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ABSTRACT

This case study provides an in-depth investigation and analysis of the implementation of a "differentiated staffing" pattern. The total differentiated staffing innovation included within its concept a number of sub-innovations, the most significant being the establishment of learning coordinators to manage change, teacher/counselors, and para-professionals to facilitate instruction. Implementation of the innovation began in 1969 and ran until the end of the 1972-73 school year.

The central purpose of this case study was to document the implementation of a major educational innovation which could be shared with other educational systems aspiring to change. Also, the study was a contribution to the sparse data available concerning the implementation of educational
innovations. Within the central purpose the study will focus on the following:

1. Discussion of recent literature concerning theory and theory/action models available in dealing with change and innovation.

2. Presentation of the changes and innovations undertaken at Quabbin in case history fashion.

3. Analyzation of problem areas in the Quabbin change experience as determined through taped interviews with leading figures responding to specific questions about the experience.

4. Analyzation of the nature of the staff's involvement and reactions to the change experience through a self-administered, teacher questionnaire.

5. Analyzation of the stages of the change process of significant innovations at Quabbin and the assessment of the relative effectiveness of each stage utilizing the Havelock process guide to change as criteria.

6. Analyzation of the role of the superintendent as the change agent at Quabbin through transactional analysis and the perceptions of staff who had undergone the change experience as illustrated in the LBDQ.

7. Discussion of the nature and relative effectiveness of "participatory observation" as a technique by which to analyze and assess a change experience and as a potential feedback mechanism.

The researcher felt that the study answered five distinct needs:

1. the need for Quabbin to understand why it experienced a "bad" change situation and a sharing of this information;

2. the need for Quabbin to examine the nature and function of the change agent's roles in light of its own experience and the willingness to share this information;
3. the need for providing a historical description of an actual change experience that failed and yet allowed for growth to follow;

4. the need to test a number of contemporary analytical methodologies as tools to provide insight and hopefully answers to many questions about the Quabbin change experience and change in general;

5. the need to discuss the potential for a "participatory observer" to function as "feedback" agent and assessor.

The method for the investigation, analysis, and assessment of the Quabbin change experience involved the following:

(1) participatory observation

(2) taped dialogue with six members of the change experience to present a historical overview

(3) taped interview with the superintendent of schools, the president of the teachers' union and a member of the school committee

(4) self-administered teacher interview questionnaire

(5) perusal of records, resources and materials prepared during and for the innovations

(6) research into change literature

(7) utilization of a change process guide and model as evaluative criteria that somewhat resembled the one used by Quabbin

(6) utilization of the following analytical methodologies: LBDQ, contextual mapping, (CIM) cross impact matrix, transactional analysis, and force-field analysis

Based on the case study and the substantive matter thereof, the researcher was able to isolate the problem areas that hindered the successful implementation of the differentiated
staffing innovation. In particular, the management style and behavior of the Superintendent, the reluctance of the Principal to commit himself to the innovation, the immaturity and lack of self-directiveness of the learning coordinators, and ultimately a breakdown in communications contributed to the demise of the implementation of the innovation.
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PREFACE

The purpose of this study is to communicate the history of sequential changes and innovations that took place at the Quabbin Regional High School and to evaluate the relative success of those changes and innovations in terms of the degree to which the objectives for each were reached. Special attention must be given to the human dynamics that interplayed while Quabbin was in the change experience. Central to the study, however, is an examination and assessment of the process for change and innovation that was utilized. Contemporary theory and research will constitute an evaluative basis from which to evaluate Quabbin's change process. Foremost, in terms of a contemporary, change-process guide, is that which has been developed by Ronald G. Havelock. This particular model contains what might be called the "cream" of current change-process research and development.

With the growing number of changes recommended for American Public School Education today, it becomes a necessity for those responsible for change to comprehend its complex nature when it comes into contact with the human element. Already, the educational stage is cluttered with evidence of projects that have failed, been abandoned, or were never able to be implemented. Progress and reform are clearly in order. "Progress" is a nice word, but "change," its instigator, is not. For change destroys comfort, implies criticism of what
"is," and promotes feelings of fear. Change means that someone's professional feathers will be ruffled, that set programs might die, and sacred cows placed out to pasture.

Many people in education are terrified by change. Most of these are individuals that labor under the dictum "teacher knows best" which is one of the most powerful and cherished traditions in American education. It is also the kind of mentality that can build a bulwark against change. Of course, NOBODY is really AGAINST innovation. It is always somebody else who is resistant to new ideas--somebody else who is the drag on the wheel of progress.

Careful analysis of change experiences would show that "stability" is not the antithesis of "change" even though public declarations often infer. It is quite often evident that preservers of an "as is" status are busily engaged in developing constantly changing tactics to maintain desirable conditions, programs, etc. Consequently, the true meanings and relationship existing between these two terms reside only in the mind of the perceiving person and remain individualistic rather than universal.

In 1967, the Gallop organization completed the last of three surveys dealing with reaction to innovation and the acceptance of change in education. Each survey dealt with a different target population: school board member, the parents of school children and teachers and administrators. All three groups were consistent in their claim that
resistance to educational innovation lay ELSEWHERE. All three groups laid the major blame for resistance at the door of "the general public."

The truth is that the general public--the community at large--does, in fact, share responsibility with the educational community for innovation. It is also true, however, that never before have both the educational community and the community at large been more receptive to innovation. The opportunity for introducing significant change into the classroom clearly never has been better. In order to benefit from this opportunity, it is necessary to have a clear understanding and a full appreciation of the conditions under which innovation is to succeed.

The problem at hand is concerned with the notion that progress, change, is "good," and the reality which exhibits a contradictory picture. When educational change, which has been badly needed, emerges, it usually does under very trying conditions. Those few who have been successful in bringing it about take on the appearance of "hero-types," of "men on white chargers" who bring law and order--as well, hopefully, as justice--to a change situation.

And yet, hero-types do not constitute the answer to the dilemma because we can never have enough of them--figuratively and literally. What we need is sufficient understanding of the change process and its components to break people away from personal and cultural imprints so that they can break
away from tomorrow's world.

This study is designed to offer education an opportunity to share in a "real" change experience that was planned. There is nothing particularly unique about Quabbin except, perhaps, that it attempted a greater thrust toward change and innovation than is traditional. What is interesting is that Quabbin faced nearly every imaginable conflict that one could structure into a simulated model. Its innovators were sensitive to change psychology and research in educational change and innovation. All Quabbin changes showed merit on "paper," and, yet, many were never accepted and, hence, implemented.

Too often an experience such as Quabbin's is merely written off as a bad show. Too often others face identical situations and never realize that they are re-living another's experience. It is as if man is bent on re-inventing the wheel.

The author was a participant observer in the Quabbin experience. His role is to be discussed and assessed in terms of his ability to function as one subjectively involved in the experiment and yet, objectively caught up in its feedback and analysis. The concept of participatory observation is a side concern but undoubtedly, one of immense value.

The purpose of this study, then, is to share an experience in change and innovation and offer replicable methodology for change process critique and evaluation. Those involved in the Quabbin Story feel that they have grown out of the
conflict. It may be fair to say that if nothing more, Quabbin has learned a great deal about its internal dynamics.

A true sense of the Quabbin experience is within the taped session which constitutes a historical study of the situation. Beyond this, the author has transcribed taped interviews with leading figures in the drama in an attempt to gain a deeper perspective into the mechanics of the changes and innovations and into the human conflict and struggle that developed. A teacher interview questionnaire was also employed to offer additional data to reinforce and to extend perceptions concerning the nature of individual involvement during various phases of this experience. Finally, news releases are appended to further the sense of reality of this experience.

One note of interest is important to relate in closing. All those involved in the Quabbin struggle with change seem to be reluctant to give it up. By this I wish to say that they are almost obsessed cathartically to discuss and constantly to examine what happened. This is still being done in the hope that answers will evolve to help explain "why?"

This study, then, in many ways is also a part of that obsession. It is more than a case study; it is, rather, an experience out of my life that has shaped a good part of my thinking about this "thing" called education and that "thing" which keeps it alive--change.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The inertia of the human mind and its resistance to innovation are most clearly demonstrated not, as one might expect, by the ignorant mass— which is easily swayed once its imagination is caught—but by professionals with a vested interest in tradition and in the monopoly of learning. Innovation is a twofold threat to academic mediocrities: it endangers their oracular authority, and it evokes the deeper fear that their whole, laboriously constructed intellectual edifice might collapse. The academic backwoodsmen have been the curse of genius from Aristarchus to Darwin and Freud; they stretch, a solid and hostile phalanx of pedantic mediocrities, across the centuries.1

The QUABBIN STORY is a study of an educational system's attempt at change and innovation. It is a study about innovation in terms of specific projects which have a defined beginning and a sequential history. Therefore, Quabbin's process of change and innovation worked through "stages" that formed the framework for planned innovation. Here change may be defined as "any alteration in the 'status quo' which is intended to benefit the people involved."2 Also,

innovation may be defined as "any change which represents something new to people being changed." 3

There are two ways to look at stages of innovation. First, it may be seen from the point-of-view of the people being changed, and the other is to see it from the point-of-view of someone who is trying to change someone else. In considering the viewpoint of the one who is changed, it is obvious that he will necessarily have some sort of problem-solving process in order to survive in a changing world. This is not to say that everyone is an expert problem-solver, and it does not imply that everyone finds innovative solutions when a problem develops; however, everyone does develop some sort of procedure for coping with change. The most primitive, and sometimes the most effective strategy for coping with change is to do nothing, hoping it will pass.

However, it is possible to represent the stages that someone might follow in solving a problem when and if he decides to act. In its simplest terms the process may involve a "stimulus," internal or external, leading to a "response." A good deal of "problem-solving" behavior in education is of a reflexive, trial-and-error variety: teachers strike--the school board either fires the teachers or surrenders to their demands. 4

---

3 Ibid., p. 4.
4 Ibid., p. 6.
The second way to look at stages of innovation is through the perspective of the change agent. Regardless of his formal job title and his position, there are four primary ways in which a person can act as a change agent. He can be:

1. A CATALYST
2. A SOLUTION GIVER
3. A PROCESS HELPER
4. A RESOURCE LINKER

Persons with any number of job titles may find that they fit one of these four role definitions. However, the four change agent roles are not mutually exclusive. Some change agents can be catalysts, solution givers, process helpers and linkers all at the same time. In terms of the four primary change agent roles, it helps if one is in a formal position of authority as leader or supervisor to bring about change in a group. "Most research studies show that the administrator is the most important gatekeeper to change. He sets the tone, opens the doors, and provides the support. . . ." 

Whoever provides the leadership for change--inside man or one from the outside--should be aware of the complex forces working for and against change.7

"The very idea of change is threatening to most of

5 Ibid., p. 7.
6 Ibid., p. 10.
us . . . ." The problem faced in a change experience that purports the notion that what works well on paper...works well on paper. The illusion that new programs are needed must be replaced with the idea that what is needed are new mechanisms and processes to find out what is needed.

Perhaps change agents should seek to provide their clients with a more favorable basic attitude toward new ideas and spend fewer efforts in campaigns to secure the adoption of single innovations.

The Quabbin Regional High School in Barre, Massachusetts, like many schools at this time in this country, felt the blitz of change and innovation. At its opening in 1967, it provided a system that was "egg-crated," secretive, coercive, sub-system orientated, cliquish, incommunicative, etc. Its approach to education was extremely traditional, offering heavy emphasis on the academic. Each subject-matter department operated as a "family" both in and outside of the school. The school's atmosphere was comfortable and virtually unintimidated by the outside.

In 1969 this complacent system was turned upside down. Pressure from the communities (Barre, Hardwick, Hubbardston and Oakham) came as the taxpayers decried the expense of

8 Havelock, op. cit., p. 57.

educating their youth. In the wake of the wave of this pressure, "accountability" as a catch word caught fire, and "results approach" demanded objectives to be stated and reached and targets had to be sought.

The "new" superintendent, arriving at the opening of school in 1967, found himself with a ready-made system prepared to change and innovate. He was hired because he was an innovator. Pressure placed on him from the school committee caused him to generate strategies to communicate this situation to administrators, department heads and staff. Prompted primarily by the need to cut costs and the desire to up-date an arachnoid curriculum, the superintendent brought about the numerous changes and innovations. In particular, all innovations at Quabbin fell under the umbrella of "differentiated staffing" which may be construed as the primary innovation. The goals to (1) differentiate the staffing pattern, (2) improve instruction, and (3) change at Quabbin were based on the following premises:

1. Behaviorally stated outcomes for learners in a sequence of learning will be clearly written for all aspects of the instructional program.

2. Instructional tasks will be clearly delineated for all employed personnel involved in the promotion of the above objectives (outcomes).

3. A team of educational leaders and decision makers will be trained in skills necessary to implement, manage, and evaluate their design.

4. A "year round" trimester pattern for programing will be scrutinized as an alternative to the present structure.
5. Integrated with staff differentiation will be the utilization of instructional materials and technology with instructional media.

6. All d/s will be on a differentiated salary schedule of which the maximum of "B" will be twice the maximum of "A".

7. Main goals will swing toward individual value growth.

8. Staff differentiation will promote more adult/student contact.

9. The role of the teacher will be shifted from dispenser of knowledge to coordinators of learning experiences.

10. To generate a habit of considering alternatives in education.

11. Outside evaluation sources will constitute an integral part of aid and evaluation.

12. Staff differentiation will be accompanied by other structural changes, such as the flexible use of time and space, which contribute to a better learning environment.

13. Measures will be taken to institutionalize a process of rational change.

14. The concept of student as teacher will be implemented wherever possible.

15. Maximum use will be made of part-time professionals (housewives with BA degrees, for example) and other community resource people with special expertise.

The timeline that follows will illustrate significant developments during this period.

September, 1968  Association with Dr. Bill Wolf for change strategy assistance, one year retainership as a project writer.


January, 1969  Arrangement made through Dr. Wolf for the placement of university interns in the system.
June, 1969  In-service training program for 21 instructional aides under the direction of Dr. Wolf and university personnel.

November, 1969 Submission of a federal project to implement differentiated staffing.

December, 1969 Creation of learning coordinator positions and selection of L/C's.

January, 1970 Project rejected; decision made to go ahead and implement the "new" structure with local funds.

January, 1970 24 hour, encounter session to establish strengths and weaknesses and propose initial staffs cuts.

October, 1970 Superintendent and teachers' union face the issue of an L/C salary range not tied to the teachers' schedule nor negotiated by them.

November, 1970 Teacher/counselor concept initiated.

January, 1971 Long, intense dispute begins over teacher/counselor concept and contract violations.

May, 1971 Timber Doodle, Temple, N. H., a retreat planned to address the problems facing the system.

September, 1971 University business department analyzes school budget at the request of Hardwick Selectmen.

September, 1971 Students boycott school cafeteria to protest what they feel to be an inferior learning environment.

October, 1971 Quabbin District Parents' Association is formed to address the problems at the school.

October, 1971 New teacher contract negotiations begin.

October, 1971 Guidance program comes under questioning by the public.

November, 1971 First school committeeeman resigns.

November, 1971 Teachers publicly protest forced guidance assignments.
November, 1971  Teachers' union votes "no confidence" in the leadership of the superintendent.

November, 1971  Contract negotiations at an impasse.

April, 1972  After much pressure, the school committee decides to hire a professional guidance staff for the coming school year.

April, 1972  The school administration receives a low rating by the faculty on a survey run in the school by the parents' group.

April, 1972  Superintendent submits his resignation; the school committee refuses to accept it.

June, 1972  The L/C structure is scrapped by the school committee in order to restore the departmental structure.

June, 1972  The principal and assistant principal resign under pressure by the school committee.

July, 1972  A new administration is formed under a management team concept.

Scenario

Let me now extend and develop the events in the timeline through a scenario that was written by this researcher for the Timber Doodle encounter session. It was shared with the participants and endorsed by the Superintendent as an accurate portrayal of the drama to date. The scenario follows:

Over the past few months as a learning coordinator and participant observer, I have had the opportunity to reflect upon the vast amount of change that my school has undergone. It all seemed to happen so fast that even today most teachers are still unsure exactly what took place. However, I do feel that I can recapture some of the significant thinking, reactions, and incidents which have
staffing pattern originated is rather difficult to say; however, there was a period of time in the fall of last year that was spent checking the possibility of securing a federal grant to finance some major changes at Quabbin. It goes without saying that money was tight. Further, it seemed that the only federal projects to be financed would be those that had built into them new and varied staffing patterns and new salary ranges.

