feels that, in order to provide maximum assurance that proper evaluation will take place, an evaluation program should be drawn up in advance, which outlines who will conduct the evaluation, how it will be carried

---

[115] Ibid., p. 139.

[116] Ibid., p. 139.

[117] Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 302.

[118] Emil J. Haller, op. cit., p. 61.

out, and when it will be done.[119] Roberta White warns that,

> It is imperative that educators avoid jumping on band wagons until innovative practices have been meticulously evaluated in terms of operational objectives.[120]

In terms of the problem of subjectivity, writers such as Matthew Miles[121] and Havelock[122] suggest that evaluation should be given to somebody not directly involved with the program. Hyrnyk speaks of the need for well trained evaluators, adding that they must have confidence that any feedback will produce changes in the program, or result in a new program altogether.[123] Corbally, Jenson and Staub feel that all appraisals, no matter how carefully planned, have subjective features, even to the point that what is considered improvement is a judgmental process, based on professional beliefs, understandings and aspirations.[124]

---

[119]Frederic T. Giles and Clifford D. Foster, op. cit., p. 11.

[120]Robert T. White, "Today, a Small Step. Tomorrow, a Great Leap!," The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, XXXVII - i, ed. Isabel C. Kerner (Austin, Texas: The Delta Kappa Gamma Society, Fall, 1971), p. 9.

[121]Matthew B. Miles, "Innovation in Education; Some Generalizations," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 652.

[122]Ronald G. Havelock, op. cit., p. 135.

[123]N. P. Hyrnyk, op. cit., p. 144.

[124]John E. Corbally Jr., H. J. Jenson and W. Frederick Staub, op. cit., p. 57.

A number of questions are raised in terms of how best to evaluate. Lawler indicates that it is important to measure the short-range progress of the student, as well as the long-term goals of the innovation.[125] Goldberg writes that

> . . . both the short- and long-range goals of an innovation must be clearly delineated and their achievement as well as their interrelationship studied before schools can have a sound basis on which to decide whether or not to accept or reject the new procedures.[126]

Frank Murray reports on a study carried out by the University of Minnesota, in which a survey had been conducted among thirty-four faculty members of the Department of Educational Psychology and fifty members of the Burnsville Junior High School in Minnesota. The survey requested them to rank order the most important kinds of information in determining the value of a particular program. Junior high school teachers indicated that the most valuable piece of information would be, "The results of a questionnaire given to teachers who had actually used or practiced the innovation." The faculty, on the other hand, indicated that the most valuable piece of information would be,

> A comparison of standardized test results between equivalent groups of children who have and have not been subjected to the innovation, or a comparison of standardized test results for a group before and after the

---

[125]Marcella R. Lawler, op. cit., p. 33.

[126]Miriam L. Goldberg, op. cit., p. 52.

innovation.[127]

Modification and Stabilization

Once evaluation has been carried out, the program should be modified in light of the results of the evaluation. Michael Kelly emphasizes that, under this process, educational planning would become a continuous process in which evaluation would act as a source of feedback for program modification.[128] Riffel regards educational planning as a cyclical and continuing process, which does not finish with the production of a plan.[129] He writes that,

> As plans are brought toward implementation and after they have been put into effect, they are recycled and revised to accommodate changes in the system and its resources or to correct errors in the initial plan.[130]

Goodwin Watson and Edward Glaser speak of the need for program modification when they write: "Part of any program of change should be a procedure for periodic review and revision."[131]

---

[127]Frank B. Murray, "Credability of Information for Educational Innovation," The Journal of Educational Research, CXVI, No. 1, September, 1970, p. 18.

[128]Michael Kelly, op. cit., p. 87.

[129]J. A. Riffel, Education Planning Reexamined (Edmonton: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971), p. 120.

[130]Ibid., p. 12.

[131]Watson Glaser and Edward Glaser quoted in Ronald G. Havelock, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973), p. 46.

Once this stage has been reached, there should be a period in which the program is allowed to gel. Havelock refers to this as a period of "stabilizing the innovation."[132] Frymier regards it as

> . . . a view of the change as 'part of the regular scene,' a fading of change from 'figure' into 'ground' with a preservation of its essential features . . . .[133]

Watson and Glaser express the importance of this stage when they write:

> Following any important change comes a period during which equilibrium is being established. Yet that condition, too, is only temporary. The organization that has accepted an innovation may need a breathing spell in which to consolidate what it has learned. But if the organization is geared to continued growth, its members will value forward-moving change as a recurrent and desirable phenomena. From the plateau on which equilibrium is regained, the cycle of change can be launched again.[134]

---

[132]Ronald G. Havelock, op. cit., p. 133.

[133]Jack R. Frymier, op. cit., p. 287.

[134]Watson Glaser and Edward Glaser quoted in Ronald G. Havelock, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973), p. 46.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As previously stated, the basic purpose of this study was to examine educational innovation and evaluation through an examination of specific procedures employed in the design, implementation and operation of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (ISEP) at the interprovincial and provincial level of operation.

The program was studied by examining:

1. The operational principles functioning during the design, implementation and operation of the program.
2. The existence of an awareness of the need for such a program by the coordinators at the interprovincial and provincial level of operation.
3. The methods employed in preparing for effecting change.
4. The methods employed in developing the specific proposal of ISEP.
5. The plan of action used to implement the program.
6. The actual operation of ISEP.
7. The methods used in the evaluation and subsequent modification of the program.

In general terms, this study attempted to consider the following questions;

1. What does the literature indicate to be important procedures necessary to maximize the chances of success of an innovation?

2. How was innovation carried out in the case of ISEP?

3. What were some of the "successful" features of the program?

4. What procedures in the design, implementation and operation of the project appear to have been most conductive to effective results in this venture?

5. What modifications in the initial design, implementation and operation of the program were necessary as a result of attempting to translate a theoretical plan of action as proposed in ISEP into a practical program?

The first question was approached through a review of the literature. A framework of innovation was drawn up by consolidating the ideas of various writers and researchers in the field of educational innovation.

The second, third and fourth questions were considered by an examination of records and documents dealing with ISEP, as well as personal interviews carried out with selected members of ISEP. Those phases of the program which appeared to have been successful were isolated and analyzed. An attempt was then made to account for the reason(s) for their success.

The fifth question was considered by isolating and analyzing those situations where modifications in the initial plan were necessary as a result of unanticipated problems

encountered.

This piece of research was done as a case study. In defining a case study, Good and Scates stated that:

> The essential procedure of the case study method is to take account of all pertinent aspects of one thing or situation, employing as a unit for study an individual, an institution, a community or any group considered as a unit. The case consists of the data relating to some phase of the life history of the unit or relating to the entire life process, whether the unit is an individual, a family, a social group, an institution, or a community.[1]

Tyrus Hillway stated that,

> Essentially the case study method comprises a careful and comprehensive analysis of the development and status of one individual, group or institution.[2]

The basic rationale for the case study is that there are processes and interactions which can best be studied as they operate within an individual or group.[3] The hope is that people working in a particular field will improve their methods of operating by studying current experience.[4] The main steps

---

[1]Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, Methods of Research (New York: Educational Division, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), p. 3.

[2]Tyrus Hillway, Introduction to Research (2nd ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964), p. 244.

[3]David J. Fox, The Research Process in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), p. 427.

[4]Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley, Educational Research: New Perspectives (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1963), p. 267.

in the case study method are collecting data, recording this data, deriving conclusions from an analysis of this data, and, on the basis of these conclusions, making recommendations.

As a form of descriptive research, the case study is concerned with what is.

> The case study is concerned with everything that is significant in the history or development of the actual situation. The purpose is to understand the life cycle, or an important part of the life cycle, of an individual unit.[5]

The basic advantages of the case study method are that it allows for the use of a combination of research procedures, that the indepth examination involved may uncover information that might have been overlooked in other methods of research, and that it affords the opportunity to study real situations from a relatively secure position. The major limitations of the case study are the same as those for any piece of scientific research, and center around the manner in which the research procedures are set up and carried out. The element of subjectivity, as well as the lack of hypothesis testing, are two further limitations.

---

[5]John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959), pp. 112-113.

CHAPTER IV

THE STORY OF THE INTERPROVINCIAL SCHOOL EVALUATION PROJECT

The origins of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (ISEP) can be traced back to an early movement toward interprovincial cooperation in educational research and development. One of the leading spokesmen of this movement was Dr. J. B. Kirkpatrick, Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. Dr. Kirkpatrick had a keen interest in educational research and development, and in particular was intrigued with the possibility of interprovincial co-operation in that area. In 1968, he presented a paper at the annual meeting of the Canadian Council for Research in Education in Vancouver, at which time he stressed the benefits to be gained from such co-operation. In spite of his efforts, however, it appeared that the address had fallen on deaf ears.

During that same year, the Social Credit Government in Alberta had created the Human Resources Research Council (HRRC), which served as a research and development organization in education. One of the interests of several staff members of HRRC was to promote the idea of interprovincial co-operation in educational research and development.

In October of 1970, HRRC sponsored a conference on educational planning in Banff, Alberta. Although the conference was national in scope, most of those present were from Western Canada. On the evening of October 20, a group of conference delegates, meeting informally, decided to revive the idea of interprovincial co-operation. Those interested in the prospects of such an undertaking agreed to hold a meeting in Saskatoon on December 20, 1970, to discuss means of establishing such a venture. Each delegate was asked to do an informal needs survey for his province prior to coming to this meeting. The need for improved evaluation systems was cited by several members from each province.