One conference that I attended with the Superintendent and the Principal gave me and them the feeling that just maybe the government might support a system like Quabbin, a system that was young, spirited and ready to accept most any challenge. Well, with the aid of personnel from the University of Massachusetts, a project was written which originally appeared to offer every member of our staff a chance to gain some valuable experiences.

The project was finished and submitted. However, the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association not to mention the faculty, was not made privy to all aspects of this proposed change. Teachers got their information via scuttlebut. Everyone talked and waited, not sure what was to happen.

While the project worked its way through various channels, the Superintendent spent exhaustive sessions either alone, or with the Principal, or with selected department heads in an attempt to move rapidly toward laying the ground work from which to launch his differentiated staffing pattern. During this period it must be said that nearly all concerned felt that the Superintendent had some "master plan," but contrary to belief nothing of magnitude evolved.

It was at this time that the Superintendent posted a notice that a new
brought us to the present state.

The past year at Quabbin was one in which that spirit of pride and exhilaration was forced out of the environment. Two things happened to bring about this change:

1. exploration and initiation of changes in staffing patterns (differentiated staffing)

2. creation of a new role—learning coordinator

These changes came about quite unexpectedly. Up to this time the Principal and department heads combined talents to handle policies and other details connected with school life. It was the department head's obligation to honor the wishes of the members of his staff. Staff meetings were regular and allowed the Principal to make good contact with teachers in gaining their insights on various issues pertaining to school life at Quabbin.

The Superintendent, however, since coming to Quabbin in 1967, was rather quiet and somewhat distant from the Quabbin school environment. He did meet on occasion with department heads and rarely with teachers. He is a warm-mannered man, one whose behavior showed him to be committed to good education. He made attempts to gain some articulation and coordination between the regional school and the elementary feeder schools. On occasion teachers saw him in action when he initiated programs featuring guest lecturers. He seemed to be high on human relations and his actions bore this out. He was a man who took his teachers from time to time out of the classroom to probe and dialogue on questions of a philosophical nature.

Just where the idea to change our
position would be created to coordinate learning in a new "unit" system and that the departmental structure would be abolished with the coming school year. Originally, it was estimated that there might be as many as fifteen new "learning coordinators." Applications were made available and at least twenty-five members of the staff responded. There were "rap" sessions on Wednesday afternoons when candidates could, along with anyone interested, dialogue with the Superintendent about the coming changes. The sessions did not meet with the success initially desired. It seems that not many teachers took the time to attend.

Other phases of the change were contemplated. One was the idea of running a twenty-four hour encounter group to better understand ourselves (all applicants) and to be given the opportunity to brainstorm on the existing system. This time was to be spent assessing Quabbin in an attempt to isolate its strengths and weaknesses. The planned session with all applicants did not take place. For one reason or another, many did not want to spend time on such a demanding venture with the possibility that they may not gain election into the new group. It was felt that this session would be more meaningful after the election of candidates.

Evidently the decision not to have the encounter session before election put the Superintendent on the spot. Also, he was pressured from all sides by the applicants, ex-department heads in particular, who demanded a decision as quickly as possible. Consequently, he appointed a selection committee composed of himself, the Principal, four department heads and one teacher. This group met on Saturday morning and reviewed each candidate's application thoroughly.
Fourteen learning coordinators evolved from the decisions of the selection committee. This included the Principal and his assistant. Not every department head was slated for the new positions. The applicants were notified immediately. Quabbin buzzed with the news as teachers jestingly debated why some were chosen over others. But not everyone found the situation humorous. At least one applicant wanted a hearing in that she questioned the manner of selection and did not feel that all areas of the school life were represented. Each applicant did meet personally with the Principal and discussed why he was or was not elected.

This is all quite interesting in that the Teachers' Association remained relatively quiet during this period. There are at least four reasons why this was so. First, this entire move, was, to the teachers, a rather clandestine act on the part of a few; second, this was the year that the majority of the staff would be up for tenure; third, the Teachers' Association was terribly weak; and fourth, the faculty was working under the second year of a two-year contract which did not allow for the re-opening of negotiations except through mutual agreement.

Once the learning coordinators had accepted their positions, the pre-planned twenty-four hour encounter group got under way. The Superintendent, his fourteen learning coordinators, and our University of Massachusetts consultant met to assess the existing system and made tentative plans to promote a new, and hopefully workable staff structure.

One of the first moves made by the learning coordinators at the inception of the encounter group was their commitment to make decisions. This
decision to make decisions was done in the Superintendent's absence, and I am not sure that he has ever recovered from the shock of hearing about it. The point just made is not actually important, but it does bear on the situations that follow in that the LC's from this point out never did make a decision.

However, the encounter session is historically significant to Quabbin because it was at this time that the School Committee had decided to cut back on programs and personnel. The Superintendent had decided to cut back on programs and personnel. The Superintendent probably knew this from the start. It was the job of the LC's in conjunction with the Superintendent, to plan where the tentative cuts would come from. The results of that meeting were the abolishment of the existing guidance department and teacher cuts in other areas bringing the total number of staff cuts to eight.

When this information finally got to the faculty, it responded angrily at first and timidly later. Every teacher not on tenure felt that he might be asked to leave. Far worse was the lack of information on cuts. No one outside of guidance was sure who was going. The cuts were to be announced at a later date.

The final realization that new staff patterns meant numerous staff cuts put the Teachers Association on the offensive. It had been weak but this would no longer be so.

This school year the QRTA has committed itself to improving its strength. Through the mechanics of negotiating it became aware of its potential which up to this time had never been used. Tenure had been granted to those staff members receiving their fourth contract. This meant that the majority of the
faculty had some sort of security to stand behind.

With a change in its executive organization and with a new vitality, the Teachers' Association began to challenge the administration about the legality of its moves the previous year. By contract the association should have been involved not only with the proposed changes in working conditions, but also it should have been the bargaining agent for the learning coordinators who were working off the salary scale and for the proposed changes in working conditions. It had been ignored. The LC's bargained individually for salaries, and the teachers had been at the mercy of every whim of the Superintendent.

This year we are completing the conditions of a two year teacher contract previously mentioned. It is important to note that this contract did not provide for the changes in working conditions caused by the eight staff cuts. This structural innovation for staff at Quabbin set up the following conditions:

1. reduction of teaching staff (with the possibility of more cuts to follow)

2. increase of class sizes

3. increase in guidance responsibilities that involve highly technical procedures for which this staff has not been properly trained

4. increase in curriculum planning and writing

5. study hall assignments involving clerical work, follow-up of absentees, etc.

6. reduction in course offerings
7. creation of a top-heavy managerial structure

8. teacher-intern and aide training programs governed by teachers

9. reduction of professional staff and increase of non-professional persons

When negotiations on a new contract were reopened this year, the QRTA found itself meeting a professional negotiator whom the Superintendent had hired with the consent of the School Committee. The fact that a professional negotiator had been hired was not so startling as the fact that the man selected was none other than a notorious lawyer who had gained a reputation in Worcester County for shaking relations between teachers and School Committee in an effort to question whether teachers had any rights at all in their profession. The Superintendent's move had set the QRTA for a tough conflict, one which is presently much alive.

With the tough line being displayed by the Superintendent, who by this time had taken on a new leadership style, the QRTA felt compelled to seek assistance from its parent organization, the Massachusetts Teachers Association. When the MTA learned of their plight, it sternly reprimanded it for ever allowing its contract to be violated. In turn they offered the services of one of their negotiators.

For weeks the Monday meetings to negotiate turned into insult sessions between the QRTA negotiator and the School Committee's. Realizing the futility of it all, the QRTA began fact finding in an attempt to alter the inappropriate situation for negotiating.

Before fact finding ensued, it seemed
that some sort of mediation must be attempted. The mediation handled by a state mediator got underway with some difficulty. However, it brought both parties together long enough to agree that negotiations might be able to resume if the QRTA agreed not to have its "obnoxious" negotiator present and if the School Committee agreed to remove its too "omniscient" lawyer. This was finally agreed with certain provisions. Negotiations did get underway. Salary was finally set and many articles of the new contract are taking shape.

Throughout negotiations events took place which really dictated the kind of atmosphere to be established. First of all, the grievance procedure was used for the first time. The administration and the School Committee were hit with numerous grievances one after another. The most important grievance being the one that was leveled against individual and group counseling. When this grievance reached the fourth level, binding arbitration, the School Committee agreed to make all guidance counseling a voluntary part of one's job. The grievance was dropped—a small victory was won by the QRTA.

In the midst of this turmoil many people at Quabbin faced some rather difficult moments. With the elimination of a guidance staff, the Principal was faced with the responsibility of setting up some kind of guidance system to meet the ever demanding needs of students. To make matters heavier on the shoulders of the Principal, who never seemed to overtly show any vast amount of enthusiasm for all that was happening, was new budgeting techniques, PPBS, being implemented by the Superintendent. This new system put a monetary premium on the success of programs. For instance, 4.0 percent of the Principal's salary came from his involvement in guidance. Consequently, the major thrust in effort and time has been
devoted to guidance. To insure maximum effort, guidance, like many areas to follow, will be built into the curriculum and stated in behavioral objectives as well be the entire curriculum. Release time never before granted was now available to work on guidance. Next, the learning coordinators began to feel from the staff a tremendous resentment that inhibited curriculum development. The staff has shown fear and little respect for the position of LC in general and for some LC's in particular. These feelings are so strong that it becomes nearly impossible for one to think optimistically about the future.

The teachers have perhaps responded most strongly to the changes, and yet, I would venture to say that they have felt the change least of all. Let me elaborate somewhat. First of all, classes run much the same as they always have. The LC position, quasi-administrative, resembles somewhat the department head structure. Although guidance and curriculum work have been foisted on them, they have been able in one instance to defeat mandatory compliance and in the other instance they have rather tacitly refused to work. Perhaps it is better to say--they have dragged their feet!

Student life at Quabbin has changed significantly. They have gained more license. This may be due in part to the number of beginning teachers coming in each year. It may also be due to a lack of commitment to enforce school regulations by the faculty—not overt, but slightly apparent.

Outside the school, the School Committee has undergone a severe chastisement by the faculty and public. It was they who from the beginning voted to support the new concepts the Superintendent brought forth.
Throughout the change process, especially this year, they, the School Committee, under QRTA pressure from protests and grievances attempted to assess some of the initial effects of the changes. They met on their own with teacher aides, interns from the University of Massachusetts and LC's. However, they did not question the faculty.

Finally, the entire school atmosphere has changed. The nervous twitching and convulsive movements within an expectant mother waiting in joy for her first born have now turned to anxiety, apprehension, and fear of miscarriage. Faculty meetings are now curriculum work sessions, LC meetings are nearly non-existent. Everyone is waiting--for what--they're not quite sure!

From the initial change environment until the present, Quabbin found itself crisis-orientated. Teacher unionism grew and strengthened in the wake of change. Channels of communication became closed, and every situation became a "win-lose" contest at the expense of the education of many and the integrity of some. One thing has become very apparent from this experience and that is: "Guidance and encouragement not power control, fosters creativity and innovativeness."10

The school year 1972-73 provided the first concerted effort to resolve the many differences of opinion and out-and-out conflicts between the teacher union, the adminis-

tration and the school committee. Before the school year was begun, two administrators were removed (principal and assistant principal), seventeen teachers sought employment elsewhere, and the Superintendent was hanging by his thumbs after receiving a unanimous vote of "no" confidence from the staff. School committee members resigned and a parents' pressure group prepared the way to have members of its organization appointed or voted onto the school committee.

The Quabbin change experience deserves consideration worthy of in-depth analysis to arrive at its weaknesses and its strengths. No experience is completely negative. Anyone who was involved in the Quabbin change experience is certain of one thing: there is no wish to be caught up in such a frustrating situation again. Yet, the reality is that many schools will suffer in much the same manner that Quabbin has in attempting change and innovation. In fact, Quabbin is still in a very "real" change state attempting to grow and develop into a psychologically healthy system.

Present demands on education not only suggest changes but also demand them. Let the QUABBIN STORY, then, serve as a beacon to aid any system to avoid the hazards of change that erupt in program and professional disintegration through misunderstanding and fear.

To establish a healthy climate for change we need first to develop ways for individual teachers to share new ideas with other staff members and to gain support for worthy innovations. Further, we need to make teachers
feel that they have had some influence in developing changes by adopting new administrative styles which decentralize decision-making.

The growing body of research findings about change processes in the schools makes clear, however, that the development of an open and supportive climate of personal and professional relationships among the members of the school faculty carried high priority.¹¹

Statement of the Purpose

The major objectives of the study will be contained in the following procedure which will attempt (1) to communicate the sequential history of the changes and innovations that took place at Quabbin; (2) to utilize the Havelock process guide to change and innovation as a procedure by which to analyze the Quabbin change and innovation process; (3) to utilize contemporary methodologies for analysis that offer a multitude of perspectives by which to measure the relative effectiveness of the stages of change and innovation at Quabbin; (4) to utilize the transactional analysis model¹² and the (LBDQ) Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire¹³


as methodologies by which to analyze the behavior and style of the superintendent as the change agent at Quabbin; and (5) to draw conclusions from the study about change and innovation at Quabbin in an attempt to offer researched information to facilitate the change process in education.

The purposes of the study will be to:

1. Discuss recent literature concerning theory and theory/action models available in dealing with change and innovation.
2. Relate the changes and innovations undertaken at Quabbin in case history fashion.
3. Analyze problem areas in the Quabbin change experience as determined through taped interviews with leading figures responding to specific questions about the experience.
4. Analyze the nature of the staff's involvement and reactions to the change experience through a self-administered, teacher questionnaire.
5. Analyze the stages of the change process of significant innovations at Quabbin and assess the relative effectiveness of each stage utilizing the Havelock process guide to change as criteria and contemporary analytical methodologies.
6. Analyze the role of the superintendent as the change agent at Quabbin through transactional analysis and the perceptions of staff who had undergone the change experience as illustrated in the LBDQ.
7. Discuss the nature and relative effectiveness of "participatory observation" as a technique by which to analyze and assess a change experience and as a potential feedback mechanism.

Significance

The school administrator today must, in one way or
another, protect himself from the threat of drastic change. It may well be that the administrative positions current in education will go out as has the saber-toothed curriculum. In any case, those in gatekeeper positions must be sensitive to and knowledgeable about the nature and workings of change.

"How is it possible for an educational system steeped in tradition and idealism to withstand the blitz of contemporary thinking and the relevant changes and innovations that have evolved from it?" Also, questions have to be dealt with which touch on moot aspects of change: is it man initiated, self-propelled (by its own merits); or man manipulated, self-exhausting; or man-power directed without necessarily having an end; or kept alive by employee loyalty to administration, job, pay route, personal convictions? Is its success a product of the ability of the staff to see and use the logic of the change, or is its success contingent on emotional acceptance (like, dislike, trust, distrust) of the change agent?

The significance of this study is focused on the questions above. The Quabbin experience is, certainly, not unrelated to present change situations taking place in other educational systems. The QUABBIN STORY contains, perhaps, some aspect of every change experience that has ever been tried. It may, also, contain some of the failures. Somehow, those who managed it should have been more perceptive when one considers the vast amount of theory that was available
and used, and the expert advice that was sought. Yet, planned change does not imply a sure-fire recipe. It may, however, offer linear direction, circular assessment and re-adjustment, but the human dynamic of internal involvement constitutes another very closely related concern which is difficult to prescribe from system to system even when one has a handle on the intervening variables.

This writer feels that the proposed study answers five distinct needs:

1. the need for Quabbin to understand why it experienced a "bad" change situation and a sharing of this information;

2. the need for Quabbin to examine the nature and function of the change agent's roles in light of its own experience and the willingness to share this information;

3. the need for providing a historical description of an actual change experience that failed and yet allowed for growth to follow;

4. the need to test a number of contemporary analytical methodologies as tools to provide insight and hopefully answers to many questions about the Quabbin change experience and change in general;

5. the need to discuss the potential for a "participatory observer" to function as "feedback" agent and assessor.