One of the presentations made during the course of the Saskatoon meeting dealt with the merits of the Elementary School Evaluation Kit, an instrument devised at the Center for the Study of Evaluation at the University of California in Los Angeles. Because of the interest in evaluation sparked by this presentation, as well as a realization by delegates that evaluation was rapidly becoming a major concern among educators, it was decided that the focus of an interprovincial research and development project should be evaluation.

At this meeting, certain basic decisions were made as to how the project should operate. Those present agreed that the project should;

1. be coordinated by someone from HRRC.
2. Operate on a low budget.
3. Encourage the social interaction of participants,

so as to encourage learning from each other.

4. Operate as a loosely knit federation.

5. Involve a number of educational groups, such as teacher and trustee organizations and provincial departments of education.

At a meeting held in Edmonton in April of 1971, the organization decided to go public.

> At this meeting a tentative structure was organized with Russ Pacey of the Alberta Human Resources Research Council appointed project director and with Kris Breckman named as Manitoba's liaison officer together with Art McBeath from Saskatchewan and Jack Reid from Alberta.[1]

A number of educators from British Columbia had been invited to this meeting, to see if they would be interested in becoming involved. However, because of the added expense involved if British Columbia were to join, as well as the uncertain attitude shown toward the project by many of the delegates from that province, it was decided that ISEP would operate only within the three prairie provinces.

After this meeting there was a temporary slowdown, due to the fact that many of those involved in its organization were away on holidays during the summer months. For the next few months, members kept in touch only loosely.

In August of 1971, another planning meeting was held in Winnipeg. During the course of this meeting, a formal

---

[1]Manitoba Educational Research Council School Evaluation Committee, Minutes of Meeting (Winnipeg, Manitoba, December 15, 1971).

proposal for the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project was drawn up, and an organizational structure for the project was finalized.

I. THE INTERPROVINCIAL ORGANIZATION

Structurally, the interprovincial organization was set up to operate in the following way:

THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INTERPROVINCIAL SCHOOL EVALUATION PROJECT COMMITTEE.

Objectives

The objectives of the committee are to coordinate, integrate and assist through the Provincial Coordinators the efforts of the respective provincial committees, school districts and schools in the design and implementation of the local school program evaluation projects.

These functions will be operationalized through the sharing and distribution of information related to proposed projects and resources on the topic of evaluation, newsletters, interprovincial conferences and through activities and duties assigned to the coordinator.

Membership

a. The Committee will consist of representatives from each of the Provincial Committees together with the Interprovincial Coordinator.

b. Two provincial representatives shall be designated by the respective Provincial Committees.

c. The position of Interprovincial Coordinator shall be an annual appointment--it will be the responsibility of the Interprovincial Committee to review the tenure of the incumbent by April of each year.

d. The Committee shall elect its own chairman and hold an annual meeting called by the chairman.

Responsibilities and Duties of the Interprovincial Coordinator

a. Be, in all matters, responsible to the Interprovincial Committee.

b. Act as editor of the Evaluation Newsletter.

c. Maintain communication--written and personal--through the Provincial Coordinators, with the evaluation project schools for the purpose of:

-identifying and being responsive to needs
-providing a 'clearing house' service in the matter of resource personnel and material
-collecting a descriptive account of each of the projects including developmental processes used.

d. In conjunction with the Provincial Coordinators, take primary responsibility in the organization of the interprovincial conferences.

e. Act as a budget officer and signing authority for monies granted to and dispersed on behalf of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project Committee.

f. Act as publicity officer for the Project.

Responsibilities and Duties of the Interprovincial Committee and its Members

Annually review program plans and budget.[2]

After this meeting, an event occurred which was to have very significant implications for ISEP. The provincial election

---

[2]Interprovincial School Evaluation Project, The Organizational Structure of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project Committee, A Report Prepared at an Organizational Meeting (Winnipeg, Manitoba, August, 1971).

held in Alberta in the fall of 1971 saw the Social Credit party removed from office and replaced by the Conservatives. It was generally believed by staff members at HRRC that the Conservative party was not favorably disposed to their organization.[3] As a result, for the next few months, staff members at HRRC spent a great deal of time on matters related to the future of their organization, and consequently had less time to spend on ISEP.

With the fate of HRRC now hanging in the balance, a certain amount of hesitation and ambivalence set in among ISEP participants. Members were forced to decide how serious they were about the project, and whether they were committed enough to carry on without the assistance of HRRC. It also forced them to consider such things as how development, coordination and dissemination would take place if HRRC were disbanded.

In January of 1972, the Conservative government announced the demise of HRRC, effective August 31 of that year. The Government's action now forced project members to make a decision. Until this time, they had been able to carry on, hopeful that HRRC would survive and continue to provide leadership for the project. Now, however, they knew that if ISEP were to continue, leadership would have to come from within their group.

---

[3]Interview with J. A. Riffel, Manitoba Coordinator of ISEP, March 25, 1975.

One of the factors which aided them in their decision making was that, after the January announcement, all staff members at HRRC who had been involved with ISEP agreed to help out by placing it high on their list of priorities, and agreeing to do whatever they could to aid in its development. Consequently, those involved with ISEP at this point emerged with a recommittment to its principles.

With the termination of HRRC, ISEP was forced to look elsewhere for an interprovincial coordinator. Dr. A. Kratzman, the Dean of Education at the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, was approached to see if he would agree to a proposal whereby, in return for one-quarter of one staff member's salary, the university would agree to give ISEP a half-time person to coordinate the project. In June of 1972, agreement was reached on this proposal, and Dr. A. Nickel from the Mathematics Education Department was appointed the new interprovincial coordinator.

In May, 1972, the first edition of the Evaluation Newsletter (the official publication of ISEP), was issued. It described ISEP on the following way;

> The project was established in response to an increasing need on the part of school people to more effectively evaluate their school programs. In the face of increasing criticism over rising educational expenditures, schools are being asked to justify innovations in their school programs and in most cases are unable to do so effectively. This project intends to encourage and assist schools in evaluating their programs by identifying and making available materials, techniques and resource people relevant to the evaluation process. Internal, rather than external evaluation will be the focus,

> with the school staff and community jointly involved in assessing the present program and future needs of their school. The project is interprovincial because of the realization that this is a common problem in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, and that a more effective attack on the problem can be launched with the resources of organizations in all three provinces. There is also an increasing willingness to cooperate in educational research inter-provincially, based partly on an awareness of the advantages of such cooperation, and more specifically on the success of Project Canada West, which has provided a practical demonstration of the potential effectiveness of interprovincial coopera-tion.[4]

In describing what would happen in the project, the Newsletter stated that:

> An action-oriented project, developmental in nature, has been designed . . . . The project schools will have a team of resource people working with them in planning and carrying out their evaluation activities. These teams will be comprised of participants from the various organizations involved in the project. .....
> A major premise of the project is that there are many evaluation materials, techniques and procedures in existence now which could be of use to school people if they were aware of them. This project would hope to identify existing resources and make them available to schools, thereby serving the dual purpose of assisting school people while at the same time making more useful the work of the researchers who developed the materials.[5]

---

[4] R. J. Pacey (ed.), Evaluation Newsletter, I, No. 1 (Edmonton: Alberta Human Resources Research Council, 1972).

[5] Ibid.

The plans at this time were to have the project occur in three specific phases. The Newsletter identified those three phases as:

> PHASE 1 - PLANNING AND INITIATION
>
> Two concurrent developments will be necessary to prepare for implementation of the projects:
>
> (1) Identification of participating schools. Approximately five schools will be selected in each of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, primarily on the basis of an interest in evaluating all or some aspect of their school program and willingness to make a committment to the project.
>
> (2) Identification of project personnel to work with participating schools. Individuals from the participating organizations and institutions will form project teams. Each project school will have a team of project people working with them as resource persons and consultants on their evaluation activities. One of the first tasks for project participants will be to begin to identify and gather resourc- relevant to school evaluation; these will include resource people as well as materials, procedures and techniques which might be useful to the schools undertaking evaluation of their program. The purpose of this particular activity would be to make available to each of the participating schools relevant ideas and materials from all three provinces. The project teams will have a dual role. On the one hand, they will work closely to assist the project schools in the planning and implementation of their evaluation. At the same time, they will be systematically observing and recording the experiences of the school people in planning and carrying out their evaluation. The information gathered by project participants will be the essence of the project at this developmental stage. It is anticipated that new insights into the evaluation process will be gained from the cumulative experiences of the project schools. Furthermore, the successes and failures of the various subprojects should enable the project participants to identify strategies, procedures and materials which have proven successful in enabling staff to evaluate their school

> program. Here again, effective inter-provincial cooperation will allow all the project schools to benefit from each individual school's experiences.
> .....
>
> PHASE 2 - IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION
>
> The project teams will work with the schools to help carry out their evaluation plans. Careful coordination, intra-provincially and interprovincially, will help project teams provide effective assistance to the schools.
>
> At the same time as the project teams are assisting the schools with the evaluation, they will continue to observe and record the processes through which the schools are moving in their evaluation activity. The key elements in the project will be interaction and cooperation. The project schools will have the opportunity to work directly with people interested in school evaluation and will have the advantage of resources from three provinces being able to assist them in their evaluation. Project personnel, on the other hand, will benefit from increased interaction with one another and from the opportunity to work directly with schools who are attempting to evaluate their programs.
>
> PHASE 3 - DISSEMINATION
>
> Dissemination will, of course, be a major aspect of coordination throughout the project. However, one of the purposes of the project is to encourage evaluation in all schools. Thus, a major effort will be made to make the findings of this project available to all schools.[6]

Financially, ISEP operated at three levels--inter-provincially, provincially and at the school level. Beginning

---

[6] Ibid.

in September, 1972, each province contributed $3,000 per year for two years to the interprovincial organization. The $18,000 which resulted from these contributions was used to pay the salary of the interprovincial coordinator as well as pay for meetings and other administrative expenses encountered at that level. At the provincial and school level, budgets and sources of income varied for each specific case.