Method

The method for the investigation, analyzation, and assessment of the Quabbin change experience will involve the following:

(1) participatory observation
taped dialogue with six members of the change experience to present a historical overview

taped interview with the superintendent of schools, the president of the teachers' union and a member of the school committee

self-administered teacher interview questionnaire

perusal of records, resources and materials prepared during and for the innovations

research into change literature

utilization of a change process guide and model as evaluative criteria that somewhat resembles the one used by Quabbin

utilization of the following analytical methodologies: LBDQ, contextual mapping, (CIM) cross impact matrix, transactional analysis, and force-field analysis

Undoubtedly, the role of the "participatory observer" needs some explanation. As implied in the phrase, participatory observer, one immediately may question the objectivity of such an individual in this role. Yet, if that individual is a professional and if professional judgment is an acceptable criterion for measurement, then, this role can be construed as an acceptable posture from which to study an education experience whether it be of the change variety or otherwise. Although not the purpose of this study, it is, however, the contention of this writer that participatory observation may prove to be a highly invaluable function. This role could develop into an agent that offers feedback,
immediate diagnosis of change process and general monitoring of innovations, not to mention the value of having the experience recorded.

**Organization**

Chapter I will consist of an introduction discussing the intent of the study which is basically a modification of an expansion of the dissertation proposal. Chapter II will provide **research of current change literature**. Methodology and procedures used in the study will be presented in Chapter III with careful consideration given to the concept of "participatory participation," the taped dialogue and interview technique, and the self-administered teacher interview questionnaire. **THE QUABBIN STORY**³⁴ summaries of transcriptions of in-depth interviews with the superintendent of schools, the president of the teachers' union, and a school committee man, and the results of the Self-administered Teacher Interview Questionnaire will serve as data to form the basis of Chapter IV. Chapter V will consist of an analysis of the data contained in the previous chapter. In conclusion, Chapter VI will provide the **summary, conclusions and recommendations** of the study.

It is an impossible task to include input from everyone.

associated with the Quabbin change experience. An attempt, however, has been made to cover the thoughts, feelings, and reactions of most. Because, if anything, this drama portrays one recurring motif:

Part of the program of change should be a procedure for periodic review and revision. Again, the role of the members of the organization is vital. By inviting them to participate in the review, we deepen their commitment to the enterprise. If they know that the experiment has been inaugurated with the intention of re-evaluating it after a reasonable period of trial, they will accept some initial inconvenience, aware that they will have a chance to air their complaints and to modify the program. If they know that they themselves will be called upon to take part in this review, they will observe more carefully and prepare themselves to offer better suggestions.15

**Definition of Terms Used in the Study**

The terms in this glossary represent those that played a significant role as idea generators, concepts, or actual practices. In no way are the definitions to be construed as being the only accepted meaning of the term, rather, the researcher has developed meanings that are generally accepted in education. Some definitions are in fact credited to particular individuals.

**Adoption:** a decision to continue full use of an

---

innovation. The process of adoption includes the modifications of a program necessary to integrate it into an existing structure and function.

Change: a series of transitions from one stable state to another with "stable state" representing only a fix in time, not a continuing condition. Change is a natural process of adaptation to new circumstances, and man is the only animal who willfully decides to maintain a status quo.

Change agent: a professional person who attempts to influence adoption decisions.

Differentiated Staffing: a process by which the teaching staff is divided into a number of categories according to their roles and responsibilities which have been identified by the teaching-learning task. In this way, maximum use of teacher interests, talents, and capabilities, so that a learning environment is provided which facilitates the implementation of various programs geared to individualize and humanize the total school educational program. The process would also include the use of paraprofessionals as instructional and clerical aides.16

Diffusion process: diffusion process is separately defined by E. Rogers as the spread of a new idea from its source of invention or creation to its ultimate users or adopters.

Dissemination: process designed to create a widespread awareness of the invention among practitioners; to inform. Or it is the process of giving and receiving information about an activity, person, or idea. The preferred way of looking at dissemination is "spreading the word." It is distinguished from spreading the practice (diffusion).

Force-field analysis: A technique developed by Kurt Lewin which takes into account all the factors which act on the client system, forces which might inhibit or facilitate adoption of an innovation, and forces which the innovation itself may exert on the system.

Implementation: the action involved in adoption; it consists of the strategies used to create an adoption climate and attention to traditional administrative functions (size, cost, availability of personnel, and political viability).

Innovation: an idea perceived as new regardless of how "new" it may be or a deliberate, novel, specific change which is thought to be more efficacious in accomplishing the goals of a system; a break with routine and habit; it disrupts unreflective ways of thinking, feeling and behaving; it requires a heightened measure of attention and interest in the matters at hand; it forces the participants, and especially the creator, to think in fresh ways about familiar subjects, to reconsider old assumptions; and it differs from change in that innovation assumes that what is proposed can be consciously and planfully justified on the basis
Learning coordinator: an educational generalist with a responsibility to promote change, aid in decision making, organize curriculum, provide in-service training, manage the instructional programs in assigned unit, and be an educational leader within the system. In particular, the L/C would provide leadership in the evaluation of program and personnel.

Planned change: a process of deliberate changing which meet stated criteria--more than just a plan to change; criteria are significant!

Planning: to prepare alternative approaches to long-range and short-term expectation and objectives.

PPBS: (Planning-Programming-Budgeting System) a critical path methodology that shows the relationship between operating programs and the goals they are designed to accomplish. Three stages are observed: (1) identification of the broad goals using systems analysis and forecasting, (2) implementation of the objectives and their cost assessments, and (3) the budget. 17

PERT: (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) a network model belonging to a class of systems called critical path methodologies. PERT is a network of a time-linear chain of events, each of which is a determinant consequence of the

---

preceding one.\textsuperscript{18}

System approach: consists of specified steps in defining need, determining objectives, identifying constraints, proposing alternatives, making a selection, carrying out the implementation, evaluation, and modification of a program/project.

\textbf{Critical Concern}

One of the greatest current fallacies among people is the belief that tomorrow will be pretty much like it is today. Even though societal critics are constantly warning us that the future is almost one with the present, we still persist doggedly to feel that we and the environment are steady, constant systems with personalities, once set, never changing.

Careful analysis of society and, in particular, the systems, sub-systems, and individuals within it, reveals a tremendous pressure to hold things steady. Psychologists and sociologists have dealt considerably with "peer pressure" and the effects thereof, but professionals have offered no help with what I choose to call "institutional peer pressure." This condition exists on the premise that it is unhealthy and, perhaps, dangerous for an institution to appear different than others of its type.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 212.
Just as the individual attitude shapes the life style of the person, so does that of the institution. For this reason, most of the substantive changes that are made in recent decades have been dictated by external pressures. The institution which is, in fact, a reflection of the composite attitudes of its sub-systems and the individuals within can only operate within the parameters of the dominant attitudes which govern behavior. Therefore, too often changes that are instituted are done so under what appears to be compulsion and coercion.

The great concern that Quabbin exhibited, and when I say Quabbin, I am speaking in terms of a collective attitude, was a fear that it was doing something more than new, something quite "radical." Recent attitudes toward the hippie-type element in society has drawn the same response. It may be fair to go one step further and say that our age strives for conformity and stability. Anything different or changing tends to exist on the fringe of society until it is able to become the norm.

There was a plea a few years back that raised the question: "Do you dare to be different?" Although it has become a cliche, it still represents the attitude of a large segment of our population not only the youth and the radical. Social critics, in particular, have spent considerable time and effort in an attempt to prepare man for something he is afraid to face.
If we are to meet this critical challenge of change, and if we must be alert to the symptoms of obsolescence, where do we begin? If change is massive, then, is it realistic to assume that small numbers of pioneers will have the impact to deal with it or will it take a great crisis of catastrophic scope and consequence to move man's head out of the sand?

Institutional characteristic and behavior present a greater threat to society than that of the individual, in that the total impact of institutional pressure certainly bears more influence and weight than that of any one individual or group. To prepare society for the shock of change, it would seem that the emphasis has to be placed where it will do the most good and that is on the institution. Institutional growth and individual growth are contingent on change as a process of search and development to obtain, hopefully, a better operational situation. Man is more bent on accepting this idea of development in his own nature, perhaps, because he senses that in some way he controls it. Yet, on the institutional level he fears that a greater force is moving him into dangerous waters. Why is this so? Well, the primary reason is that man fears the insecurity of mobility when it works on a large scale. This is so because institutions are not accustomed to much internal movement—it comes to close to chaos at first glance.
Consequently, organizational change is extremely dangerous at this point in time. When the bureaucratic nature of the institution is broken down to the degree that movement vertically and horizontally becomes a dominant behavior, then, perhaps, an attitude will be born that can accept and control the process which offers development—change.
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH OF CURRENT CHANGE LITERATURE

To enhance this study it is necessary to examine the current literature on planned organizational change with careful emphasis given to the implementation of organizational innovations. This chapter presents significant conclusions that emerged from a review of change literature.

Attempts have been made to develop and apply a model from studies of the diffusion and adoption of innovations among large numbers of people to explain successful planned change in organizational settings. It would seem appropriate then, to consider first the work done in this tradition and speculate about the value of it. Following this, a more detailed discussion of planned organizational change studies may be presented.

**Diffusion and Adoption Studies**

A number of major reviews of diffusion and adoption studies have been conducted in the past few years. Rogers\(^1\) reviewed 506 studies in anthropology, rural sociology, educational and medical sociology. He classified them under the following problem areas: stages individuals go through in the adoption process, characteristics of innova-

---

tions and their rate of adoption, attributes of early and late adopters, influence to opinion leaders on the flow of ideas, and the role of the change agents.

Several general observations may be made about these studies: (1) they generally deal with the spread or adoption of rather simple technical innovations such as hybrid seed, tranquilizers, or audio-visual aids; (2) the agricultural studies have focused on the spread or adoption of innovations among individual farmers residing in a particular country, state, or region; (3) the studies of medical innovations have primarily dealt with their diffusion and adoption by doctors in a single community; (4) the anthropological studies have focused on the spread of such practices as the use of new tools, wells, and modern farming techniques within non-industrial societies; and (5) the education studies have primarily dealt with adoption rates of innovations in school systems.

From his extensive review of adoption and diffusion studies, Rogers\(^2\) proposes a model to explain why individuals do or do not adopt innovations. He identifies five critical stages in the adoption process: awareness, interest, trial, evaluation, and adoption. This model has frequently been cited in the educational literature and is a useful formulation for analyzing the successful introduction of innovations.

\(^2\)ibid., pp. 16-17.
in schools. The Clark and Guba\textsuperscript{3} approach to change in education parallels the Rogers' model in certain important respects. It emphasizes several processes including the development, adoption and diffusion of educational practices.

It is my belief, however, that Rogers' model has little use in explaining the success or failure of the implementation of innovations in schools or other types of organizations. Its lack of utility is due to certain of its assumptions which are not applicable to the implementation of "organizational" innovations. One of these basic assumptions is that during any of the intermediate stages between awareness and use, the individual is free to decide himself whether the innovation shall be tried, and if tried, whether it should be continued. If the innovation does not please him, he is free to reject it. If he is not pleased with his evaluation of it, he can discontinue his use of the innovations in most school situations, for example, those in which teachers are asked to redefine their roles by their superordinates. Moreover, the adoption of a particular program by administrators does not necessarily mean that it will be instituted or implemented at the school level. A study conducted by Carlson\textsuperscript{4} revealed that the mere adoption

\textsuperscript{3}David Clark and Egon Guba, An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1965.

\textsuperscript{4}Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovations, Eugene, Ore.: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965, pp. 71-81.
of programmed instruction by school superintendents did not necessarily lead to the desired change at the school level.

Analysis of the Rogers' model reveals adoption of simple technological innovations by individuals which do not demand the aide of others. It assumes that one can undertake trials in an either/or fashion and that short trials are sufficient to render an effective evaluation. Educational innovations, on the other hand, are not normally tried on a small scale without the cooperation and support of others.

It would appear then, that while the Rogers' model may be useful in understanding the adoption of simple innovations among varying groups of individuals, it seems to be of questionable value to explain the implementation of organizational innovations.

Initiation of Organizational Innovations

Much of the literature on planned organizational change is concerned with the way that organizational innovations are effectively initiated. A great deal of research emphasizes the importance of change agents and participation of subordinates as important ingredients of successful initiation. However, the notions of "change agent" and "participation" have varying definitions. For example, some use change agent to mean outside helpers, while others demand that the person(s) labelled change agents, actually direct planned change efforts. To some "participation"
means the extent of influence in decision-making, others mean simply involvement, while for others physical presence is enough.

Buchanan in his studies found that most change strategies placed stress on change agents who conducted group discussions. Leavitt showed that much of the literature on planned change assumes that a change agent will be used to facilitate initiation. The importance attributed to change agents during the initiation phase of planned organizational change seems to be based on the following reasoning: in general, members of an organization are unable, or find it difficult, to diagnose their problems in a realistic manner.

Great emphasis in the literature is also given to the importance of subordinate participation in initiating innovations. The authors that have stressed the importance of participation of subordinates in planned educational change have used one or more of the following arguments in support of their views: (1) participation leads to higher staff morale, and high staff morale is necessary for successful

---


implementation; (2) participation leads to greater commitment, and a high degree of commitment is required for affecting change; (3) participation leads to greater clarity about an innovation, and clarity is necessary for implementation; (4) beginning with the postulate of basic resistance to change, the argument is that participation will reduce initial resistance and thereby facilitate successful implementation; and (5) subordinates will tend to resist any innovations that they are expected to implement if it is initiated solely by their superordinates.\textsuperscript{7}

On the other hand, the Morse-Reimer\textsuperscript{8} study of the subordinate participation in decision-making in a large business firm reveals that both the high and low groups on the independent variable, participation showed significant increases in productivity, the dependent variable. Consequently, this investigation does not offer support for the varying effectiveness of different strategies. The Coch-French\textsuperscript{9} study which French tried to repeat in a Norwegian factory without success, is filled with methodological deficiencies: lack of control of third variables, improper use of statistical


\textsuperscript{9}Lester Coch and John French, Jr., "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations 1, No 1, (1948): 512-532.
techniques given the size of the sample, and failure to test
a number of assumptions made in their argument which were
testable.

The proven effects of participation in connection with
the use of an outside change agent is doubtful, as Leavitt
notes:

Bennis, Benne, and Chin in their
reader, The Planning of Change (1961),
are so enamored of it that they have
quite specifically set out power equal-
ization as one of the distinguishing
features of the deliberate collabora-
tive process they define as "planned
change" in organizations. A power
distribution in which the client and
change agent have equal, or almost
equal, opportunities to influence is
a part of their definition of "planned
change" . . . . The issue of validity
remains a critical and difficult
issue. When empirical studies have
been taken to evaluate outcomes, the
results have been equivocal at best . . . .
Even several of the individual case
analyses . . . have led to equivocal
or negative results. PE practices
have been carried much more by their
transferable operational techniques
and by their impact of persons than
by their demonstrated results.10

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman express similar doubts
about the participation of subordinates in decision-making,
primarily with reference to goal determination:

The idea, first, that the participa-
tion of subordinates in decision-mak-
ing was possible, and second, that it
was desirable has been the subject of

10 Leavitt, op. cit., pp. 1158-1159, 1167.
There is no question that a genuine attempt to extend the scope of the participants has been made in some places. The interpretation of these attempts and of their purported success is far from clear. Within certain limits, it is likely that more latitude than is currently available to most people in industry can be given to individuals to develop their own ways of achieving the ends that are presented to them by a centralized authority. This is a reasonable solution to the problem of motivation, more reasonable than the usual formulation to participation. To expect individuals at lower levels of the organization to exercise control over the establishment of overall goals is unrealistic. Thus, when participation is suggested in these terms, it is usually a sham.\footnote{F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959, pp. 177-178, 117.}

As shown above, even if participation were effective, it is problematic whether subordinates have the knowledge, competence, or the desire to make major decisions about organizational changes.

In summary, the review of the literature reveals that the use of change agents and participation are generally believed to be strategic variables with respect to the successful initiation of change proposals, and that it is assumed that a strategy of initiation involving a change agent and subordinate participation typically leads to successful implementation of innovations. This may be true if the participants are mature, self-directed, and responsible.
There is, however, a scarcity of research evidence to support the propositions that participation is positively related to variables such as the clarity of an innovation, the morale of the staff, and its commitment to an innovation and that these variables are positively associated with implementation.

**Implementation of Organizational Innovations**

There appears to be greater attention given to initiation than to implementation in the literature. This is illustrated by the treatment given these topics by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley in their book, *The Dynamics of Planned Change*. Here planned change is viewed as a collaborative process involving a change agent and a client system, with discussion of studies concerned with the training and role of the agent related to problems of initiation: helping organizations clarify and diagnose both internal and external problems, establishing a firm change-relationship, and helping organizations examine and select alternate solutions and goals. They give attention to what has been called implementation which they label "Phase 5" in the section on "Transformation of Intentions into Actual Change Efforts."  

---


13 Ibid., pp. 130-140.
and "Change Methods Used in Phase 5: The Initiation of Change Efforts." Their discussion is closed on this topic by saying:

In our sample of change projects agents do not speak of their efforts to provide either direct or indirect support for change efforts in the client system's sphere of existence. As a result, we can report here only a limited variety of methods appropriate to Phase 5. Much creative work remains to be done in developing methods for use in this crucial part of the helping process.

The literature on planned organizational change dealing with the period of implementation mentions numerous "facilitators" of implementation. Those most important being: (1) external and internal support for change; (2) adequate funding; (3) adequacy of plan for meeting organizational members' needs and the organizational problem under consideration; (4) member acceptance of the need for change;

---

11Ibid., pp. 221-226.  
12Ibid., p. 226.  
13Wigren, op. cit., p. 162.  
14Miller, op. cit., p. 18.  
(5) retraining of members for new tasks;\textsuperscript{20} (6) the presence of a change agent to give needed support and advice.\textsuperscript{21} It is unfortunate, however, that most of these reports are open to criticism on a conceptual and methodological basis.

Their weakness is conceptual because they generally treat the implementation of organizational innovations as an event rather than as a process.\textsuperscript{22} Many reports in the literature treat conditions as unchanging and implementation as the result of an accumulation of isolated conditions.

Isolated conditions as barriers or facilitators to implementation are not "uncovered" through systematic analyses of organizations in change. Most explanations are based on speculative accounts of experiences during an effort to introduce an educational change. Therefore, no supporting evidence is offered about conditions that are presumed to serve as important factors influencing organizational change. In most cases\textsuperscript{23} the objective is not to test or generate either hypotheses or theories about implementation but to report change experiences.


\textsuperscript{21}Miller, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 223.


Much of the literature turns out to be speculative. Bennis, after noting that the problem of implementation is a "continually vexing one," proceeds to cite without supporting evidence a number of facilitators or "shoulds" during implementation efforts:

The client-system should have as much understanding of the change . . . as possible . . . the change effort should be perceived as being as self-motivated and voluntary as possible . . . The change program must include emotional and value as well as cognitive (informational) elements for successful implementation . . . . The change-agent can be crucial in reducing the resistance to change.  

Carlson specifies three barriers to change without supportive evidence:

Part of the explanation of the slow rate of change in public schools according to many students of organizational change, lies with the absence of an institutionalized change agent position in public education. A change agent . . . can be defined as a person who attempts to influence the adoption decisions in a direction he feels is desirable. He is a professional who has as his major function the advocacy and introduction of innovations into practice . . . . In addition to the lack of a change agent, schools are also handicapped in change activities by the weakness of the knowledge base about new educational practices . . . . There is no struggle for survival for this type of organization service in organizations like schools.


25 Ibid., p. 176.
existence is guaranteed. Though this type of organization does compete in a restricted area for funds, funds are not closely tied to quality of performance. These organizations are domesticated in the sense that they are protected by the society they serve... it seems reasonable to suggest that the domestication of public schools is a hindrance to change along with the lack of a change agent and a weak knowledge base about educational innovation.  

Barnes indicates the problems that develop when participants in change efforts also attempt to observe them:

This problem need not concern us if we are interested only in organizational change, but it becomes crucial as soon as we turn our thoughts to the study of change. Some behavioral scientists (e.g., Blake, and Kouton, Argyris, Shepard, Bennis, Sofer, Rice, Jacques, Trist, F. Mann) seek and apparently achieve proficiency in both areas. But behavioral scientist critics decry these dual attempts to change organizations and also do research on the changes. The possible bias of social scientist involvement is of major concern... In essence, the critics of observer "involvement" want a science built upon the observation of human behavior rather than a science which involves attempts to practice as well as observe observers, so the reasoning goes, remain detached and relatively objective. Participants become involved and overly subjective; they begin to overvalue and push their own beliefs and "normative" theories.


There are exceptions, however, most reports about innovations in schools that require changes in teachers' behavior ignore the teachers' perspectives. Peterson examined the implementation of team-teaching in a high school and a case study of an effort to implement nongradedness in an elementary school serve as good illustrations of this. Both studies are written from the perspectives of the educators who administered the programs.

It does appear, however, that in both of these studies the actions and reactions of the teachers are filtered. The validity of their perceptions, therefore, is open to challenge and such procedures lend support to the criticism offered by Barnes.

In a number of studies, inappropriate methods are used to assess the degree of implementation. It is asserted by some that successful implementation took place, but the evidence is based on very subjective personal assessments. Others offer little or no evidence at all. For example, an


administrator presented a description of factors related to the implementation of nongradedness in his school system, but no data are presented to support the successful implementation of the innovation.

Numerous studies show that the methods used to determine behavioral changes are highly questionable. In a study that dealt with the relationships between types of leadership behavior and the degree of implementation of comprehensive classroom curriculum plans, the extent of classroom change was measured by interviews with the teachers.32

Utilization of subjective appraisals in investigations to determine the extent of organizational change has significant implications. The importance of obtaining an accurate measure of the dependent variable in any study cannot be overstressed. Work based on systematic observations of the behavior in question is dearly a necessity. This researcher's of the importance of obtaining an objective and unbiased measure for examining a change effort has lead him to obtain direct information through participatory observation, interviews, and a teacher questionnaire. It is essential to use formal assessment procedures.

This review has indicated that the literature is


deficient in several important respects. First, there has been little concern for testing theories about factors influencing implementation. Second, data used to isolate conditions having an impact on implementation are obtained from the perspective of those who initiate them. Finally, the method used to assess the degree of implementation is open to serious question; careful measurement would require collecting and analyzing data based on systematic observation.

The Havelock Process Guide to Change and Innovation

Ronald Havelock has offered much to the area of change in an attempt to simplify the knowledge diffusion and utilization process which is the impetus for change. The process functions under the following formula: who says what to whom by what channel to what effect for what purpose. Many examples may be found to illustrate the formula. Within the field of agriculture, who (agricultural researchers and developers) says what (hybrid seed corn) to whom (corn producing farmers in the United States) by what channel (the many facets of the cooperative extension service plus seed manufacturers and retailers) to what effect (increasing corn yield) for what purpose (increasing farm income directly and the nation's food supply indirectly). When this formula is applied to the field of education, it

works in the following manner: who (a team of university scientists, educators, and publishers) says what (a new high school science curriculum) to whom (teachers of high school science across the nation) by what channel (packaging, publication, and setting up training programs) to what effect (nationwide acceptance and adoption in a majority of high school curricula) for what purpose (improved science instruction and improved student learning of science). \[34\]

Havelock's formula also offers a format within which advances in research diffusion can be related to current communication operations within the field of education. First, the formula can be used to evaluate the efficacy of the various diffusion components currently utilized by educators. Second, the formula can be used to determine the place of people in the educational change process. That is, who initiates activity, who sustains the activity, who adopts it within their practice, what norms influenced adoption, and so forth. Perhaps a better understanding of the human factor in the process of change would result from this type of study. And third, the formula can be used to obtain baseline data about innovations being offered to the field. Data of this sort are needed to relate factors like difficulty, complexity, expense, and time to methods of diffusing

an innovation.  

To augment the above, Havelock has developed a guide to the "process" of innovation which is a manual written for educators working for reform at all levels. These people are the CHANGE AGENTS of education. The book does not tell "what" changes should be made nor does it recommend specific innovations, but it does provide a good deal of information on "how" successful innovation takes place and "how" change agents can organize their work so that successful innovation will take place.

As a guide to a process as complex as innovation, the author is concerned with ideas designed to assist the organization contemplating change or in the process of change by providing a CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION, a way to organize thinking and planning about specific activities. Beyond this it gives ideas on WHAT THINGS TO LOOK FOR (including THINGS TO AVOID) in yourselves, in your clients and in your procedures. It is also a CHECKLIST-REMINDER on important aspects of the process, and directs the change agent to important LITERATURE AND RESOURCE PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS who have something to say about specific issues dealt with today or tomorrow. Finally, the author provides guidelines for MEASUREMENT, EVALUATION, and DIAGNOSIS of the problems which are confronted

35 Havelock, op. cit., p. 139.

36 Havelock, op. cit., p. 3.
and offers TACTICS and STRATEGIES that have been used successfully by others.

The Havelock process guide to change is certainly nothing new in that it bears many of the aspects of various change models. It does, however, build into itself aspects that transcend the traditional linear change model which usually postulates four distinct functions to educational change--research, development, diffusion and adoption (e.g., Clark-Guba Model). Havelock offers a number of orientations to change which utilize concepts and research findings from the behavioral sciences for the purpose of facilitating improved functioning of an organization. In particular, he presents a model that utilizes a systematic, problem-solving process undertaken by members of an organization with possible assistance from consultants to improve the organization in such a manner that it can reach and sustain an effective level of functioning in a changing environment.

Associated with Havelock's process guide to change are his three major strategic orientations: the problem solving (P-S) orientation, the social interaction (S-I) orientation, and the research, development, and diffusion (RD&D) orientation. The orientation which best resembles the Quabbin change orientation is the P-S Orientation as represented in the model below:
The P-S strategic orientation somewhat resembles the Quabbin strategy in that it utilizes a process that lends itself to a local school environment. Observation of the S-I orientation reveals that its concern is with larger external influences from interaction with resource organizations, reference groups and associations. It may be construed as a higher, more complex process of innovation designed to work diffusion through a social system—a system larger than a local school. On the other hand, the RD&D orientation is one that involves extensive planning, development, production and packaging that might better be applied in a laboratory or a "lab" school, but it does not apply itself to a local school environment.

The P-S orientation is a strategy that involves an

37 Ibid., p. 155.
integrated sequence of steps or phases. It is problem-solving in that the improvement objectives set and the course of action taken are developed to meet the specific needs of the organization. It is collaborative, in that members of the organization and consultants jointly do the problem-solving. It displays an understanding of organizational psychology; it offers techniques for facilitating changes; and, it provides action skills. Finally, it aims at self-renewal capabilities—institutionalization of structures and resources that provide for continuous evaluation and innovation.

This orientation rests on the assumption that innovation is a part of the problem-solving process which goes on inside the user. It provides a patterned sequence of activities beginning with a "need," sensed and articulated by the client, which is translated in a "problem" statement "diagnosis." From the problem statement the client-user is able to conduct a meaningful "search" and "retrieval" of ideas to concern himself with "adapting" the innovation, "trying out" and "evaluating" its effectiveness in "satisfying" an original need. The outside change agent functions in a consultative or collaborative role to assist the user by providing new ideas and innovations specific to the diagnosis. He may also provide guidance on process and problem-solving.38

38Ibid., p. 156.
Incentives for Innovation

The "market" structure of the public school "industry" has a major effect on school's decisions to adopt innovations, and the bureaucratic structure and incentives of schools shape in specific ways the transition from adopting innovations to implementing them.39

Public schools do share a number of common characteristics with other nonmarket-oriented public utilities, in that they are self-perpetuating bureaucracies, thanks to tax-supported status, certification practices for teachers and administrators, and the custom of promotion from within. Seen from this perspective schools resemble many civil service agencies, notably public health, welfare, and criminal justice systems. They also share with these systems a characteristic which profoundly affects their institutional response to innovation. They cannot select their clients and the clients must, as a practical matter, accept the service, whether or not he is satisfied with its quality.40 Also, they operate under a highly decentralized system of governance, but a highly complex structure of influences. The 18,000 school districts in the United States find that each is subject to a range of local community influences as well as the influences and legal authority of state and federal government.


40 Carlson, op. cit., p. 3.
Like certain other self-perpetuating bureaucracies, schools are a labor-intensive craft industry whose managers often present to the outside world the impression that the craft is highly specialized, that its functions cannot be carried out by replacements whether in the form of uncertified labor or machines.\(^1\) Schools then become a captive servant of a captive clientele, and its contribution is uncertain.

The thrust behind the initiation of any innovation would tend to be an improvement of educational processes, better educational outcomes, economic efficiency or economic and social improvement. Yet, unlike a market economy, the school's response to innovation has been:

1. more likely to adopt cost-raising innovations
2. less likely to adopt cost-reducing innovations
3. less likely to adopt significant changes in resource mix (threat to the guild structure)
4. more likely to adopt instructional processes or new wrinkles in administrative management (brings about little change)
5. less likely to change accustomed authority roles
6. be equally unwilling to face as competitive firms have to face large-scale encroachments\(^2\)

Schools, therefore, seek to maintain bureaucratic and social stability. From the viewpoint of a market economy, it may be argued that many of the innovations adopted by schools are nothing more than fads since there is little or

\(^1\) Pincus, op. cit., p. 115.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 116.
no serious attempt to validate them in terms of productivity or effectiveness criteria—or any market-like mechanism that separates the wheat from the chaff. The validation process for educational innovations is ultimately measured by bureaucratic and social acceptability.

The bureaucratic factor supporting innovation was thought to be "per capita" school spending, a view based on the extensive studies of school district administrations conducted by the Teachers College. More recent research, however, supports the following factors:

1. Bureaucratic safety (self-perpetuating)
2. Response to external pressures (financial constraints)
3. Approval of peer elites (key figures)

Based upon the outline of Glaser in Increasing the Utilization of Applied Research Results, students of change have found the factors supporting innovations in organizations to include the following: organizational attitudes that support change (such as free communication, support administration and colleagues, high staff morale); clarity of goal structures, organizational structures that favor innovation (sufficient decentralization of authority, existence of a large number of occupational specializations, existence of structures for self-renewal); professionalism

---

of staff; organizational autonomy (not excessively dependent on public opinion or tests of political feasibility to validate planned change); and a few strong vested interests in preserving status quo method of operation. Taking into consideration the existing constraints, schools tend to voluntarily adopt innovations which promote the schools' self-image by demonstrating that schools are:

(1) "Up-to-date" (modern plant, curricular offerings, etc.)

(2) "Efficient" (new budgeting and accounting systems)

(3) "Professionalism" (workshops, in-service training, etc.)

(h) "Responsiveness" (formalized links to parents)

Empirical evidence as illustrated in Some Aspects of Research and Development in the United States shows that small districts adopt fewer innovations than larger ones, presumably because large districts are more able to keep informed of new methods, and face a wider variety of both external and system-generated pressures for change. As of 1969 it pointed out that the most widely adopted institutional innovations were: teacher aides, ability grouping, team teaching, elementary resource teachers, movable partitions, T.V. instruction, and non-graded sequencing. Also, curricula innovations were widely introduced between 1965-69 in science,

math and reading with the prime influences coming from NF3 and from the sales effort of new commercially marketed curricula (e.g., the EDL reading laboratory and SRA reading program).

These findings indicate that planned research and development efforts are, in curriculum change, likely to be more effective in gaining adoption than most modest efforts, the current success of the Southwest Regional Laboratory prereading program being another case in point. It is important to note that the NFS and SWRL programs were worked out in collaboration with practitioners, which helped to encourage the adoption. Finally, programs were widely publicized and praised by professional educational groups, so that there were social pressures for adoption.

Because so many factors, not the least of which are the uncertainty of benefits and the certainly of resistance, tend to operate against any substantial voluntary change in the structure of the schools, desires for programs and reform, therefore, tend to be channeled into "refer" areas. This would include those areas that involve spending more money on the existing resource mix (more teachers, more administration, etc.), or those that involve the kinds of change in curriculum or administration that do not seem to threaten organized groups in and outside of the bureaucracy. This is the collateral reason for the often-noted prevalence of faddism in school reform. If structural changes are
prohibitively costly in real terms, then the attractiveness of less costly reforms, or even of chasing after will-of-the-wisp, is high lined. 45

Many innovations are implemented in a manner so that they never get a fair trial. There has been wide-spread support for the adoption of such innovations as ungraded classes and team teaching; yet, these innovations are rarely implemented. A school district will adopt ungraded classes and then implement it by teaching essentially a graded curriculum in the "ungraded" class. There are several reasons for this failure to implement innovations effectively. In particular, R&D organizations frequently do not provide sufficient implementation guidance. Also, teachers, administrators, and students may not accept the obligation to change their behavior patterns in ways consistent with the implementation. On the other hand, schools may simply not know how to implement the innovation.