Essentially, the first two years of operation were spent initiating and consolidating ISEP's overall operations.

> In retrospect, most of the time in the project seems to have been taken up with creating the inter-institutional framework, within which the project could operate. We were trying to create a consortium which would help schools, and it took us longer to create the consortium than it did for people to carry out their projects.[7]

The last two years were spent in rather intensive operation and activity at the school level. Those involved at the interprovincial and provincial level of operation spent a good deal of time talking to participants about their concerns, and helping them to carry on with the operation of their projects. Each province had appointed a project coordinator, who now played a key role in operations within his own province.

> The coordinators of the project promoted the activities of the project schools in a variety of ways. Dissemination of information was one of the major means used to accomplish the aims of ISEP. Reports of activities in the schools

---

[7] J. A. Riffel, op. cit.

> were distributed to the sponsoring agencies, to the participating schools, and to the media. Information was also shared with agencies in other parts of Canada. Liaison among the project schools was maintained by the coordinator who was also responsible for interprovincial cooperation. Contacts were made among schools in three provinces, resulting in a number of informative inter-school visits. Resources in the form of materials and consultant assistance were made available to the project schools. Conferences were held for participants in the project. Schools shared reports on aims, processes, difficulties and resources.[8]

The coordinator, while expected to promote these various activities had to be careful as to the amount and timing of help offered.

> It is a matter for sensitive judgment on the part of the coordinator or the consultant to determine when it is appropriate to take the initiative and to intervene. It may not be appropriate to intervene at all in certain cases: support and facilitative services may be all that is required. In other circumstances, however, a contribution based on knowledge and experience may prove to be the turning point in moving the project along the path to success. The importance for the coordinator of maintaining open communications and of being sensitive to the reactions of participants cannot be over-emphasized.[9]

---

[8] J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Hersom and Colleagues, Developing Evaluation Systems in Schools: Organizational Strategies, a Report from the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (Saskatoon: Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, February, 1975), p. 60.

[9] Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, Final Report presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November, 1974), p. 15.

Another key role during this time was that played by the consultant. Consultants, working without fee, were assigned to each of the project schools. In many cases, these people provided invaluable assistance to schools in their struggle to establish and maintain their programs.

An important part of each school's project was a case study write up. Each school had been encouraged to keep a log, in which they recorded major events which occurred during the course of their project. Near the end of the 1973-74 school term, conferences were held in Edmonton and Regina, at which participants were given assistance in writing up their project reports. In the end, all participating schools except W. C. Miller Collegiate in Altona submitted a case study report of their particular project. These reports were very valuable, not only because they forced participants to rethink their entire undertaking, but also because they were a valuable source of information to anyone wishing to follow up on the project, or to begin a similar project of their own.

The final step in the project was the publication, in February, 1975 of a monograph entitled Developing Evaluation Systems in Schools: Organizational Strategies, by J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Hersom and Colleagues. This monograph, which was a report from the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project, combined theoretical organizational strategies for those wishing to develop evaluation systems in schools, with descriptions of events and findings from those schools which had participated in ISEP. In the words of the authors:

> . . . this monograph is only a beginning in the improvement of evaluation. It deals with evaluation not so much in terms of as we know it is or as it should be, but in terms as we know it can become. We hope it will be a useful beginning--that it will provide insights, if not answers, into some of the issues which will face those concerned with developing evaluation systems in schools.[10]

II. THE PROVINCIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Those associated with ISEP had recognized for some time that significant structural, political, social and contextual differences existed between the three provinces which made it impossible for each one to operate in the same way. Therefore, each province had its own organization which made basic decisions as to how the project would function within that province. This paper will now examine in some detail ISEP operations within each province.

A. Alberta

In early February, 1972, Dr. E. Ingram and Dr. A. Riffel, both staff members at HRRC, began to identify schools in Alberta that would consider participating in ISEP. In three out of four cases, they chose schools in which they had already established relationships with personnel within the school districts. The schools selected to participate were:

---

[10] J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Hersom and Colleagues, op. cit., p. 3.

(1) Lethbridge Public School District No. 51,

(2) Brentwood School, Strathcona County,

(3) St. Joseph's High School, Edmonton Catholic School Board, and

(4) St. Mary's, St. Monica's and St. Martin de Porre's Schools, Calgary Separate School Board.

In May of 1972, Dr. N. Hersom from the University of Alberta was appointed provincial coordinator. During the summer months, she engaged in preparatory activities designed to facilitate the project's development. Her activities included communicating with people to serve as members of a provincial policy committee, setting up banking arrangements, contacting participating schools and obtaining the assistance of Mr. Bernard Masters to act as executive secretary.

The first Provincial Policy Committee meeting was held on September 9, 1972 in Calgary, and was attended by members of the following support agencies--the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Alberta Department of Education, the Lethbridge Public School District, the University of Alberta and the Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies. At this meeting, the following decisions were made;

1. To name the project the Alberta School Program Evaluation Project (ASPEP).

2. To endorse the purposes of ISEP, with the initial emphasis on communicatin and assistance to the project schools in planning and implementing evaluative activities.

3. To charge the provincial coordinator with the responsibility of coordinating the ASPEP activities of the project schools.

4. To take responsibility for the budget, policies concerning management of the project, reporting and publicity, project evaluation and liaison with Manitoba and Saskatchewan projects, and with the interprovincial coordinator.

5. To hold Policy Committee meetings twice each year in Calgary.

The overall objective which the Policy Committee set out for ASPEP was

> . . . to develop a framework or model describing procedures which school staffs might adopt to evaluate educational programs in schools.[11]

Membership in the Policy Committee changed somewhat between the 1972-73 and 1973-74 school years. However, five members of this committee maintained contact for the two year period, and therefore provided a degree of continuity within the committee.

Financially, ASPEP was funded by the Alberta Government Department of Education ($6,000), the Alberta Teachers' Association ($3,000), the Alberta School Trustees' Association ($3,000) and the Human Resources Research Council ($3,000). The three major areas of expenditure were the

---

[11] Naomi Hersom and Bernard Masters, Locally Initiated School Evaluation (Edmonton: Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, August, 1973).

interprovincial fee, an honoraria paid to Dr. Hersom and the travel costs for participants at various ASPEP meetings.

In accordance with ISEP philosophy, each school was encouraged to define its own particular evaluation project, as well as determine the manner in which the project would be carried out. Given below are the four school systems involved in ASPEP, along with a general description of the project undertaken.

Brentwood Elementary School in Sherwood Park focussed on a study of their Social Studies program in grades 1 to 6. A four man steering committee, consisting of the principal, vice-principal and two classroom teachers, was formulated to head up the project. The school began by identifying dissatisfactions with the Social Studies program, and setting out needs that would have to be met in order to improve the program. They then proceeded to meet those needs. In addition, teachers worked in grade groups to develop units of study and resource files for the new Alberta Social Studies Curriculum.

St. Joseph's Composite High School in Edmonton carried out an evaluation of their vocational education program. Staff members at the school attempted to discover why students had enrolled in particular vocational education programs, as well as what use was made of the training they received after graduation. To gather this information, parents, teachers, students and industry were consulted. The findings were then used to improve course offerings at the school. In some cases, courses which were not fulfilling student and industrial needs were phased out of the curriculum, while other phases

of the program were given increased emphasis.

St. Mary's Community School had been created as part of a five year plan with the purpose of establishing a multi-service school as conceived in the Worth Commission Report. It had been formed through the amalgamation of one elementary, one junior high and one high school under the control of a Principal-Designate. As their project, St. Mary's School attempted to develop liaison with non-school agencies and individuals as a means of determining their effectiveness as a community school.

The Lethbridge School System began their project by attempting to identify the basic educational goals for their system. This was done by means of a broad survey of educators, students, parents of students and the general public. The seven major goals which were identified as a result of this exercise were then used as a basis for further curriculum development.

Through a series of provincial and interprovincial meetings, those teachers involved in ASPEP were given the opportunity to come together with teachers from other schools who were also involved in ISEP. These meetings allowed participants to get together in order to exchange ideas, share experiences, plan strategies and socialize. Below is a list of meetings which were available to Alberta participants, along with a brief resume of the main emphasis of each meeting.

Date	Place	Event
June 1-3, 1972	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP meeting to aid schools in determining their area of evaluation.
October 23, 1972	Calgary	ASPEP conference at which participants reported on their individual projects.
November 28, 1972	Edmonton	ASPEP conference at which schools were given help in formulating their projects.
February 16, 1973	Edmonton	ASPEP conference dealing with practical implications for evaluation in a school district.
March 1-3, 1973	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference dealing with evaluation techniques.
November 23-24, 1973	Edmonton	ASPEP conference dealing with conceptual issues of evaluation.
January 23-25, 1974	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference dealing with a variety of topics, including models of professional development and alternate forms of evaluation.
April 5, 1974	Edmonton	ASPEP conference to provide assistance in writing up project reports.
May 11, 1974	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference for all schools to provide assistance in writing up final reports.

B. Saskatchewan

In January of 1972, Dr. A. McBeath sent a letter to all schools in Saskatchewan, describing the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project, and inviting any schools who would like to be involved in such a project to reply. The letter stressed that;

> It is not a project in which external evaluators will assess the program in your school. On the contrary, we would hope to enlist the involvement of school staffs in the evaluation process, through providing them with some resources and making consultant personnel available. At the same time at another level, we would expect to identify and provide existing materials pertaining to school planning and evaluation, in addition to have [SIC] a variety of self-evaluation instruments, processes and procedures tested in school.[12]

A total of thirty-one schools responded to the invitation. After a screening process which involved interviewing teachers from each school, six schools were selected to take part.

In Saskatchewan, ISEP was carried out under the sponsorship of the Saskatchewan Educational Research Association (SERA), with Dr. A. McBeth of the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, acting as provincial coordinator. The bases for the project's operation were determined by a Provincial Coordinating Committee, which was made up of representatives

---

[12] Program Evaluation, An Invitation Sent to all Schools in Saskatchewan from the Coordinating Committee, Western Canadian Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (Regina: The University of Saskatchewan, January 20, 1972).

of a number of educational institutions. The composition of this committee was;

Dr. F. Whitworth, Saskatchewan School Trustees Association

Dr. T. McKague, Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation

Dr. H. Birnie, College of Education, Saskatoon

Dr. A. McBeath, Faculty of Education, Regina Campus (Chairman)

Mrs. A. Sojonky, Saskatchewan Department of Education

Financial support for the Saskatchewan project was offered by the Saskatchewan Department of Education, the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, the College of Education in Saskatoon and the Faculty of Education in Regina. Each of these organizations contributed $600 per year to pay for the $3,000 interprovincial fee collected from each province. Another major source of income was the Department of Education's Innovative Projects Fund. Each participating school had applied for and received sufficient financial assistance to defray the major costs of their project. The Provincial Coordinating Committee operated without a budget, with members paying for expenses out of their own pocket.

As was the case in Alberta, each school was encouraged to define their own project as well as to determine methods of operation. The following is a list of the six schools that took part, along with a brief description of their project.

Pleasant Hill School in Saskatoon entitled their project, "Assessment of Student Evaluation Process in Pleasant

Hill School." Prior to becoming involved with ISEP, the staff had begun to examine closely their methods of evaluating students' progress and the means of communicating this progress to parents. Therefore, as the project evolved, it centered around two general concerns--evaluation and communication. The study was set up to examine the procedures used in the student evaluation process and the methods of communication as they related to teachers, students and parents.

Vanier Collegiate in Moose Jaw chose as their study, "Identification, Articulation and Establishment of School Goals: Evaluation of the Program of a Middle Size High School." The project had arisen at Vanier Collegiate because of the recognized need by staff and administration of identifying and articulating the specific educational goals for the school and relating these goals to the instructional program in the school.

Tisdale Unit Composite School's project was entitled, "The Goals and Objectives of Tisdale Unit Composite School." Their concern was to determine what the community at large saw as the goals and objectives of a composite school. This was seen as a relevant study in light of the fact that the goals and objectives of the school had never been stated, and therefore teachers were not really aware of what the community and students expected from the school.

Kinistino Elementary School dealt with, "Improving Communication Between Home and School." The teachers on staff felt that, for a variety of reasons, many of the parents

were not aware of the goals of the school, had conflicting goals or had no tangible goals of their own. They hoped to use the results of their project not only as a method of improving communication, but also as an aid for future long-term planning.

Martin Collegiate in Regina worked on "A Developmental Model for the Identification and Ongoing Evaluation of Secondary School Objectives: A Community Process." Their goal was

> To develop a process for the identification of the objectives of Martin Collegiate as held by parents, students and professional staff of that school jurisdiction; the evaluation of school performance in its achievement of those objectives; and for on-going reformulation of educational objectives and school performance evaluation.[13]

Weyburn Junior High School dealt with "School Climate at the Weyburn Junior High School." Their objective was to determine methods whereby a junior high school could evaluate itself in an effort to bring greater humanism into all phases of school life. Their concern was triggered by the fact that

> . . . some parents of students in Weyburn Junior High School expressed dismay over what they felt was a 'forced' maturation

---

[13]Robert F. Frohlick, Philip Schalm and Glen M. Belsey, A Developmental Model for the Identification and Ongoing Evaluation of Secondary School Objectives: A Community Process, A Report on the Martin Collegiate Evaluation Project (Regina: Department of Education, 1974), p. 1.

> of their children because of the climate of the school.[14]

Teachers therefore felt that it had become increasingly important to all concerned that an assessment be made as to what was intended and what was actually happening at their school.

Throughout the life of the project, a number of interprovincial and provincial inservices were organized for participants. Given below is a list of those inservices;

Date	Place	Event
June 1-3, 1972	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP meeting to aid schools in determining their area of evaluation.
October 13, 1972	Saskatoon	Meeting of the three northern schools (Tisdale, Kinistino and Pleasant Hill) to exchange information on their project.
November 30 - December 1, 1972	Saskatoon	Provincial ISEP meeting at which each school made a presentation on their project to date.
March 1-3, 1973	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference dealing with evaluation techniques.
October 19, 1973	Regina	Provincial ISEP meeting at which each school discussed the present status of their project.
January 23-25, 1974	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference dealing with a variety of topics, including models of professional development and alternate forms of evaluation.
May 11, 1974	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference for schools to provide assistance in writing up final reports.

---

[14]Ray Hamm, Tony Turnbridge and Anne Marie Merle,

C. Manitoba

In early February, 1972, Dr. J. Peach and Mr. K. Breckman began to identify educators and schools in Manitoba whom they thought might be interested in becoming a part of the project. In this manner, six schools were identified. Each school was then assigned an outside consultant, who was chosen primarily on the basis of interest, competence and ability to work with school and community groups.

The Manitoba phase of ISEP was coordinated by the Manitoba Educational Research Council (MERC). Originally, Mr. K. Breckman of the Manitoba Teachers' Society was named provincial coordinator. However, in October of 1972, Dr. A. Riffel, now on staff at the University of Manitoba, assumed this position when Mr. Breckman left Manitoba to pursue further studies in the United States.

MERC agreed to support the project by providing financial assistance and by setting up a provincial co-ordinating committee, on which members from a number of educational organizations in Manitoba were invited to serve. The final composition of this committee was:

Dr. R. Gray - Manitoba Home and School, Parent Teachers' Association

Mr. J. Downey - Manitoba Educational Research Council

School Climate at the Weyburn Junior High School, A Report on the Weyburn Junior High School Project (Weyburn, Saskatchewan: Weyburn Junior High School, 1974), p. 4.

Dr. P. Coleman - Manitoba Association of School Trustees

Dr. J. Peach - Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

Mr. S. Klym - Manitoba Association of School Inspectors

Mr. G. Green - Manitoba Association of School Superintendents

Mr. W. R. Gordon - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Dr. A. Riffel - Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

Basically, the provincial committee was assigned the following areas of responsibility;

(a) Resources inventory - The identification and cataloguing of procedures, approaches and resources relevant to evaluation and planning.

(b) Development of projects involving individual schools - This involved the selection of schools and resource personnel to conduct individual evaluation projects.

(c) Knowledge expansion - The mobilization of appropriate resources to fill in gaps in existing capabilities.

(d) Dissemination of information - The fostering of communication among project members, teachers and others interested in improving evaluation techniques.

As previously mentioned, MERC had assumed responsibility for financing the Manitoba project. However, one of Dr. Riffel's concerns, as provincial coordinator, was to find sources of income which would relieve MERC of some of this responsibility. Over the course of the Manitoba project,

funding was received from the Manitoba Department of Education ($3,000), the Manitoba Association of School Trustees ($1,000) and the Manitoba Teachers' Society ($500).

In keeping with the ISEP philosophy of local autonomy, each school was urged to take responsibility in determining the nature and direction of their project. Listed below are the six schools involved, along with a brief description of their area of interest:

John Pritchard School, Winnipeg - Their study dealt with community expectations of the school. The staff at this school felt that such a study might show whether the objectives of their school, their school division and the Manitoba Department of Education were in harmony with objectives held by parents and the community. They hoped that such a study might also indicate the influence which social, economic and ethnic factors have on the pattern of expectations for a public school.

Riverside Elementary School, Thompson - Teachers at this school chose to do an evaluation of the integrated day concept which they had recently adopted. The basic process behind the integrated day was that students worked at learning centers which contained units of work relevant to their particular level of development and of interest to them. Because this was a new venture for their school, the staff expressed the desire to evaluate this particular program.

King Edward School in Winnipeg originally chose to do an evaluation of their Early Childhood Demonstration

Project. This had to be dropped, however, when a building program for their school was announced in March of 1973, which meant that the Project would have to be greatly modified. In place of that evaluation, a decision was made to do an evaluation of a new approach being used in their school for the teaching of expository, descriptive and creative writing.