In spite of prodigious effort, common guidelines that guided did not exist; the language of school organizations, teaching and goals for pupils remain metaphorical and literary but neither practical nor scientific.46

There seems to be a greater interest in the language of innovation than in the complexities of translating language into innovative practices. This style may well be

45Pincus, op. cit., p. 121.

entirely reasonable in the absence of evidence that conclusively supports the advantages of the innovation. For the school's purpose, verbal adoption may be entirely sufficient, and a preference for the verbiage of magnificent vistas has been noted by various observers. Inherent in all of this appears an important causal factor which points to a lack of communication between sponsors of innovations and the ultimate users—students, parents, and teachers—which tend to work against change at the user level.\footnote{\citet{fullan_overview}}

School districts are hard-pressed between voter reluctance to raise property taxes and employee wage demands. This squeeze tends to buttress whatever preference the school authorities have for system maintenance over innovation, and the actual flow of funds is likely to reflect those preferences. Some attributes of federal aid enhance these tendencies, and act to discourage incorporation of innovations into the school system. Pet projects exist between one and three years, and seed money must be replaced by the district at great costs. There are no clear-cut governing policies toward innovation. "Soft money" is frightening and not worth the effort. Finally, support of innovations is small compared to impact aid and compensatory education.\footnote{\citet{pincus_pet}} If one is to believe Bowles and Gintis, the only way to change the

\footnote{\citet{fullan_overview}}

\footnote{\citet{pincus_pet}}
schools is to reform or revolutionize society, because the schools today are in effect performing the role that the majority influences in society want them to, and not the way that reformers want them to.

Problems

Presently, the great gap between research and the organization, and the related problems that illustrate the following must be addressed:

(1) Researchers are more interested in disciplinary prestige than in problem-solving in the schools

(2) A great gulf exists between innovation and implementation even with regional laboratories incentive to produce R&D results

(3) Researchers disseminate results through journal articles and reports; practitioners learn through briefings, meetings and informal discussions

(4) R&D change model view the schools as a passive adopter of new products

(5) Researchers and practitioners often don’t speak the same language because their operating styles, perception of issues, and priorities are different.\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 133.}

From the above it would appear that R&D agencies should become problem oriented, and at the same time conduct workshops, seminars and institutes. Also essential would be R&D assistance during the implementation period. Orientation and mutual understanding are essential. R&D must turn to a clinical model of change, one which adapts general
findings or processes to the engineering model which offers a standardized product to the clients at large. Case studies of innovations are also needed that deal with implementation. There is to be considered the analysis of incentive patterns, and possibly the restructuring of system incentives. Finally, experimentation is the only answer in that there can be no agreement about the nature of priority of social objectives.

Summary

This chapter reviewed studies on planned organizational change with reference to the problem of implementing organizational innovations. I arrived at the following conclusions. It is apparent that the model growing out of diffusion and adoption studies offers little use for understanding what takes place during an organizational implementation endeavor. The planned organizational change literature suggested internal and external organizational conditions existing prior to a planned change endeavor that could have an impact on the degree of implementation. A small portion of the literature considered the period during which the implementation occurred. Many studies fall victim to a typical problem in that they had serious methodological or conceptual short-

My review of implementation studies substantiated the statement made by many observers about the paucity of knowledge concerning the conditions influencing the implementation of organizational innovations. It illustrated that the success or failure of organizations to implement innovations assumes that members are initially resistant to change and that it is the ability of management or a change agent to overcome their resistance that accounts for the success or failure of endeavors to implement innovations. This explanation ignores important considerations about obstacles to which members who are not resistant to change may be exposed when they make endeavors to implement innovations.

My review indicated that there was a great need for in-depth studies of organizations, in particular schools, trying to implement organizational innovations in order to isolate factors that inhibit and facilitate their implementation.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND DATA COLLECTION

The rationale for the selection of the basic research strategy and the specific techniques used in this inquiry was based on a view that was expressed in this way:

People who write about methodology often forget that it is a matter of strategy, not of morals. There are neither good nor bad methods, but only methods that are more or less effective under particular circumstances in reaching objectives on the way to a distant goal.¹

This chapter presents the major methodological approaches used in designing and carrying out the study and the reasons for the decisions made concerning them. I shall consider first why the case study method was employed. Then I shall discuss the following matters: securing formal administrative approval for the inquiry, gaining assistance from staff who had participated in the implementation of the innovation, and discussing the significance of my role as a "participant observer." Finally, I shall describe the procedures followed and the major problems encountered during the field-work phase of the investigation.

Rationale for the Use of the Case Study Method

to share the change experience, the significant objectives of the study were stated as follows: (1) to ascertain information to increase the author's knowledge of conditions, in addition to members' resistance to change, that did serve to block or facilitate the implementation of organizational innovations; (2) to ascertain whether there was any empirical support for the author's contention that the change process utilized was a truncated version of many contemporary ideas and research on the matter, viz., the Havelock Change Process; (3) to examine the consequences of the role performance of management for the implementation phase of the process of change.

The author deliberated about the most efficacious means to pursue these objectives in light of the fact that he had participated throughout the entire implementation phase as a responsible member of middle management whose job it was to implement the various innovations planned at this time. During the adoption and implementation stages, however, careful consideration was given to document all aspects concerned with planning such as PERT charts, flow charts, and recorded minutes of all meetings. Consequently, voluminous amounts of recorded data exist that contain the essence of this experience in educational change and innovation. It was also concluded that the research design should include certain additional specifications.

First, data would need to be obtained from those staff
members who had participated in the innovations to check their attitudes, performance, and perceptions concerning the strengths and weaknesses of each innovation and the manner in which the innovations were implemented. More specifically, data would be required that covered the period of time when the innovations were introduced, when efforts were first made to implement them and when an assessment could be made of the extent to which the innovation had been implemented. This particular methodological specification was essential to obtain a detailed description of the organizational dynamics that occurred after the introduction of the innovations into the educational organization.

Second, the study should be designed so that the research issues could be examined in as objective a setting as possible. Third, the procedures used should permit a rapport between the participant observer and the participants that could be maintained over a relatively lengthy period of time. Fourth, the research strategy should make provision for the use of a variety of techniques for obtaining data.

**Participatory Observation**

One principal consideration of the study is focused on the "participant-observer" as a credible posture to be assumed by that individual selected to be both researcher and contributor to the implementation of innovations at hand.
Participatory observation is certainly not new or radical as a mechanism for providing instant, analytical feedback to the changing organization. The person in this position may be heralded euphemistically as an educational auditor. Realistically he becomes the nerves of the organization if he is to be effective. His most important function is revealed in the incident below.

It was Ernest Hemingway in the early 1960's who first revealed the characteristic required to be a "great writer" when he was goaded into answering the question by replying, "In order to be a great writer a person must have a built-in shock proof crap detector." In his response, Hemingway identified an essential survival strategy. One may look at the history of education and realize that there has been a deep veneration for "crap." The history of change on the other hand is a chronicle of the anguish and suffering of men who tried to help their contemporaries see that some part of their fondest belief were misconceptions, faulty assumptions, or practices that were either ineffective and, perhaps, even harmful. The participatory observer, therefore, must be a person that would be able to cultivate the technique of "crap detecting" to the extent that he would be able to set before the managers of change those things that appear to be faulty, illogical or down-right stupid.

\[^{2}^\text{Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, Teaching as a Subversive Activity, New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1969, p. 3.}\]
There are many ways to describe this function. Norbert Wiener would insist that the participant observer would function as an "anti-entropic feedback system." "Entropy" is the word used to denote a general and unmistakable tendency of all systems—natural and man-made—in the universe to "run down," to reduce to chaos and uselessness. The process may not be reversed but it can be controlled. One way to control it is through "maintenance," as stated by Eric Hoffer. It is his belief that the quality of maintenance is one of the best indices of the quality of the system in its particular state. Wiener uses a different metaphor to get at the same idea when he says that in order for there to be an anti-entropic force there must be adequate feedback. Changes and innovations may not run down, but they often run-a-muck. In other words, we must have instruments to tell us when we are running down or astray, when maintenance is due. For Wiener, such instruments would be people or persons who have been educated to recognize the intricacies of change or innovation implementation, to be sensitive to problems caused by change, and who have the motivation and courage to sound alarms when anything resembling entropy accelerates to a dangerous degree. This is what is meant by "crap detecting." This concept is also the thing that would provide what John Gardner coins the "ever-renewing society." This perspective allows one to be a part of his own system and, at the same time, to be out of it. One views the activities of his group much like an
anthropologist observing tribal rituals, fears, conceits. In this way it is possible for one to recognize when reality begins to drift too far away from the grasp of the tribe.

To achieve such a perspective is not easy if one considers the difficulty associated with one's ability to achieve a high degree of freedom from the constraints of the tribe or the system. If we assume that others have been victimized by indoctrination, is it possible for anyone, then, to step out of his environment and remain objective while looking in? One's perceptions of what is "true" or real is shaped by the symbol-manipulating institutions in his tribe. What each of us has to deal with is "prejudice." None of us is free of it. However, it is the sign of a competent "crap detector" that he is not completely captivated by the arbitrary abstractions of the system in which he happens to be.

In other words the role of the participant-observer should reflect two functions that must interrelate. On the one hand, it is limiting to simply observe, because one is not able to feel what it is like to live and work in the particular environment that is being changed. Yet, just participating without keeping an overall sense of the flow and structure will also be of slight help. Above all, it is essential to be able to share all with colleagues. All in this situation might include: Where are we in terms of innovation implementation? What forces are with us? Which forces are opposed? How credible is our position at this
time in terms of what we are trying to do? What are significant strengths and weaknesses? Are we all communicating?
What is the faculty's perception of the structure? Are they comfortable with it, or do they have to subvert it in order to survive? These questions are hard because inevitably they involve your own or someone else's ego. But they must be raised if there is to be any growing. If the participant-observer function is accepted, it resides within the structure as a system that is "supportive", and as such it is a role that may be assumed in an alternating manner. The key then is supportive in this process.

Data Collection: Methods and Procedures

Taped Dialogue

This researcher utilized three approaches to data collection. The first is contained in an overall account of the Quabbin change experience which appeared in an article published in the Journal of Research and Development in Education Volume 6, Number 4, Summer, 1973, under the title: "The Quabbin Story." Six persons contributed to the taped dialogue focused on the Quabbin experience in implementing a series of innovations that fell primarily under the umbrella of "differentiated staffing patterns." A University of Massachusetts professor from the school of education who worked with the system as a change consultant, the superintendent of schools for the Quabbin Regional School District
who was responsible for the initiation of the innovations that were implemented, a Quabbin Regional School Committee member who was drawn into the system at a very crucial point to deal with the controversy, as it had come into the community, the president of the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association who defended the teachers' position as it stood in opposition to working conditions that were in violation of the teachers' contract, a learning manager whose responsibilities resembled quite closely those of a junior high school principal, and the author who functioned as a participant observer and who worked in the system as a learning coordinator in the humanities unit all contributed in an informal transactional manner. The dialogue was, however, designed to focus in a reflective manner on the (1) need for change in this system, (2) the particular changes that were brought in, (3) the process by which the innovations were implemented, and (4) the degree of success of the innovations that were implemented into the organizational structure. Beyond this, there was also implied in the willingness of participants to experience this, a hope that, perhaps, more light could be shed on the problems that developed relative to the innovations that seemed to be in violation of teachers' contract or good, healthy educational practices. This aspect of the involvement was a cathartic venture on the behalf of each contributor in that only one attempt was ever made to assess this change experience and that was a week-end retreat.
to a hunting lodge in New Hampshire at a critical point when much in-fighting was beginning to surface. The retreat was considered a success, but, like many successful things, it was short-lived and not followed up.

**Taped Interviews**

The second approach was an in-depth interview with three key personnel who could offer perceptions on the changes and innovations from three distinctly different perspectives. The first interview, and the lengthiest, was with the superintendent of schools. There is no question whatsoever that he and he alone provided the strategy for the institutionalization of a number of organizational innovations that fell under the umbrella of "differentiated staffing patterns." It is also fair to mention that the particular innovations that were implemented into the organization were those that he had selected prior to the implementation stage. The interview focus was directed at the superintendent as an "excitor" of change although those involved in the system at the time would have preferred to regard him as the internal change agent. The phrase *change excitor* would be the one that he would prefer in that it does provide a connotation from the interest stage to that of adoption.

Through the interview technique the author desired to expose the qualities of the man who managed a rather large innovative operation. This exposure is not designed to negate
a particular quality, but, rather, to offer a close scrutiny of the man's beliefs and practices as they worked on the change process and the selection process which determined what innovation would be implemented. Questions built around these objectives were prepared. The interview took place in the superintendent's office in the afternoon. He graciously gave of his time and energy in this undertaking, he felt strongly about contributing to this investigation, and the interview will attest to his frankness in answering all the questions set before him. He is an educator well schooled in change process.

Unlike the dialogue technique, the interview provided the opportunity for selective questioning that would ride deeply into a particular issue. It also gave the interviewer an opportunity to vent his feeling in a less threatening way.

The next interview was with the president of the teachers' union. Here once again the author desired to provide an opportunity for in-depth narration on the Quabbin change experience from the perspective of the teacher. The president of the QRTA was exposed in the same manner as the instructional staff to the innovations that were implemented. There was, however, a tremendous amount of responsibility on her shoulders to carry any and all complaints to either informal resolution or to grievance. Beyond her role as a junior high school social studies teacher, she governed the
teachers' union during the years of critical confrontation. The teachers' union emerged as a strong monitoring agency out of the conflict that transpired during the innovation implementation stage.

Central to the focus of this interview are three points: (1) the extent to which the teachers perceived the need for organizational change, (2) the willingness of the teachers to change their behavior as it was prescribed within the innovations, and, (3) the degree of successful and unsuccessful implementation of innovations and the results thereof. Also of significance is the behavior of those managing the change process, and, in particular, that of the superintendent of schools who assumed the over-all responsibility for at least initiating into the system the organizational changes that were pursued.

The final interview was with a member of the Quabbin Regional School Committee who felt compelled to serve on the school committee when the conflict within the school between the teachers' union and the school administration flared up in the community and fear developed that the education of the youth would be endangered. This particular school committee member was voted on to the school committee like two others out of a political shake-up which caused old school committee members to either resign or not run for re-election. The new school committee members who replaced the old during this period were members of a parent group that asked for
clarification on the practices undertaken at the school and requested enlightenment on the conflict that was apparent to the extent that students brought it home to their parents.

This interview would round out the field of perception as it gazed on the Quabbin experience in organizational change. It was essential to gain the perspective from the community which may be considered a reflection of the perception of the students. In this instance the author moved his focus into the area that dealt with the following: (1) the communities' need to respond to what it felt to be a precarious position for students caught in a conflict, (2) the communities' willingness to behave rationally as it pursued answers to numerous questions linked to the innovations that were implemented, and (3) the political effectiveness of the communities to implement changes relative to the conflict at the local regional high school.

The taped dialogue and the interviews with three key personnel constituted what may be called a "framed narrative." The reader is able to grasp in total a historical perspective that resided within the taped dialogue. There are numerous foci in this portion of data which built the whole tale from beginning to end. Architectonically, the taped dialogue formed the outer frame for its scope and perspective was purposely broad. It was an excellent lead in because it was comprehensive and somewhat detailed in sections. Each interview, on the other hand, formed a
smaller interior frame that held particular foci that were treated in more depth. Rationale, justification, and additional reflection offer the reader in this section a behind-the-eye-ball insight into the behavior, thinking, and beliefs of those being interviewed. Change perceived here is drama as human beings come into play with new ideas.

Self-administered Teacher Questionnaire

The final technique which the author utilized and which molded an even small interior frame for the narrative was the self-administered teacher questionnaire. Twenty-one professionals, those still in the system who had been a part of the Quabbin change experience, completed the questionnaire. The group included: one administrator, five L/C's, and fifteen teachers (these constitute the positions held during the change period). The questionnaire was distributed at a meeting. It was discussed in depth. There was no time limit for completion. All questionnaires were returned within one week from the time of issuance. The twenty-one individuals completing the questionnaire were enthusiastic and willing to contribute to this study in any way.

Through the questionnaire the author intended to trace the stages that lead to the implementation of the differentiated staffing innovations and others within the d/s frame. The questionnaire started with the awareness and interest stages and directed the teacher, learning coordinator or
administrator to respond to items that (1) new educational ideas were shared with the faculty, (2) their reactions to the ideas, and (3) the manner in which the ideas were directed in the school and by whom.