W. C. Miller Collegiate in Altona decided to do a study of community goals and expectations. Essentially, the committee set itself four tasks;

1. To identify community aspirations regarding education.

2. To increase community involvement in the evaluation of the educational system.

3. To make recommendations for future evaluation procedures.

4. To report the results of their undertaking to the local school board.

This study resulted from a recognition of the presence of a polarity of attitudes toward the school. Much of this polarity had occurred because of the closing of high schools in smaller towns, and the transporting of students to the centralized collegiate in Altona.

Neepawa Area Collegiate also chose the area of community goals and expectations as the focus of their study. The outcomes which they hoped to achieve from such a study were;

(a) Improved communication between the community and the school.

(b) A greater awareness of the community's priorities in education.

(c) Greater participation by the community in planning educational changes.

William Russell School in St. Boniface set out to study ways and means of improving communication and cooperation among staff members of an open area school. Their main concern was with such items as improving relationships between teachers, sharing materials and ideas, sharing philosophies of open area teaching, discussing mutual concerns, improving communications at staff meetings and seeking professional expertise.

On December 19, 1972, William Russell School indicated a desire to withdraw from ISEP. They stated that their needs were of a personal nature, and that the general feeling of the staff was that they did not wish to continue. A few months later Neepawa Area Collegiate also withdrew from the project.

At this point, West Kildonan Collegiate was contacted to see if they would be interested in becoming involved. On March 21, 1973, they indicated that they would like to participate. They set up a program to evaluate the effectiveness of pilot courses which they had set up in English and Mathematics at the Grade X level for students who had not fulfilled the requirements of the Grade IX Course, but were

of such an age that repetition of the year's work would probably be counter-productive.

In Manitoba, as in Alberta and Saskatchewan, a number of interprovincial and provincial inservices were held. Listed below are those inservices which were available to Manitoba participants:

Date	Place	Event
June 1-3, 1972	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP meeting to aid schools in determining their area of evaluation.
December 7-8, 1972	Winnipeg	Provincial ISEP meeting dealing with proposal development and progress to date.
February 17, 1973	Winnipeg	Provincial ISEP seminar dealing with evaluation.
March 1-3, 1973	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference dealing with evaluation techniques.
May 10-11, 1973	Winnipeg	Provincial ISEP meeting with workshops on evaluation and the use of the end product of the project.
January 23-25, 1974	Regina	Interprovincial ISEP conference dealing with a variety of topics, including models of professional development and alternate forms of evaluation.
May 11, 1974	Regina	Interprovincial conference for all schools to provide assistance in writing up final reports.

CHAPTER V

AN EXAMINATION OF SELECTED PROCEDURES

This chapter will consist of an examination of selected procedures which were employed in the design, implementation and operation of ISEP. Because the study concentrated on the interprovincial and provincial level of operation, the procedures selected for examination were basically in the area of the establishment of operational principles.

I. FACILITATION OF COMMUNICATION

Those involved with the organization of ISEP recognized the value of having participants know each other well. In their opinion, allowing participants to become well acquainted would improve communication and the exchange of ideas by breaking down many of the institutional barriers which often exist in projects of this nature. For this reason, one of the points emphasized early in the organizational stages was to encourage interaction of participants, so as to promote learning from each other.

One of the major vehicles used to accomplish this exchange of ideas was a series of interprovincial and provincial meetings, which brought participants together on different occasions during the course of the two years.

An examination of records and case studies would

indicate that these meetings were often very valuable in encouraging communication and the exchange of ideas.

> The attendance and participation at provincial and interprovincial seminars resulted not only in the formation of friendships with colleagues in other school divisions and provinces, but also in an exchange of views and ideas. Common areas of concern were often identified and feelings were expressed many times suggesting that an inter-provincial co-operative approach such as ISEP may often be the better method of finding solutions to such problems.[1]

> Inter-Provincial meeting held in Regina attended by project leader and three staff members. Talking to other persons, discussing projects was a very valuable part of the process . . . .[2]

> Even a cursory reading of the participants' reports indicates that the opportunity for sharing experiences and reactions with other project schools at an upcoming seminar was often just the impetus needed to arouse enthusiasm and to keep the project moving ahead. In many ways, the seminar contributed to the formative evaluation of both the inter-provincial and provincial projects. There were occasions when the project participants were able to become sufficiently detached from their individual projects so that they could assess their accomplishments and deficiencies, be open to ideas of

---

[1]William Badiuk, A Comparative Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to the Teaching of Expository, Descriptive and Creative Writing in the Upper Elementary Level, A Report on the King Edward School Evaluation Project (Winnipeg: King Edward School, 1974).

[2]L. G. Salamon and others, Interprovincial School Evaluation Project, A Report on the Tisdale Unit Composite School Evaluation Project (Tisdale, Saskatchewan: Tisdale Unit Composite School, 1974).

> how they might proceed, and make plans to do so.[3]

As a result of the interaction which took place at these meetings, communication and sharing of ideas between meetings also improved. Naomi Hersom, writing about the Regina conference in 1973, indicated that the personal contacts initiated at the conferences would ". . . contribute to more frequent written communication between schools working on similar projects."[4]

Another example of the improved communication which occurred as a result of participants getting to know each other at the interprovincial and provincial meetings was the development of inter-visitation programs between participating schools. An examination of case studies indicates that those who took part found them to be very valuable.

> Doug and I tremendously enjoyed our visit to Pleasanthill School. Meeting the staff, sharing ideas, exchanging materials, and touring the school were just some of the fantastic experiences. Let not inter-school visitations die.[5]

---

[3]Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, A Final Report Presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November, 1974), p. 13.

[4]Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, An Interim Report Presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, April 30, 1973), p. 5.

[5]Edna Kully and others, Interprovincial School Evaluation Project, A Report on the Brentwood Elementary School Evaluation Project (Sherwood Park, Alberta: Brentwood Elementary School, 1974), p. 8.

> Another important part of the evaluation process was the sharing of ideas and experiences among members of various projects through conferences and inter-visitation.[6]

II. FLEXIBILITY

Flexibility has already been cited as an important feature in any innovative activity. A close examination of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project reveals a degree of flexibility which served to strengthen the overall program. This flexibility grew out of the decision to operate ISEP from a set of organizational principles which were broad enough to allow for individual decision making at each level of operation.

At the provincial level, each province had an organization which made basic decisions as to how the project would operate. This was a very important feature, in view of the fact that there were significant structural, political, social and cultural differences between the three provinces. The autonomy given to each province resulted in a number of advantages for the program's operation.

1. It allowed each province to operate its own budget. As a result, each one was able to seek financial support in a way that would allow them to make the best use of

---

[6]Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, A Final Report Presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November, 1974), p. 4.

the resources available. For example, each of the project schools in Saskatchewan applied for, and received innovative project grants from the provincial Department of Education. This not only eased the financial burden on each school, but also gave the project a degree of status within the province. In Manitoba, this control of the budget allowed the provincial organization to expand the number of agencies who were financially committed to the project. Because a financial committment often results in a committment to the principals of the project, Manitoba was therefore able to broaden its base of support within the province.

Allowing each province to operate its own budget also allowed them to allocate financial resources to the area of greatest need within their province. As a result, each province was able to respond to those needs within their province which were most relevant to the success of the project.

2. A second benefit which grew out of allowing each province to make basic decisions as to the operation of projects within their own boundaries was that each one was able to choose their own method of recruiting schools. Consequently, each provincial committee was able to use the method which would be most appropriate for their own particular circumstances. For example, in Alberta, schools were chosen with which Dr. Ingram and Dr. Riffel had already established good working relations. On the

other hand, in Saskatchewan, where those circumstances did not exist and this method of selection would not have been as appropriate, the provincial committee was able to use a different method of recruitment more in keeping with their particular circumstances.

At the local level, each school was allowed to determine its own particular evaluation project, as well as the way in which the project would operate. This independence at the local level strengthened the program in a number of ways;

1. Because ISEP allowed each school to choose an area which was relevant to them, the programs became more meaningful than traditional evaluation programs, which tend to designate the area to be evaluated. This may have been one of the factors which accounted for the high degree of committment which most of the participants showed toward their project.

2. It allowed schools to modify their programs according to local situations. Consequently, when a building program was announced which forced King Edward School to modify their Early Childhood Demonstration Project, they were able to switch their evaluation study to a new area. It also meant that, when the Indian students were permanently withdrawn from Kinistino Elementary School midway through the project, the school was able to change the focus of their study.

3. Finally, it meant that a number of different

aspects of the total school process were evaluated. Consequently, the project allowed a large number of materials and techniques to be tested out, and also provided a variety of recorded experiences which would be of value to schools interested in setting up evaluation programs within their schools.

III. INVOLVEMENT OF THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

As previously stated, the leadership and support of the school administration is a key factor in any innovative activity. Recognizing the potential importance of these people, the organizers of ISEP encouraged the administrators of the various schools to become involved in the project.

To begin with, all but two of the initial contacts were made through the school principal. One exception was the Lethbridge Public School District, which operated a system-wide project. In that case, contact was made through the Director of Curriculum. The other exception was the Neepawa Area Collegiate Institute, in which contact was made through the guidance counsellor. This school, it will be recalled, later dropped out of the project.

Because of their initial contact with the project, very often the school administrators ended up providing valuable leadership throughout the life of the project.

> In most cases, the principal assumed a leadership role in the initiation, design and implementation of the projects. In

> these projects there was ongoing administrative participation, stimulation and support.[7]

Many participants, speaking of the role of the principal in the project, were very emphatic that their leadership and support had been crucial to the success of the project within their school.

> Therefore, Weyburn Junior High's first task, after having been selected as a participating school, was to choose an area of study. Several meetings of the staff were devoted to this task. The leadership role at this point in the study was assumed by the principal.[8]

> Had the Principal not had the dominant role, the project would not have been carried through so successfully, nor with such professional efforts from the staff.[9]

> The principal is the key to the involvement of a staff in an innovative project.[10]

---

[7] J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Herson and Colleagues, Developing Evaluation Systems in Schools: Organizational Strategies, A Report from the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project (Saskatoon: Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, February, 1975), p. 60.

[8] Ray Hamm and others, School Climate at the Weyburn Junior High School, A Report on the Weyburn Junior High School Evaluation Project (Weyburn, Saskatchewan: Weyburn Junior High School, 1974), p. 6.

[9] Darcey E. Burlingham and others, Dandelion Days, A Report on the Pleasant Hill School Evaluation Project (Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Pleasant Hill School, 1974), p. 48.

[10] Barbara J. Clardige, "Project Case Study of Riverside Elementary School in Thompson, Manitoba" (Thompson, Manitoba, 1974).

An examination of the various case studies indicates that those participating in ISEP recognized the key role which school administrators play in creating an environment in which innovative activity could take place.

> An innovative school climate is characterized by trust and respect. The principal must earn and give them.[11]

> The role played by the principal is of importance in a school wide project. It is the principal who is in the ideal position to initiate, manage and monitor project activities . . . .[12]

> The principal's function is to create an environment which is flexible enough to 'role with the punches' thrown by the environment (school board, community, department of education).[13]

> The principal is central and essential in school-wide change. If he is neutral, an informal staff leader cannot carry the project through. Ideally, the principal is the change agent. He can inject the mild disequilibrium which makes people feel the need for change, can deal with the individual staff members in order to prevent their becoming maladaptive, and, in effect, can control the need for change so that each staff member can feel it and deal with it constructively.[14]

> The principal usually is the one with a knowledge of the background of the project members in terms of experiences. He then can play an important part either by encouragement, assignment or by manipulation to make certain the roles are adequately filled.[15]

---

[11] J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Hersom and Colleagues, op. cit., p. 29.

[12] Barbara J. Claridge, op. cit.

[13] J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Hersom and Colleagues, op. cit., p. 29.

[14] Ibid., p. 29.

[15] Ibid., p. 29.

> The departure of an innovative principal usually sees a project collapse as replacements are usually people who deserve promotions, but not necessarily those who fit the mould of the innovator.[16]

IV. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVOLVEMENT

Another feature which strengthened the project was the fact that most of the schools attempted to involve not only staff members, but students and the community as well.

A. Community Involvement

1. Three of the projects did not seek the involvement of the community. In these projects, teachers evaluated a limited aspect of the instructional program.

2. The other projects differed in the reasons for which community involvement was sought and the degree to which it was achieved.

One rural elementary school, in which Indian students made up approximately 50% of the enrolment, looked for parental involvement in developing a statement of goals for that integrated school. When the Indian students were permanently withdrawn from the school midway through the project, the school staff changed the focus of the study to parent-school communication, with the intention of developing and maintaining a high level of communication between the school and its community, and fostering a high level of parental participation in school activities. These were accomplished through extensive use of the local press, through public meetings and small group discussions, and through the use of parents who voluntarily assisted in classroom and extra-curricular activities.

---

[16] William Badiuk, op. cit.

A Junior High School staff examined its school climate. One aspect of this project, in which a small group of parents was actively involved, was the design and administration of instruments which could describe and assess parent-teacher relationships. These instruments were used to gain input from a substantial number of parents in the community.

In some cases, the project design called for the involvement of parents and the broader community in the formulation of a formal statement of goals for the school. A rural secondary school aimed toward involvement of as many members of the community as possible, with the intention of initiating ongoing communication between school and community. An urban secondary school looked to the community for legitimation of its goals. This project involved a relatively small, select sample of community members. Both of these projects produced goals statements which closely paralleled the Phi Delta Kappan (PDK) Goals Kit, and in both cases their own ranking of the PDK goals statements were adopted.

In two projects, public involvement was gained through the use of school councils. Each of these school councils had a broadly based membership drawn from students, the general public, parents, and the professional staff. Each project had strong orientation toward the concept of the community school. It is noteable that the first already had an active community base which it wished to maintain; the second wished to create a community base where none had existed before. One of these projects was situated in a community which had actively opposed centralization and which had maintained a vital Home and School Association. This Home and School Association was central in the initiation and design of the project. The other project was initiated and designed by the professional staff of three schools which had merged to form a community school in an urban area. In both projects, the school council served as the project steering committee.

Other projects did not aim toward obtaining formalized goals statements, but rather toward involving parents and students in the evalua-

> tion of the school's procedures and products. An urban elementary school sought parental inputs regarding such matters as the effectiveness of the reporting procedures used by the school. Another sought parental legitimation of new teaching procedures which had been introduced into the school's open area. An urban secondary school sought to improve communications between home and school in order that parents and students might make well-informed choices from the school's offerings. As well, this school aimed to make administrative decision-making more open and visible and responsive. A suburban K-9 school found its community undergoing a socio-economic change as a result of extensive highrise and townhouse construction. This staff set out to legitimate the existing goals statements in the eyes of its changing community.[17]

B. Staff Involvement

The degree of staff involvement within a particular school depended to a large degree upon the quality of leadership shown.

> Staff involvement in the project activities was also related to the leadership displayed. Of particular importance was the degree to which the leader had the power to legitimate the project. A number of project reports indicated that the staff members wanted to be assured that the project would 'make a difference,' that the procedure of school evaluation could be expected to produce results which would be visible in the future operation of the school. One school, in which the principal was only marginally involved in the evaluation, reported ongoing pessimism about the usefulness of the project.[18]

---

[17] J. A. Riffel, P. Schalm, N. Herson and Colleagues, op. cit., pp. 30-32.

[18] Ibid., p. 36.

Another factor in successful staff involvement was provision for the induction and orientation of new staff members to the program within their school. This was necessitated by the fact that leadership and staff turnover during the course of the two year project created a major problem of discontinuity in various projects.

The project benefitted tremendously from the hard work and concern of those teachers who did become involved. The dedication which these people showed was perhaps the single most important reason for the success which ISEP enjoyed. It is to the credit of the organizers that this kind of committment was established, in spite of the fact that the work which teachers did put in was largely voluntary, with little if any tangible renumeration.

> All people connected with it were volunteers. None received financial compensation; few were released from their regular duties. All worked within existing constraints; there were few concessions to make their innovative activity less burdensom.[19]

Another benefit related to staff involvement was the fact that most participants looked back on the project as having been very worthwhile;

> However, although the project went through a long gestation period, and eventually produced a fairly innocuous-looking offspring, it is felt that the whole project was of inestimable value to all concerned.[20]

---

[19] Ibid., p. ii.

[20] Alfred Selinger and others, Identification, Articulation and Establishment of School Goals: Evaluation of the Program of a Middle Size School, A Report on the Vanier Institute Evaluation Project (Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan: Vanier Collegiate Institute, 1974), p. 6.

> Personal Growth Study group felt thoroughly satisfied with their accomplishments for the past two years.[21]
>
> It has all been very worthwhile.[22]

C. Student Involvement

An examination of the various reports indicates that very often students showed initial reluctance toward becoming involved. For example, in Vanier Collegiate;

> Students were encouraged by classroom teachers, student council advisers and intercom announcements to attend an initial meeting with other members of the community and the staff. Not one student responded.[23]

However, those schools which encouraged and cultivated student participation found that many students did become involved, and moreover, played a very important role in the project.

> As has been previously mentioned, the students preferred at first to work in a way of their own preference, but, as with the parents, once they lost their original feelings of shyness or inferiority, they made extremely valuable contributions.[24]
>
> When asked what the school should be doing, our students had definite ideas about programs and school philosophy. Their ideas were well thought out and not facetious. They participated in public meetings to express and defend their ideas. Today, our

---

[21] Darcey E. Burlingham and others, op. cit., p. 45.

[22] William Badiuk, op. cit.

[23] Alfred Selinger and others, op. cit., p. 15.

[24] Ibid., p. 22.

> students feel that they are a part of the school and that their interests are considered. We now have a happier school.[25]

V. OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

One of the basic purposes of ISEP was "Stimulating professional development of school staffs by encouraging involvement in the evaluation process."[26] In view of the fact that ISEP was a project which emphasized process rather than product, the degree of professional development which did occur is a very important consideration.

If one is to judge by the reaction of participants, there is ample evidence that this professional development did occur, and was perhaps the most important outgrowth of the total program.

> Despite the many frustrations that the individuals in the school had with ISEP and ASPEP and our involvement in this entire project, the rewards and the associations that we made with people and with the directors of ISEP and ASPEP certainly have added professional growth for the members that were involved at that level.[27]

---

[25] L. G. Salamon and others, op. cit.

[26] R. J. Pacey (ed.), Evaluation Newsletter, I, No. 1 (Edmonton: Alberta Human Resources Research Council, 1972).