The next phase of the questionnaire constituted a quasi-evaluative and trial period. In this section the faculty was asked to deal with the following: (1) the part each played in looking over what appeared to be tentative organizational innovations, (2) the nature of communication at this point, (3) the degree of comprehension each had of the ideas that were circulated, and (4) the probable need for inservice education for understanding and behavior changes that might be prescribed.

Within the next section, each person looked at the organizational innovations in the implementation stage and focused on the following: (1) the part each saw himself playing, (2) the obstacles that appeared, (3) the initiative each lent to make the innovations work, and (4) the type of atmosphere that developed in the wake of the organizational innovations as they became institutionalized.

The next section of the questionnaire dealt with the implemented organizational innovations and directed itself to the following: (1) the discernible effects of the implemented innovations as perceived by each on the student body, staff, and community, (2) the individual reaction to the implemented innovations, and (3) a reflection (hindsight
being 20-20) on the nature of change and change process to facilitate innovations into an operational mode.

The last portion of this section of the questionnaire was a survey of those involved in the change experience to describe the background of each participant relative to age, training, and position in the system. Also attached to this portion were two questions the first of which dealt with things that were favorable and unfavorable to the change experience, and the second dealt with forces that were either favorable or unfavorable to the change experience. Both requests were prioritized through consensus of those participating in the questionnaire. A modified Delphi technique was used to gain consensus in both cases.

Part III of the Self-Administered Teacher Questionnaire is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire\(^3\) which was found to be a most effective instrument available to measure teacher perceptions of the superintendent from two separate behavioral dimensions: (1) consideration, and (2) initiating structure. The questionnaire consists of a series of statements, fifteen on each dimension, about the superintendent on a five-point scale ranging from 4 to 0 are used to quantify the instrument to enable the researcher to plot the mean scores of both dimensions into one of four quadrants.

\(^3\)For details regarding this instrument see: Ralph K. Stogdill, "Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII," The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Education, Columbus, Ohio, 1963.
for purposes of analysis.

To increase information regarding the superintendent's perceived real and ideal leader behavior, the LBDQ was given on two occasions. On each occasion the items were not altered but the directions to the respondents were modified so that the desired information was obtained.

First, to determine teachers' perceptions of their superintendent's leader behavior, the LBDQ was employed without modification. All teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire. The unmodified instrument is referred to as the LBDQ Real in this study. Second, to provide additional information, an alteration was made in the directions of the instrument to allow teachers to indicate what they consider to be the behavior of an "ideal" superintendent for their school. The responses are to be compared to the responses given on the LBDQ Real to identify the difference between what teachers perceive to be the superintendent's leader behavior and what they identify as ideal leader behavior. Because no instruments exist which measure ideal leader behavior in terms which correspond to the two dimensions of the LBDQ, the use of this instrument with the alterations in directions (called LBDQ Ideal) was essential to keep all data compatible with the theoretical framework of this study. It must be noted that only the basic directions were changed; no items were altered in any manner.

The superintendent was also asked to participate. He
was asked to rate his own behavior on the same two dimensions as those on which his teachers rated him. Again, the only modification of the LBDQ concerned changes in the basic directions. The directions were modified so that the superintendent would have the opportunity to describe what he felt to be the ideal behavior of a superintendent in his school. Again, only directions were changed, and the same two dimensions used in the LBDQ Real were studied.

A most critical question formed the basis for the hypothesis to be tested in this part of the study. The question was, "Is there any relationship between the superintendent's style of leader behavior and the school's ability to implement change?" The author hypothesised that the school's willingness or ability to implement change would be contingent on a superintendent who tended to use personal style behaviors high on consideration rather than normative.

It was essential to pre-test the questionnaire through an internal consistency check to insure reliable data. Therefore, three teachers worked with the author in the construction and initial criticism of the instrument. In particular, it was important to sequence the questions in the most appropriate order, and to build questions that would gain results without projecting an opinion on the part of the researcher.

After the first questionnaire was constructed, the twenty-one participants were asked to critique it before it became finalized. This was done. The information gathered from the
questionnaire critiquing was taken under consideration by the questionnaire construction committee and the final product was developed to the satisfaction of all.

**Questions Central to Data Collection**

The data collected and the methods and procedure of analysis will deal with five questions that reflect the major concerns of this study as stated in Chapter I. Below are the questions to be analyzed:

Question #1: "What was the management style utilized by the Superintendent as the promoter and implementor of change as depicted in the available data?"

Question #2: "What was the nature of the Quabbin change process, and how does that process compare with that expounded by Ronald Havelock?"

Question #3: "How did particular, significant events in the 'Quabbin Story' impact on one another, and what was the magnitude and significance of each impact on the total environment?"

Question #4: "How did the administration and the Quabbin faculty transact through the various phases of implementation of organizational changes?"

Question #5: "How did particular forces impact upon the organization in its desire to change?"

**Methods Central to the Analysis of Each Question**

Question No. 1 addresses itself to the leadership style of the superintendent. The Leadership Description Questionnaire is used as a basis to plot the Superintendent's leadership style. The leadership style of the superintendent may be analyzed by plotting the mean scores on both dimensions
according to where they fall into each of four quadrants:
(1) "above the mean on Consideration" and "above the mean
on Initiating Structure," (2) "below the mean on Considera-
tion" and "below the mean on Initiating Structure," (3)
"above the mean on Consideration" but "below the mean on
Initiating Structure," and (4) "above the mean on Initiat-
ing Structure" but "below the mean on Consideration." The
two means may be constured as coordinates which define the
four quadrants.

FIGURE 3.1 A quadrant scheme for

describing leaders' behavior on the

Initiating Structure and Consideration
dimensions. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>MEAN INITIATING SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN OF
CONSIDERATION
SCORES

Question No. 2 touches on the change process utilized,
and for the analysis of this question the writer has selected
Contextual Mapping which has been defined as "a graphic dis-
play of the logical and causal dependencies of functionally

4Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration,
related phenomena." The method requires that causal dependencies among trends and subtrends be identified; that logical deductions be made from identified discrepancies; that implications be derived from stated deductions; that possible alternative directions of trends be identified; and that the consequences of each alternative be delineated.

Two basic assumptions underlie this method: (1) that forces which create a discernable direction of progress are more likely to continue than change, and (2) that the combined effect of such forces will promote discernable change patterns.

This particular methodology has certain advantages in that it provides a vehicle for forecasting alternative and comparative futures. It also makes use of the systems approach to forecasting. The method balances analysis and synthesis. Through contextual mapping a problem may be dimensionalized in terms of multiple variables and solved as an entity. Handled appropriately, the method becomes an organized, disciplined way of approaching complex problems.

There are limitations to this method. First of all, it is an extrapolative process, and it is somewhat dependent on subjectivity and interpretation. Also, it is based more on imagination than data. Finally, it is difficult to establish parameters. The process involves identification

---

of all components and variables affecting the problem(s).

Question No. 3 focuses on the impact that particular events have on one another. For the analysis of this particular question, the Cross Impact Matrix (CIM) method is used by which the interrelated items in a set of events and the impacts thereof can be considered as to the significance of the interactions of the ideas under consideration. The CIM can be used to consider both the probability of occurrence of an event and the impact this probable occurrence could have on other events. Data from the matrix can be useful for the long-range planner in estimating how a change of a cluster of occurrences might be expected to significantly alter a future state. The cross impact matrix techniques are a powerful tool "for clarifying the relationships between and among events and for determining the possible implications of alternative policies and the influence of external events on these policies."

The entire process involves developing the linkage between the individual events to determine if there are any significant interactions or patterns of interactions.

There are at least three considerations that must be examined through this process. The first and the easiest interactional element is that of time relationship. This

---

would give the logical and causal influence of the impact of one event on another which contributes to the overall relationship of the various events. In addition to time, the two other factors to be considered are effect and force. In terms of effect, the question is, "Does event A have a positive or a negative relationship to event B? Does A enhance or retard the probability of B? Is A a necessary and/or sufficient condition for B to occur?"

Probably the most valuable aspect of the CIM method is the determination of inputs. During this stage, either the investigator or the participants who are playing the game are forced to examine very carefully the nature of the event under consideration with respect to interactions on other events, as well as the probability of that event occurring with respect to other events.

There are some limitations of the technique. For a sound data base, one critical variable in dealing with a large number of events is that of obtaining or developing a computer program that can perform the analysis. However, where the number of events is limited, a variety of simple exercises can be designed wherein the participants can deal with the positive and negative impacts of the various events, display this reaction to their group, and work through the eventual relationships between these events being considered.7

---

This development can be and usually is a tedious and time-consuming process.

Question No. 4 centers on the nature of the relationship that existed between the administration and the faculty. One way to scrutinize this relationship is through a transactional analysis methodology. Here it becomes necessary to examine organizational and individual needs as they are reflected in the four possible life positions with respect to oneself and others:

1. I'm not OK - You're OK
2. I'm not OK - You're not OK
3. I'm OK - You're not OK
4. I'm OK - You're OK

These same life positions may be seen as group relationships within an organization or the relationship that the organization has toward those in it.

Within the transactional states given above we must also examine the "stroke" environment that has been created. In this instance stroking is a behavior on the part of an individual or organization to offer positive reinforcement to those within the environment. Strokes fall into numerous categories. For example, they may be physical or symbolic, warm or cold, fuzzy or prickly, and abstract or concrete. This need to be stroked accounts for the stimulus hunger of

---


9 Ibid., p. 13.
the organization. Also, it is essential to be aware of two myths that have been built around stroking. The first is that each of us carries about with himself a limited bag of strokes; therefore, give them out sparingly. The other is that a stroke should not have to be requested. There is no basis for either of these statements.

Besides stimulus hunger there is also **structure hunger** that must be considered because it creates the involvement or time profile of the individual or the organization. There are six behavior categories that constitute the way that one spends the two to two and one-half billion seconds one has to live:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (Games)</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Withdrawal</td>
<td>sleep, day dreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rictuals</td>
<td>social exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Activity</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pastimes</td>
<td>talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Games</td>
<td>limited intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intimacy</td>
<td>intimacy, honest relationship between two persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those activities above call for one to answer a number of questions such as: How do I want to spend my time? With whom? In particular, the structure profile of the organization can be quite revealing in terms of the particular activities to which it fosters or is committed.

It is also essential to be aware of **position hunger**
which covers the concern for self love and love of others:

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c c}
\text{Self Love} & + \\
\text{Not OK} & \text{OK} \\
\text{Love of Others} & + \\
\text{You're not OK} & \text{You're OK}
\end{array}
\]

Position hunger will shift depending on the setting and those in it. In terms of the system it does provide a database from which to examine not only the persons within the organizations but also the organization itself.

The TA methodology also involves an examination of ego states portrayed in the following:

- Open System 1. Parent - Should's, Don't's
- Cold Clear 2. Adult - Data, Computer
- Develops First 3. Child - Affective, Feeling

These states of being are not roles but psychological realities.\(^\text{10}\) They are not concepts like Superego, Ego, and Id.

Through these structures, ego states, TA attempts to get the person or the organization into contact with itself. This activation of awareness of oneself is referred to as one's ability to "cathexis." This is built on the premises that we are actors primarily, not reactors, that we are responsible for our actions, and that we have choices.

From an ego state portrait it is possible to determine the system or messages:

\(^{10}\text{ibid.}, \ p. 10.\)
The profile will provide information from which the question may be posed: What can I do to change the ego state? Let's also examine some of the good messages coming from the system:

I believe in you!
I trust you!
You may do what you want to do.
Please check though!

In this way TA gets at the problems in the system or the individual. It is possible to look at the nature of the transactions to see if they are complementary, crossed, or ulterior.

Finally, what are the drivers within the individual or the organization? In this case drivers would represent socially acceptable behaviors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be Perfect</td>
<td>This is impossible!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Strong</td>
<td>I must also allow myself to feel!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Me</td>
<td>I must also please myself!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try Hard</td>
<td>I must stop trying and do!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurry Up</td>
<td>I must give myself permission to slow down!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linked to the drivers and in opposition to them are what is termed injunctions. Don't(s)
1. Don't . .
2. Don't be . . (Don't exist)
3. Don't make it
4. Don't be well (Sane or healthy)
5. Don't be important
6. Don't belong . .
7. Don't be you (Sexual identification)
8. Don't think . .
9. Don't feel . .

Out of this concern the question must be raised: How do drivers/injunctions affect the organization? Herein lies the significance of TA in that it can construct the script and project the life of the organization or individuals within it to determine whether what exists is comedy, tragedy, adventure; what the cast of characters is, their dialogue, theme; and what is the climax toward which we are moving!

There are distinct advantages in identify scripts to pursue the following:

1. What are the messages?
2. What do you want?
3. How do you affect change?
4. How can you cathet A's into the system?

Question No. 5 is directed toward an examination of the forces within the change environment that have influenced institutional change in either a favorable or unfavorable manner. The methodology used to pursue this issue is Force-field Analysis. Kurt Lewin fathered a technique of
Force-field Analysis that has a long and prolific history of application in education.\(^1\) Social forces, he postulated, are symptomatic of underlying forces that represent the dynamic elements in a situation and result in tendencies toward or against change.\(^2\) These forces can be identified, then classified as "driving" or "restraining," and predictions of social events derived there from. Lewin and his followers were interested primarily in telesis—"doctoring" the respective forces to permit or insure desired events in the future.\(^3\) The elements tied to Force-field Analysis are (1) the employment of "forces" as causative agents, and (2) the use of pooled judgments as descriptors of the causes and of their results.

One of the greatest strengths of Force-field Analysis lies in its ability to make a modest beginning toward seeing ahead and responding to what is being seen. It takes one endeavor and looks around for immediate impingements upon that endeavor. Assuming impingements arise from forces, it selects a limited number of forces to be projected into the future. The impingements on the endeavor of these forces


are then deduced. In reality, not all impingements are identifiable. What is essential, however, is that there is a manageable "slice" of what-can-happen to deal with; and manageability is enhanced by the existence of inertial momentum which, as Daniel Bell says, almost guarantees that tomorrow will be more like today than different from it.¹⁴

The discipline of this technique is clearly set forth in Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies.¹⁵ The process is paraphrased below:

1. An enterprise is selected—in this case, a school system undergoing organizational change.

2. Forces are defined as events or pressures whose impact upon the organization impels, in specific ways, toward institutional conflict or change.

3. A knowledgeable observer (participant observer) scans the present and immediately past environment that has an impact upon and impels the organization toward a particular action or reaction. Great reliance is placed on descriptive and/or analytical formulations such as those produced by questionnaires and interviews.

4. A limited or manageable number of forces is then selected. This may be done through a participatory mode such as a Delphi technique would offer. These forces are then projected into the future. Descriptions are written for each force.

5. The observer draws upon recorded data and inferential summaries to describe the past nature of each force and the previous impact it has had on the organization.


¹⁵Ibid.
6. Guided by the dynamics perceived in the preceding analysis, the observer forecasts the future-nature of each force and predicts its future impact.\(^{16}\)

Further reflection on the nature of the technique outlined should offer elaboration on the fifth and sixth elements. An observer is not left entirely on his or her own. Instead, certain sensitizing reminders pertinent to the organization are set down as guides. While these guides are encouraging rather than restraining, they do propose a sort of flexible common core of stances to be adopted in selecting and interpreting data. For example, the authors of *Preparing Educational Leaders* used questions as guiding probes. Here are some questions to guide force-description:

- **a.** What are the salient features of each force?
- **b.** Are there significant and identifiable factors that have made the force especially visible during the past year, months, etc.?
- **c.** Are there relationships between the force and dimensions of its environment that have special implications for assessing impact on the organization and administration of the school?
- **d.** Has the force had demonstrable impacts on organizations or individuals outside of the school?
- **e.** What is the essential mode of impact or influence of the force?
- **f.** At what points on or within the organization has the force had its greatest influence?
- **g.** What are some of the major unresolved and emergent issues posed by the force?\(^{17}\)

\(^{16}\textit{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. } 2-6.\)

\(^{17}\textit{Ibid.}, \text{ p. } 5.\)
Other questions to keep in mind would include:

a. Has the force changed the formal organization of the school with regard to such variables as size, number of hierarchical levels, divisions, nature and number of subunits, span of control, or base of authority? If so, in what ways?

b. Has the organization been influenced either quantitatively or qualitatively through changes in such variables as regulations and procedures, diffusions of status, task interdependence, and informal organization?

c. Are there perceived new relationships within the organization and/or beyond that are related to the influence of the force?

d. Has financial or moral support for the organization on the part of external organizations, interest groups, or community leaders changed as a result of the force?

e. Have new types of organizational stress been created either through "overloads" on the system or through highly intense internal conflict in the system? If so, describe.

f. Is the administrator faced with different kinds of decision problems as a result of the force?

g. Are the sources of conflict which the administrator must resolve either intensified or of a different character?

h. Have there been changes in the nature of internal administrative processes, such as decision making, communication, coordination, planning, programming, evaluating, and so forth? 13

The observer must be cautioned, however, because the construct "force" presents a major problem to Force-field Analysis. From all the possible constellations of actions -by-persons which may be extracted and labeled as "forces," there will probably be an almost infinite number of choices.