[27] St. Mary's Community School, A Report on the St. Mary's Community School Evaluation Project (Calgary: St. Mary's Community School, 1974).

> The active involvement in the process was in itself a tremendous learning experience. The research on evaluation involved, the interaction with other professionals in the field, and the struggle to find solutions, all contributed to professional growth. Mine is not an isolated case where personal educational goals have been re-examined and changes for the future have been instituted.[28]

> In conclusion, there were a number of supplementary benefits which resulted from project activities in Alberta. The professional development of participating teachers went beyond the evaluation process and touched all aspects of their teaching activities. Teachers also became more involved in the educational decision-making which took place in their school.[29]

> At the end of the first year we could see an improvement in parent-teacher-student relatinships, so it was decided to continue in this direction.[30]

> Teachers had to ask themselves some fundamental questions about themselves and their teaching. Tremendous personal and professional growth.[31]

> All staff members (especially those on the Steering Committee) have experienced growth through involvement in the project in evaluation skills, student/teacher relationships, curriculum skills, as well as becoming aware of what is going on in education around them. This has taken place through inservice sessions related to the project, involvement with personnel from the University and other project

---

[28] William Badiuk, op. cit.

[29] Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, A Final Report Presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November, 1974), p. 10.

[30] Stan Sinclair, Improving Communication Between Home and School, A Report on the Kinistino Elementary School Evaluation Project (Kinistino, Saskatchewan: Kinistino Elementary School, 1974), p. 12.

[31] L. G. Salamon and others, op. cit.

schools and through reading.[32]

> Teachers have an increased awareness of the evaluation processes which can be applied to all subject areas.[33]

> The model which was developed during the evaluation activities seems applicable not only to program evaluation, but to a wide variety of evaluation topics such as program, administration, teacher performance, and pupil learnings. The model seems to have systematized teachers' daily intuitive classroom evaluation activities. Its potential influence reaches beyond the local evaluation 'project' to the individual evaluation of teaching and learning.[34]

> ISEP has provided an opportunity for teachers to discuss problems and to share ideas, not only among themselves but also with the consultants that were available.[35]

> Committee work required reading in areas of evaluation and measurement, attitudes, and interest. This reading provided a background of knowledge which, in combination with in school inservice training on such topics as data analysis, sampling techniques and evaluation, has resulted in a familiarity with terminology and a confidence of expression that enabled the teachers to discuss programs and the rationale behind them.[36]

---

[32]Barbara J. Claridge, op. cit.

[33]Edna Kully and others, op. cit., p. 13.

[34]Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, A Final Report Presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November, 1974), p. 10.

[35]Edna Kully and others, op. cit., p. 29.

[36]Barbara J. Claridge, "The Impact of an Innovative Project on a Manitoba School" (Thompson, Manitoba: Riverside Elementary School, 1974), p. 10.

> As a cooperative undertaking by the three prairie provinces, this evaluation project is already providing teachers with renewed awareness of the role of the internal, local evaluation.[37]

> Regarding the teaching staff, one is left with the feeling that, if only for the increase in professionalism, the whole exercise was a success.[38]

> I feel that I have grown tremendously as a professional person.[39]

This chapter has identified procedures which were perceived as contributing most significantly to the success of the project. Those procedures which were identified were:

(a) The facilitation of communication.

(b) The flexibility built into the program.

(c) The involvement of school administration.

(d) The opportunities for involvement of the community, staff and students.

(e) The opportunities for the professional development of participants.

---

[37] Naomi Hersom, Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, An Interim Report Presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November 20, 1972), p.7.

[38] Alfred Selinger and others, op. cit., p. 21.

[39] Darcey E. Burlingham and others, op. cit., p. 47.

At this point, a general comment is necessary on two other points. Although little has been said about political awareness, the assumption should not be made that those responsible for the design, implementation and operation of the program were not skilled in this area. In truth, few occasions arose which required delicate political maneuvering. Consequently, it is difficult to comment on the degree to which the program's organizers possessed these skills.

It is also difficult to judge the ability of these people to create an atmosphere that would facilitate change. Because ISEP operated in a number of schools, none of which were administered by the program's organizers, they could not be held responsible for the atmosphere within the school. Consequently, it is impossible to judge the program's operation according to this principle.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, MODIFICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will serve as a summary of the thesis. It is composed of a restatement of the problem and the procedure followed, a summary of the major findings, an examination of modifications that were necessary as a result of attempting to translate a theoretical plan of action into a practical program, a conclusion and several recommendations.

I. THE PROBLEM

The basic purpose of this study was to examine educational innovation and evaluation through an examination of specific procedures employed in the design, implementation and operation of ISEP. The procedures chosen for examination were those which appeared to be most "successful" according to the perceptions of participants.

II. THE PROCEDURE

Essentially, the study was carried out by an examination of records and documents dealing with ISEP, as well as personal interviews carried out with selected members of ISEP. Those phases of the program which appeared to have been successful were isolated and analyzed. An attempt was then

made to account for the reason(s) for their success.

III. THE FINDINGS

The results of this study indicate that the following procedures contributed most significantly to the success of the project;

Facilitation of communication. One of the procedures used to encourage communication among participants was the organization of a series of interprovincial and provincial meetings. Evidence gathered indicates that not only was there a good exchange of ideas during the course of these gatherings, but that participants also tended to communicate more often between meetings as a result of getting to know each other better.

Flexibility. ISEP was further strengthened by the flexibility that was built into the program. This flexibility basically resulted from the fact that the interprovincial organization, while giving broad guidelines for the program's operation, allowed for individual decision making at the various levels of operation. At the provincial level, each organization was allowed to operate in a manner best suited to their particular circumstances. As a result, each province was able to set up their own methods of recruiting schools and financing projects. Autonomy at the school level lead to a greater diversity of projects, an increased opportunity to modify programs in order to meet local situations and a

greater relevance of programs for those involved.

Involvement of the school administration. A conscious effort was made to involve school administrators in the various projects. An examination of ISEP materials indicates that these people played an important role in many programs, not only by providing leadership and support, but also by creating an environment in which innovative activities could take place.

Opportunities for involvement. A key factor in the success of many projects was the involvement, not only of staff members, but of students and the community as well. This involvement often created unanticipated benefits to the school system, such as improved relations between the school and community, better interpersonal relations between staff and students and greater involvement of staff members in school programs.

Opportunities for professional development of participants. Judging by the reaction of participants, the greatest benefit to come from the program was the opportunity for professional development which ISEP afforded. This recognition of professional growth may well have been one of the major factors which kept participants active and committed to the project.

IV. MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED

As is often the case when implementing a new program, certain modifications became necessary due to unforeseen circumstances. The fact that ISEP was able to continue functioning as successfully as it did, in spite of these circumstances, speaks well of the strength of the project and the committment which people had toward it.

Change in leadership. The first significant modification which was required during the life of the project was the change in leadership. As already indicated, the initial leadership for ISEP came from the Human Resources Research Council of Alberta. However, when events beyond the control of ISEP necessitated a change in leadership, the project faced its first severe challenge.

This change in leadership had a number of implications. In the first place, it meant that an additional financial outlay was required, due to the fact that the leader now had to be paid. More significant than the financial implication, however, was the fact that the leadership was removed from those people who had been involved with the project from the beginning. As previously noted, it was only through the committment of those initially involved in the organization of ISEP that the project was able to overcome this first major hurdle.

Modifications in individual programs. A few indi-

vidual projects had to be modified or discontinued as a result of circumstances which developed during the course of the project. The most notable examples were:

1. King Edward School, in which the announcement of a building program resulted in the discontinuance of their Early Childhood Demonstration Project, which was to have been the focus of their study.

2. Kinistino Elementary School, in which the scope of the project was changed when the Indian students, who made up close to half of the school population, left the school to attend a segregated school system on the James Smith Reserve in February of the first year.

3. William Russell School in St. Boniface, which withdrew from the project when their staff decided that their needs were of a personal nature, and therefore could be better met in other ways.

As mentioned earlier, the flexibility which was built into ISEP allowed both King Edward School and Kinistino Elementary School to modify their program and continue on, in spite of unforeseen complications.

V. CONCLUSIONS

An examination of perceptions of participants in ISEP indicates that the project was of definite value to the participating schools. Moreover, it gives support to the policy of creating temporary, short term organizational structures, similar to ISEP, as a means of stimulating

locally initiated evaluation. Finally, this study indicates that educational innovations, with careful planning and personal committment from those involved, can occur.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study indicate that there are certain operational principles which, if followed in future projects such as ISEP, could increase the likelihood of their success. The recommendations which follow are based on an analysis of these principles, and the role which they played in increasing the "success" which ISEP enjoyed.

As a result of this study, it is recommended that future innovative educational programs consider the following principles:

1. Opportunities should be offered for participants to become acquainted on a social basis. Evidence has already been cited to indicate that the social interaction which ISEP encouraged, proved helpful in encouraging communication and the exchange of ideas throughout the life of the project.

2. Inter-visitation programs between participating schools should be encouraged. In ISEP, these inter-visitations not only led to the sharing of ideas, but also proved to be a morale booster for those involved.

3. Programs should be flexible enough to allow for individual decision making at each level of operation. In the program just studied, this autonomy not only

appears to have encouraged greater committment to individual programs, but also made programs more meaningful by allowing them to be designed according to local interests and needs.