13 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
open. Also, this technique needs additional protection against the tunnel vision so likely to ensue from treatment of force constructs as if each were independent. It is easier to coordinate an observable fact to a resultant of forces than to the component forces individually.

Beyond the data described in this chapter, the author has placed in Appendix E a series of newspaper articles arranged chronologically, which illustrated the sequence of events in journalistic fashion. The value of this information was quickly apprehended in that it showed the effect that either an individual or group can have in terms of political muscle by utilization of a public facility like the press. The articles described quite vividly the surfaced conflict and pressed on to allow the public to weigh the arguments aired by each faction.

The information and all of the data associated with this study did not require the author to cloak the persons, places, or events in anonymity. There is nothing contained herein that has not either been shared with those involved or been publicly displayed via the press. The willingness to contribute to this study and the attitude on the part of the participants to seek answers was highly commendable. In light of the information contained within the data that make up Chapter IV, it seemed tautological to describe the school system and communities feeding it.
Summary

This chapter described the research methods in the inquiry process that were utilized to illustrate best, in the author's mind, the Quabbin experience in change and innovation. Within the chapter primary consideration is directed at the rationale for the case study method. Also, the author reported the circumstances which lead to the administrative and staff approval for the study. In particular, the function of the author as participant-observer is defined and discussed so as to clarify his association with the change experience. The chapter also described the various data-collection techniques that were used to support the findings in this study. Finally, questions that prompted the particular data collection and the methodologies used for analysis are covered in-depth in this chapter. One idea moves to the surface throughout and that is the feeling that there is no one best approach for investigating and analyzing a change experience. This writer through a varied approach to analysis using contemporary methodologies offers the reader a number of perspectives by which to examine the Quabbin change experience.
CHAPTER IV

DATA: TAPED DIALOGUE, SUMMARIES OF THREE INTERVIEWS, TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, AND DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

Introduction

The following is the transcription of a taped dialogue undertaken by this writer to meet the request made by Prof. W. C. Wolf, Jr. at the University of Massachusetts. It was Prof. Wolf's desire that an attempt be made to re-capture Quabbin's experience in change and innovation which would provide the basis for an article in an educational journal devoting one publication to communication in change.

Contributors were selected on the basis of their desire to be a part of the dialogue and on the basis of the importance of the part played in the Quabbin change experience. Reflected in the dialogue is an accurate perspective of all factions involved. The dialogue was, for the most part, extemporaneous. It called for an honest appraisal from each participant. Nothing was rehearsed or previously agreed upon. The individuals concerned are all open-minded, opinionated, and fair.

There is nothing in the dialogue to be construed as an answer to the problems that Quabbin faced. Rather, the dialogue holds a multiple perspective constructed into historical overview of the Quabbin change period (1969-72) that could provide a basis for analysis of the situation. As a documentation of a change experience, it is invaluable, and as a document of emotion and thought in action, it is precious.
Background of Contributors

Chairman: He is a full professor in the Department of Education at the University of Massachusetts. Over the years he has established a close liaison with the Quabbin system. His background in research, development and diffusion of information in education is excellent. At an early point in the Quabbin experience he served as an outside consultant. Like many that touched the Quabbin scene, he was not retained throughout the experience.

Superintendent: He has been the superintendent of Quabbin from the first year of operation. He has had a number of years in education with experience in teaching, curriculum coordination, and administration. He is committed to management by objectives and a systems approach to control. Presently, he is the superintendent/principal of Quabbin Regional High School in Barre, Mass. From his initial contact with Quabbin to the present, he is committed to change and innovation. His selection as superintendent was contingent on his adherence to innovation.

School Committee Member: He is a member of both the Quabbin Regional School Committee, Barre School Committee, and Supervisory Union 63 School Committee. He is an educator in his own right possessing teaching credentials and a Masters degree in educational administration. In the Barre community, he is an insurance man of long-standing respect. He has children in the Quabbin system and values their education.
dearly. Also, he represents the parent group in that he rose to the school committee from their ranks. Barre has always been his home.

**OESTA President**: She is currently the reading supervisor at Quabbin. She is a tenacious lady committed to fair play and good education. She gained a leadership role in the teachers' association through commitment and concern for what she felt to be detrimental results from shaky innovations. In the Barre community she commands the respect and admiration for her honesty and endeavor to help others. She came to Quabbin in its first year.

**Junior High School Manager**: He is presently one of the assistant principals in the administrative team. Teachers that work with him respect his honesty and level-headedness. It must be pointed out that he was actually the only member of the old administration to be hailed by teachers as an excellent person and educator. He came to Quabbin from New Hampshire in its first year as a department head in English. His early success with people earned him advancement into the ranks of the administrator. He holds a graduate degree in administration.

**Learning Coordinator**: He is also a member of the administrative team. He came to Quabbin in 1967 like so many others from the University of New Hampshire where he worked as a teaching and research assistant. As a department head in English he pushed innovation in these early years by building non-graded electives. He was a learning coordinator
in the humanities unit in the previous structure of the school. He holds graduates degrees in administration and is a doctoral candidate in leadership and administration at the University of Massachusetts.

Taped Encounter: The Quabbin Story, an Experiment in Change

Preface

Man lives in a climate of change. Nonetheless, when a small segment of society like an educational institution is confronted with rapid and radical change, it becomes threatening and professional survival is at stake.

The Quabbin Story deals with a particular change issue in which a junior/senior high school became the focal point of demands and financial mandates from a community and its school committee. The dialogue format that carries a typical, traditional school from its secure complacency to new, often untested programs and processes is a sample only of what is, has been and will occur in schools throughout the nation.

Quabbin Regional Junior/Senior High School opened its doors in September of 1967 to a thousand students, to a new superintendent with a ready-made school and to a staff of fifty-nine which was, for the most part, new to the communities feeding the school. From the beginning Quabbin never allowed itself, whether through staff or administration, to acknowledge the needs of the communities it was supposed to serve. The only real and acceptable alternative for the
staff and department heads was a "carte blanche" to build larger departments and costlier programs which influenced and reinforced a college preparatory curriculum for a school that sent only thirty per cent of its students to four-year colleges.

This insensitivity and unawareness on the part of the staff, department heads, and administration, reached a crescendo when the school committee which had gained many new members made true community feelings known: "The school is too expensive. We cannot afford the existing costs for the Quabbin Regional system, and we will not tolerate proposals for more programs and more staff." Consequently, the administration without notifying the staff was forced to seek alternatives. It had the opportunity to hold the school stable and to squeak by with watered-down programs, but the power structure from 1968 on was committed to maintaining quality education in the programs that existed.

In the three-year change interval, the superintendent with his alternatives and a newly appointed cadre of learning generalists, learning coordinators, set about to meet the demands of moderate-cost/high quality education. The administration pledged itself to operate its school at the average per pupil cost of comparable regional high schools in the state of Massachusetts. A limited number of staff cuts followed. The largest cut and most vulnerable area to be dissolved was guidance. It was the feeling that learning coordinators could supervise and evaluate related curriculum
areas and control the pupil personnel program, i.e., guidance. A large Federally funded project in differentiated staffing had just fallen through. The project meant hope for innovative programming and without it, new ideas and practices could only exist by the willingness of staff to initiate them if they had merit and were comprehensible. The fat was stripped from all programs and every member of the staff began to feel the blows of new staffing practices that called for an expansion of the teacher's responsibilities.

The superintendent was the change agent in the school and he attempted to prepare the way for what was to come. A newsletter came out periodically discussing innovations that were either coming to the school or were already there. In addition to the newsletter, large amounts of educational articles, reprints from journals and texts, were distributed to staff for reaction. The notion that seeding the ground is wise before sowing is valid, but in this instance the calibre of the articles was such that most who read them admitted that they were difficult to comprehend and the jargon was heavy and disoriented from any frame of reference they had known. Confusion, misunderstanding, and mistrust resulted.

From his earlier experiences the superintendent took his changes to the public, not only to share with them the nature of each, but also to give the public an opportunity to react to these changes. Numerous gatherings were arranged at the school, but the public seemed rather wary by the whole
thing. Teacher/aides, teacher/interns, master teachers, differentiated staffing, pupil personnel services, and an odd leadership structure only generated more confusion. The public reaction, therefore, was a mild acknowledgement, disguising its ignorance of what was really happening.

Unlike most changes that come into a school, the one at Quabbin was total in that it not only touched every member and every program but demanded changes in their behavior. It was not enough merely to change the title of a person or his function. Management by objectives, program planning, budgeting systems, behaviorally stated objectives in curriculum reorganization and accountability were indicators of change.

The Quabbin Story raises a vast number of questions even today to many that lived through its years of conflict. If anything useful has come out of the experience, perhaps it is a deeper understanding about human nature and the way people react to the change process which is a chain reaction when once set off. There is no prescription for change; however, there is one safe rule to follow and that rule says, "Without an atmosphere of mutual trust and, above all, understanding and communication, change is destined to failure."

For the sake of empathy for those going through difficult processes of change and to give them support with the knowledge that they are not alone in their tribulations, the Editor of the journal has agreed to the dialogue format which is atypical of professional journals that follows in the
spirit of how humans react to change.

The Beginning

Chairman: A brief background is necessary to set the stage for the events of the past three years. It would seem that the school committee member who is present, having been a resident of Barre, Massachusetts, one of the four towns of the Quabbin Regional District, might give some insight into the formation of the District.

School Comm. Member: My communication with the people of the four-town area which constitutes the Quabbin community goes back to the early 1960's when a regional district was only a proposed idea. This communication was direct and came in my official capacity as a member of the Barre Budget and Finance Committee. We, the committee and the community, both knew that a regional school was going to cost us more money than staying on with the old system. Change to a regional school was going to mean sacrifice, but we were willing to get on with it because our people were realistic enough and optimistic about their children's place in the new push for education. We knew that the old obsolete buildings and equipment could not comply with the expectations of greatness that the national push to accelerate education was demanding of its citizens. "Buy into a regional school set up," was the message I got from the concerned citizenry. As a matter of fact the whole finance committee got the message to buy. We carried that plea to the annual town meeting and
recommended that 1,000 taxpayers in Barre borrow and pay back almost 45% of $2,500,000 to finance this future education. We read our expensive warrant; there was no discussion from the floor; a call for a vote went out; it pass unanimously. Everyone on the committee felt that the responsibility to see to it that those people who wanted so much for the youth of their community would realize some of their dreams.

Chairman: The Quabbin Regional School Committee was made up of members of four communities—Barre, Hardwick, Hubbards ton and Oakham. These were the four towns that had come together for the first time with a common goal. What were some of the problems that they faced?

QRTA Pres.: Barre in particular had a large vocal minority which opposed the regional concept from the beginning and has continued its opposition to this day. Many children from the homes of this vocal minority are inclined to be anti-Quabbin, non-participants in school activities, and resentful of school personnel and rules.

School Comm. Member: We fought numerous rumors that the pessimists had spread over the construction site of the future Quabbin Regional High School. I was still fighting this negative communication without any public office capacity hitched to my name in 1965 when the actual building of Quabbin got underway.

QRTA Pres.: The School Committee, determined to have a fine school, hired a man to be acting superintendent for the period of the building, equipping and staffing of the school.
A short time later a principal was also hired. The principal remained very much in the background until after the school opened because rumors began circulating to the effect that the acting superintendent had been discharged from a nearby regional system under questionable circumstances and that his hiring practices were based on his being a WASP proponent. In spite of being a very controversial figure during his term as acting superintendent, he, with the approval of the school committee, filled many top positions with friends, demeaned local teacher-applicants, and finally set up a school that many taxpayers felt was beyond the ability of local towns to support. When all the transition work was completed, the acting superintendent departed. His replacement was on hand to welcome the staff when the nearly completed Quabbin Regional did open its doors in the fall of 1967.

Chairman: How did you find the environment when you first entered this new position? What is important here is the extent to which you comprehended what you were getting into.

Supt.: Coming into the community as its new superintendent, I soon noticed community unrest and uncertainty, particularly in the town of Barre, created by the decisions that rejected local teachers and also local administrators in the process of staffing the new regional school, and the school itself was located in the town of Barre.

There was also community unrest and uncertainty resulting from the resistance to the creation of a regional school district. In some of the research that I did, particularly in the town of Hardwick, I noticed that they voted in and out
of the regional school district at least three different times and there continued to be a disrespect for the concept of the regional school idea among persons in power positions--Board of Selectman, Finance Committee, and such. But perhaps even more relevant was community unrest and uncertainty that was created from publicized conflict between the temporary superintendent and the school committee. A check of the local newspapers provides a review of the kind of feuding that was created at the final period before the school was operational. Yes, there was unrest in the community.

I note too that there was a complete lack of public involvement in the development of the school program. No attempts were made to promote community involvement. Time and effort were perhaps reasons for this. No communication was made with the public or parent link with the school. There was, in fact, a transplant program of studies taken from a nearby school. It offered a heavy priority on programs for those seeking college preparatory experiences. There was no effort made to determine the needs of the students of the Quabbin community. Again, little effort was made to link the secondary programs to those existing elementary experiences of our children.

The temporary superintendent with some assistance from the principal drafted the program of studies, generated the grouping and scheduling practices of the school, the procedures for marking, and the honor roll system. All were generated from the same single source. There was also a transplant...
of a set of school committee policies with limited involvement of the school committee in the creation of such policies. There was no involvement of the staff other than the principal. Policies were created out of the past experiences of the temporary superintendent combined with his analysis of sets of policies of other school systems. The school committee role was fundamentally to endorse such policies. The acting superintendent, as a matter of fact, had a proposed agreement between the teachers association and the school committee at this early stage. The agreement in essence gave him "carte blanche" and he used it.

Chairman: Is it then fair to assume that one man had laid the total foundation of this school from plant to policy to program and then left?

Supt.: Yes. The school philosophy and objectives were drafted by him, placed in the program of studies pamphlet, not studied and approved by the committee, not discussed by the staff, not publicized in the community and basically ignored in the decision-making of the school committee. The new principal, department heads and the staff, therefore, had almost complete freedom to use their own individual philosophies in making decisions that were facing them, providing, of course, that these early decisions were in concert with the superintendent's.

GTA Pres.: I think perhaps there are some other circumstances that should be brought out. For instance, Hubbardton, one of the feeder towns, formerly sent its high school students
to high schools in nearby towns. At the time one of these nearby high schools was crowded and did not plan to continue to take Hubbardston students. Oakham was in the same situation. These two towns in particular were very anxious to be part of the regional set up. Hardwick and Barre were not quite as anxious. Although, in 1966 the junior high school in the town of Barre did burn, and for a year and a half the high school and junior high school students were on double sessions which made education for the students and teaching most difficult.

The school committee pleaded with the high school and junior high school teachers to stay and to see them through the situation. The school committee assured them they would be given every consideration, in fact, prime consideration when the new school opened. Most of the teachers did stay and at least were looking forward to moving to the Quabbin Regional.

In many instances, the acting superintendent and the new principal did not see the worth of some of these teachers; consequently, many of them were not hired. Many observations and some rather crushing remarks were made. For instance, one teacher was told that teachers could not be much good if they had stayed in the Barre system as long as they had. This did not lead to good feelings among the teachers who were hired upon entering Quabbin. In addition the local teachers had not been given any salary figures nor had they been given brochures on the philosophy of Quabbin or about
the curriculum. They were merely hired as a teacher in one department or another.

In spite of all this, I think that the teachers and people of the town of Barre were most anxious to see Quabbin get started. They fully realized that the children were being denied full education advantages with the double sessions. This in turn may have created the impression to people from out of town coming into the community that the people of the community as a whole were most anxious and receptive to the new school.