4. Involvement of the school administration should be actively sought. In many cases, administrators not only provided valuable leadership and support, but also played a key role in creating an environment in which innovative activity could take place.

5. Leaders of such projects should encourage the involvement not only of staff members, but of students and community members as well. In projects where these groups were involved, they proved to provide a valuable contribution. However, it must be stressed that their involvement must be genuine, and not a mere form of tokenism.

6. Provision should be made for the induction and orientation of new staff members. This was particularly important in those schools, where there was a high staff turnover during the two years of the project.

7. Because one of the major purposes of any educational activity is the improvement of the learning process, such projects should attempt to maximize opportunities for professional development. Judging by the reaction of participants, this might well have been the most lasting benefit to develop out of the entire program.

Although the program was highly successful, there were some areas of concern expressed by participants. These

concerns form the basis for the recommendations which follow. These recommendations, if implemented in future undertakings such as ISEP, could possibly lead to even more effective programs.

1. Teachers involved should be given more time off from regular school duties. The heavy demands which involvement in ISEP made upon their time was a major concern expressed by many participants. This concern was especially evident among primary and elementary teachers, where preparation time was very limited. In many cases, the extra demands made on the teacher's time resulted in less preparation time, less involvement in extra curricular activities or less than adequate time spent on ISEP activities.

2. The specific aims of each project should be defined and made known to participants as early as possible. In some cases where the aims were not clearly defined early in the life of the project, participants started out with unrealistic expectations. Consequently, members in those projects tended to become frustrated and disillusioned when their expectations were not met.

3. There should be greater flexibility in time allotments for individual projects. A number of participants in ISEP expressed concern over being tied into a program with a predetermined time structure. It would appear that the time allotted for each project should reflect the nature and complexity of the specific undertaking.

4. Project results should be disseminated more widely. In many cases, the results of specific projects would have been of interest and value to other teachers in the field, to sponsoring agencies and to the general public. Wider dissemination of results would also have given participants more public recognition for their efforts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adams, Don. Achieving Educational Improvements. Syracuse: Center for Development Education, Syracuse University, 1964.

Adams, Don (ed.). Educational Planning. Syracuse: Center for Development Education, Syracuse University, 1964.

Baldridge, Victor J., and Burnham, Robert. The Adoption of Innovation: The Effect of Organizational Size, Differentiation, and Environment. Palo Alto: California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1973.

Banke, Ivan S. The Dictionary of Administration and Supervision. Los Angeles: System's Research, 1971.

Bennett, Thomas R. II. The Leader and the Process of Change. New York: Association Press, 1966.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959.

Corbally, John E. Jr., Jenson, H. J. and Staub, Frederick W. Educational Administration: The Secondary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Henclay, Stephen P. Educational Research. New Perspectives. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers Inc., 1963.

Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Frymier, Jack R. (ed.). A School for Tomorrow. Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973.

Giles, Frederic T., and Foster, Clifford D. Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.

Good, Carter V., and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research. New York: Educational Division, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Goodlad, John I., Klein, Frances M., and others. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Haller, Emil J. Strategies for Change. Toronto: Dept. of Educational Administration, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.

Hartley, Harry J. Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Havelock, Ronald G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Hillway, Tyrus. Introduction to Research. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

Jacobson, Paul B., Logsdon, James D., and Weigman, Robert R. The Principalship: New Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Lawler, Marcella R. (ed.). Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1970.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Miles, Matthew B. (ed.). Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964.

Miller, Richard I. (ed.). Perspectives on Educational Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Morphet, Edgar L. (ed.). Designing Education for the Future, No. 3, Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

_____., and Jesser, David T. Preparing Educators to Meet Emergency Needs. New York: Citation Press, 1969.

Riffel, J. A. Education Planning Reexamined. Edmonton: The Human Resources Research Council, 1971.

Roberts, Glyn W. (ed.). Achieving Educational Improvements. Calgary: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1971.

Street, David (ed.). Innovation in Mass Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Articles

Anderson, Gary J., and Lauwreys, Joseph A. "Altering the Structure of Teacher Education: A Case Study from Atlantic Canada." Interchange. IV, No. 2-1, 1973, pp. 88-98.

Fantini, Mario D. "Patterns for Reform in American Teacher Education." Interchange. IV, No. 2-1, 1973, pp. 28-39.

Johnson, Henry C. Jr. "Some Reflections on Educational Reform." The Educational Forum. XXXVIII, No. 1, 1973, pp. 85-92.

Hemphill, David H. "A General Theory of Innovativeness." Alberta Journal of Educational Research. XIV, No. 2, June, 1968, pp. 101-114.

Hilfiker, Leo R. "Factors Relating to the Innovativeness of School Systems." The Journal of Educational Research. LXIV, No. 1, pp. 23-27.

Kelly, Michael. "Educational Planning from a Teacher's Point of View." Comparative Education. VIII, No. 2, 1972, pp. 85-92.

Murray, Frank B. "Credability of Information for Educational Innovation." The Journal of Educational Research. CXVI, No. 1, September, 1970, pp. 17-20.

Riffel, J. A. "Renewal in Manitoba Education: Toward an Approach to Research and Development." Manitoba Journal of Education. IX, No. 1, January, 1974, pp. 23-28.

Shiman, David A., and Lieberman, Anne. "A Non-Model for School Change." The Educational Forum. XXXVIII, No. 4, May, 1974, pp. 441-445.

White, Roberta T. "Today, A Small Step. Tomorrow, A Great Leap!" The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin. XXXVII-i, Fall, 1971, pp. 7-16.

Wolf, W. C. Jr., and Fiorino, A. John. "Some Perspectives of Educational Change." The Educational Forum. XXXVIII, No. 1, November, 1973, pp. 79-84.

Reports

Badiuk, William. A Comparative Evaluation of an Innovative Approach to the Teaching of Expository, Descriptive and Creative Writing in the Upper Elementary Level. A Report on the King Edward School Evaluation Project. Winnipeg: King Edward School, 1974.

Burlingham, Darcey E., and others. Dandelion Days. A Report on the Pleasant Hill School Evaluation Project. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Pleasant Hill School, 1974.

Frohlick, Robert F., Schalm, Philip, and Belsey, Glen M. A Developmental Model for the Identification and Ongoing Evaluation of Secondary School Objectives: A Community Process. A Report on the Martin Collegiate Evaluation Project. Regina: Department of Education, 1974.

Hamm, Ray, Turnbridge, Tony, and Merle, Anne Marie. School Climate at the Weyburn Junior High School. A Report on the Weyburn Junior High School Project. Weyburn, Saskatchewan: Weyburn Junior High School, 1974.

Hersom, Naomi. Alberta School Program Evaluation Project. An Interim Report presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, April 30, 1973.

_____. Alberta School Program Evaluation Project. A Final Report presented to the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, November, 1974.

_____., and Masters, Bernard. Locally Initiated School Evaluation. Edmonton: Alberta School Program Evaluation Project, August, 1973.

Kully, Edna, and others. Interprovincial School Evaluation Project. A Report on the Brentwood Elementary School Evaluation Project. Sherwood Park, Alberta: Brentwood Elementary School, 1974.

Riffel, J. A., Schalm, P., Hersom, N., and Colleagues. Developing Evaluation Systems in Schools: Organizational Strategies. A Report from the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, February, 1975.

Salamon, L. G., and others. Interprovincial School Evaluation Project. A Report on the Tisdale Unit Composite School Evaluation Project. Tisdale, Saskatchewan: Tisdale Unit Composite School, 1974.

Selinger, Alfred, and others. Identification, Articulation and Establishment of School Goals: Evaluation of the Program of a Middle Size School. A Report on the Vanier Collegiate Institute Evaluation Project. Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan: Vanier Collegiate Institute, 1974.

Sinclair, Stan. Improving Communication Between Home and School. A Report on the Kinistino Elementary School Evaluation Project. Kinistino, Saskatchewan, Kinistino Elementary School, 1974.

St. Mary's Community School. A Report on the St. Mary's Community School Evaluation Project. Calgary: St. Mary's Community School, 1974.

The Organizational Structure of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project Committee. A Report Prepared at an Organizational Meeting. Winnipeg, Manitoba. August, 1971.

Unpublished Materials

Claridge, Barbara J. "The Impact of An Innovative Project on a Manitoba School." Thompson, Manitoba, 1974. (Typewritten).

_____. "Project Case Study of Riverside Elementary School in Thompson, Manitoba." Thompson, Manitoba. 1974. (Typewritten).

Tapes

Goodlad, John I. "Models for Change." Los Angeles: Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972.

_____. "The Challenge of the Seventies." Los Angeles: Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972.

_____. "The Resistance of Schools to Change." Los Angeles: Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1972.

Other Sources

Pacey, R. J. Evaluation Newsletter, I, No. 1. Edmonton: Alberta Human Resources Research Council, 1972.

University of Manitoba. Personal interview with J. A. Riffel, Manitoba Coordinator of the Interprovincial School Evaluation Project. March 25, 1975.

_____. Minutes of Meeting of Manitoba Educational Research Council School Evaluation Committee. Winnipeg, Manitoba. December 15, 1971. (Typewritten).

_____. Program Evaluation. An Invitation sent to all schools in Saskatchewan from the coordinating committee, Western Canadian Interprovincial School Evaluation Project. Regina: The University of Saskatchewan, January 20, 1972.