Supt.: May I jump in here with a thought? Perhaps a reaction? As I listen to the thoughts being reflected upon the salesmanship that was involved in contacting many of us, I'm not sure that this really parallels some of the history that is being revealed this evening. I am particularly wondering how many of the staff had the high expectations that I had—when in fact some of the communities were really pushed into the regional idea and didn't have the high aspirations in the beginning for the Quabbin Regional District School.

If I am expressing this correctly, I think it is relevant to the history as far as communicating is concerned and the problems we have run into since then. I know of many who once taught in this community and now teach outside of Barre. Yet, they still reside here. Some of them serve in positions of responsibilities as far as decision making—e.g., the finance board. I think we've had a couple and up on the School Committee that were rejected at the time of application.
for the Quabbin Regional staff.

QMTA Pres.: I wouldn't want to have a wrong impression created here. I think that aspirations for the education of the children were very high in the community, but acceptance of the regional concept for the school was more negative until such time as the junior high school burned. At that time the community felt pushed into having to accept it, but I think there was still a deep undercurrent against the regional even though the regional school was an expedient thing that had to be accepted at that point.

School Comm. Member: Back during this period of the initial opening of Quabbin several of my friends were on the school committee, and they shared the same enthusiasm we had on the Budget and Finance Committee for a regional school. We were fully aware of what a regional concept was. We had truly been rivals with Hardwick. Oakham had, however, attended old Barre High School, and Hubbardston had been a playground for us as children. There was no ill feeling among the communities of Barre, Oakham and Hubbardston; however, Hardwick had been an old rival of long standing. Still, members of the committee were optimistic.

Friends of mine on the school committee were somewhat of a new generation. They were looking forward to innovation. They had been locked into their world. In trying to get work they found out they were ill-prepared and were standing awe-struck by Sputnik. Being teenagers by the end of World War II, they wanted something that no other generation from
this area would have dared to ask for. They were not there demanding quality education for their kids and probably without any regard as to who was going to pay for it. This concern might have been the crux of some of the early problems.

Chairman: This is undoubtedly a good point to have the superintendent deal with his perceptions as they unfolded during this initial period.

Supt.: As superintendent in the school system and the superintendent that was hired to become the operational manager in 1967, I can add to the perceptions of the beginning. Let me do it in an outline fashion; however, some of it may be redundant. First of all, in 1967-68, we did have a brand new facility for the four towns which had agreed to form a new regional system planned for students in grades 7 through 12 and commonly referred to as a Junior High School unit and a Senior High School unit.

It is significant that in that first year of operation the staff and the program did start under circumstances where the facility itself was unfinished. The staff started eighteen days late under circumstances where part of the facilities were not even usable for at least half a year. This has implications as far as communications are concerned.

The new staff was recruited from throughout New England and selected by a temporary superintendent who was hired for the express purpose of getting the new program established and staffed. He retired in the summer 1967. He was assisted by the school principal who was hired and employed about a
year before the school opened. He became the school's chief administrator. A new school superintendent, myself, was recruited from another Massachusetts regional school and I believe selected for the express purposes of experience and interest in curriculum and instructional areas.

At that time there was also a new position created—that of Business Manager—whose express purpose was to take care of the details of business so that the superintendent could, in fact, work in the area of curriculum. A traditional staffing pattern was established and it was based upon a department structure with fourteen department heads, each responsible for leadership in his own department. The departments were English, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, Language, Business Education, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, Art, Music, Physical Education, Reading, Athletics and Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps. This constituted to a limited extent a traditional department set-up in a regional secondary school. There was, however, a unique, or somewhat unique set-up for guidance services and leadership. I refer to a structure where the principal assumed the direct leadership role for guidance, assisted by three full-time counselors. The point that I wish to make here concerns the unique responsibility for leadership placed upon the principal. There was also somewhat of unique set-up for the retarded learners—with two special education teachers providing instruction in the academic areas. Other special education students were integrated into subjects, such as art, home economics, home—
room activities, athletics, etc., but again the overall coordination and leadership for this program rested with the principal. I make these points because these were two areas where there was no recognized department head, or specialized leadership.

There was one full time assistant principal with no clearly defined or structured role except that of assisting the principal in ways determined by their mutual decision-making. The expectations for this position was that of managing discipline problems in the entire school—grades 7 through 12. There were also, somewhat unique for a regional school, the equivalent of two study hall monitors, through the use of two language teachers who has only partial loads, and one full time monitor hired at $20.00 a day and employed as a non-professional. In 1967 I think this was considered a unique feature of a regional school. Likewise in the original plans there were two lay readers to assist the English Department in the chores of correcting themes and compositions. This program never did materialize, but at least it was in the staffing structure. Perhaps more important than this kind of look at the staffing structure was the belief that we did have a spirit of enthusiasm and high aspirations among the staff that had come together.

**Staffing**

Chairman: What were some of the initial reactions and impressions gained by the new staff members coming into the
school community for the first time?

Jr. High Manager: I was hired as the head of the Mathematics Department after being contacted by the principal of Quabbin to come down for an interview with the principal and the acting superintendent. The impression I had after seeing the lovely brochures that were prepared for us was that the salary schedule was a very attractive one for a person coming from New Hampshire. The school seemed to have been well planned; at least, that was the impression I had without seeing the building. I thought, in fact, that as budgets went, the sky was the limit. I was told that Federal monies were available for various materials in the Mathematics department. I was also asked by the acting superintendent to draw up lists of books that I would like to see in the new school library, and select types of desks that I would like to see in the Math classrooms.

Although I was still working at another school, I spent many evenings drawing up long lists of reference books, consulted various Math teachers on possible text books to use, and drew on my own experience. The decision on the use of Math books was basically my own; however, when the school opened in 196?, I found that very little of the Federal money had been made available. I did get most of the software that I wanted as far as reference books went for the library. Textbooks that I had asked for had been approved, and I had had two previous meetings with the Mathematics Staff here in Barre.

I was somewhat disappointed in the structure of the
school; frankly. For a new school, I think, if it was built in a very traditional manner. Immediately, I found that as far as instructional materials went, the Math Department was really quite bad off. However, because of my relationship with the principal, I did find in my three years as Math Department Head, I really had no problem getting what I felt was needed for the Mathematics Department.

Learning Coord.: I, too, came to Quabbin Regional High School for the first time, in 1966, when contacted at the University of New Hampshire where I was working as a graduate research and teaching assistant. The brochure that I looked at and the salary schedule that was presented in it certainly were handsome at the time. The educational philosophy and objectives purported in the brochure led me to believe that this was, in fact, the kind of school that I would like to go to. So, consequently, I answered the brochure and was invited down, in 1966, to be interviewed by the acting superintendent and the principal.

Chairman: Was your reaction to the brochure substantiated on a visit to the school? Was the offer as good as it appeared in the advertisement?

Learning Coord.: When I came here I've got to say I was impressed with what I saw. The principal was very warm, very congenial and seemed to be extremely concerned in what he was doing. He was confident of the support he had from the community, the acting superintendent, and confident in the hand-picked staff he was in the process of selecting. I
also had an opportunity to go out to the site which in 1966 was still under construction. I have to admit the building tended to be traditional, but still it was new and seemed to offer a tremendous challenge.

Working at the University of New Hampshire in the next few months and waiting for the summer of 1967, I received many communications from the acting superintendent and principal. There were mandates requiring me to make requests for equipment, materials, and textbooks to be funded through a Federal grant. This I did. I was also asked to make requests for the materials that would be needed in setting up the reading laboratory. This too was handled through the help of some of the people in the reading department at the University of New Hampshire. All of these requests went in. I was amazed because there didn't seem to be any limit. Anything that I asked for, I was assured I'd get.

I remember coming down in August, 1967; the building was not completed, but very close to it. I was impressed with the people I met. I was impressed with the staff that had been selected to represent the English Department. These people were subject matter experts. Some of them had come out of the old system. Many, however, had been imported, like myself, from New Hampshire. This might have been because the principal was a New Hampshire man. I'm not sure. I think perhaps it had some affect. I do know that one of the criticisms that was levied at many of the people that came in from New Hampshire was the fact that most of them were graduates of Keene State College. Consequently some ill feelings were
developed, initially that Quabbin was generating a great fraternity.

Chairman: It seems that the initial selling job was done in an impressive fashion.

Learning Coord.: The thing that amazed me was that Quabbin was beautiful; it was a picture and at the same time a facade. I worked at Quabbin for three years before I began to recognize some of the conflict existing with the communities. One of the things that struck me as very peculiar was that the school tended to be extremely divorced from the communities.

QATA Pres.: That is true, but I don't think that this justified the idea of a closed corporation. I think the teachers had academic freedom. I think the teachers were enthused. They were busy; they were happy; and, they felt they were promoting good education. They were so taken up with this and their planning that money was lost sight of as an object. Programs, conferences, materials, etc., all were for the asking. They were so caught up with this that I think they never took the time to look outside the area in which they were working. It was practically a world unto itself.

Learning Coord.: It was, definitely! The initial thrust was not to take the school to the community. Preparation was made to take teachers coming in to the system through a course in A/V. This school was fantastically equipped: projectors all over the place, an overhead projector in each room, screens; just unbelievable. In ten years out the community was never fully made of the type of equipment had ever the
amount that was in this building initially. It took me three years to realize this.

Many of us looking back now would tend to say the first three years in particular were honeymoon years. To sort of coin a phrase in education today: We weren't "accountable" to anybody in the community. We were basically "accountable" to ourselves.

QRTA Pres.: The majority of the people of the communities definitely felt unwelcomed. They did not dare to approach the site. I have had so many people ask me how to reach a certain teacher. "Do I call the principal's office? Or the Guidance? Do I send a note in by a student?" They really stood almost afraid to make contact with the school. They felt it was a closed corporation and that they were not to intrude.

Learn'g Coord.: Would it be fair to say, also, that the majority of the Quabbin Regional teachers lived outside the community?

QRTA Pres.: That is true.

Learn'g Coord.: I have to say that I was never once bothered with the need to sell any program. It was my feeling that if a particular department in Quabbin chose to make a particular program operational, it merely did it with the understanding that it would be received with open arms by all concerned. The school committee rubber stamped everything. They were fantastically courteous and idealistic. Most of them, however, never came into the school.
Chairman: I am sure the school committee, through earnest concern and a willingness to please, felt obligated to continue with a pattern firmly fixed.

Supt.: Let me interject this thought. Having come in at a stage where the school committee was rubber stamping—"YES, YES, YES SING," the more I think about it; now easy it was; it was not costing them any money at that stage. The cost was going to be understood later on. They were making decisions about buying furniture, doing nothing about the school program, curriculum, and those kinds of things. Looking back at 1967-68, the year we began operating, we saw school committee members dropping off and getting out of the picture. I conclude that one of the reasons is that there was a shift of problem solving on their part. They really started to get into the areas of curriculum and programs, and no longer were facing the kind of decisions they were accustomed to.

In a month we were confronting them with the first operational budget and "What!," I guess it was about $250,000.00 higher than they could imagine. Within the first six months we began to see school committee members changing their interest as far as serving on the committee.

QRTA Pres.: I think that based on things that have been said that it is easily understood that people from the outside —like most of the administration, department heads and many of the teachers—were bound to come to the conclusion that they were teaching middle to upper middle class economic area
children and their expectations for these children and their discipline with these children were all based on this philosophy. Many times I've seen a teacher very let down because the response and the results achieved were not what they expected. They couldn't understand why. I think it was because they had been working in communities that were much more wealthy and had much more cultural background than ours.

Chairman: What affect did the high expectations have on budget planning?

Supt.: Budget planning for the 1968-69 school year engulfed the department heads and the principal in the so-called grass roots approach within one month after a new school was opened. Within the month the needs of each department for the next year were set using the educational aspirations of what ought to be and without any awareness of any total financial limitations. "But be practical", was sort of the guiding philosophy that first year. The superintendent and principal would be responsible for presenting to the School Committee a budget proposal that modified the total request. No reality of past budgets were available as a frame of reference; no realities of community expectations of financial limitations were available.

Chairman. It seems difficult to believe that no one bothered to gain a require assessment of the communities' abilities to pay. What accounts for the further misconceptions associated with comprehending the nature and intent of the (in)land community?
Learn'g Coord.: One of the things that bothered me to a great extent was that I lived in Barre while I was here and found it very difficult to come to know the community. One thing was happening to me within Quabbin. As a department head I was becoming conditioned to operate in a particular way I thought was meeting the needs of the students from all of the communities. My department became conditioned—I would tend to refer again to this as the HONEYMOON YEARS. This has been said before.

Three years of this type of conditioning; three years of working with a department in which all of the members were very close: partying together, spending tremendous amounts of time together, building programs together, and never once having to worry about anyone coming in to criticize or even to notice the nature of the program that we were planning, gave us a sense of confidence. It gave me a sense of commitment to plan our own way; and I have to admit at this particular point that much of the planning that we did was done in a divorced atmosphere. The planning was not once tied to the needs of the communities. I would ask—do you agree with this kind of view?

Jr. High Manager: It was my feeling that when the school opened we certainly had two honeymoon years, instead of one. I have always been impressed by the fact and I've made reference to this in things I've written about the school. We always and still do have academic freedom. This has perhaps changed a little bit, but basically teachers have been able
to generate their own innovative ideas, try various things in
classes; however, under the old department head structure, I
found we were pretty narrow in our views.

Supt.: I didn't conceive that we had even the two years of
honeymoon. The realities came upon us hard and fast. Perhaps we didn't talk about them, but they were there. If
the communities knew these realities, how can we say that the
school was sailing smoothly?

Chairman: It would appear that the school was sitting
on a bomb--a financial one which was ready to explode at any
moment. Perhaps the calm before the storm. As a school
committee-man what are your views in retrospect concerning
the opening?

School Coun. Member: In 1967 when Quabbin Regional
opened, the transaction had put the children of former ball
rivals on the same team. My own children were finding friends in families that lived six miles away from ours for several generations, and we had never known of one another's exist-
ence. The new school had been staffed with some very promising people, and it looked as if everything regionalization
had to offer had come to Quabbin.

The social response lasted two years. Then the bills
came due and with them a stark reality that the community
had been sold more education than it wanted to pay for came
clearly into focus. The language was at first light hearted and humorous as it carried its message through the Quabbin
community. Nicknames were applied to administrators an
the former acting superintendent was cast with the principal under the circus title of "Barnum and Bailey". Then the remarks got nasty and such comments as, "Maybe Barnum and Bailey think that everyone that was born every minute came here to live."

The original school committee that had hired the temporary superintendent came under sharp criticism in the community. The principal seemed withdrawn and cold to some people who had dealings with him. Rumor painted a picture of him as a man who sat in his office watching TV, while his secretary ran the school. People who lived under the reputation of being hard-nosed budget cutters were elected to the school committee and complaints that the principal had been given early tenure by a lame-duck committee passed from mouth to ear in the community. Much gossip claimed that the temporary superintendent returned from his Florida palace each year for some kind of pay-off. It was never clear which way the alleged money was to be passed.

These images lived on in the town in spite of the public meetings that the present superintendent held to explain changes in the school, changes that the school would undergo in order to bring its operational cost down to a level the tax base could stand. As a matter of fact, these meetings, whether planned or by chance at public gatherings had generated a source of mistrust for the superintendent.

The purpose of change was believed to be grounded in some secret deception that was a get-rich scheme for the
administrators at Quabbin. PPBS budget terminology was coined as a burying place for payoff funds for the superintendent, and behavioral objectives, differentiated staffing, as well as any other unfamiliar jargon became the educator's way to confuse the sucker who bought a ticket to the circus. In other words—the Quabbin and the Community were not communicating in a positive way. The community felt that it had bought tickets to the circus, saw the first two shows under the big top with a full cast and they loved it.

When the third show came on the ringmaster was still there, but six acts had been repossessed by the mortgages. The audience was disappointed. They viewed the change of scene as chicanery, a cover up for the fact they were getting second best. Their super education was no longer what they had thought it to be in the early sixties and they were fighting mad at the thought they had to give the kids less. This disappointment is what was being communicated in the area towns.

Meanwhile, the Quabbin staff was experiencing the same disappointment as were the individuals in the community when differentiated staffing was introduced. The community had become critical of the entire staff and the results of the frustration they were experiencing. Remarks about all educators sticking together were dropped in areas where teachers were known to be. Any acts of resistance by the staff to the changes were met with jeers. This seemed to indicate to people of the community that teachers were just
balking for more money. The teachers were referred to by some of the community as "those money-hungry bastards". Non-professional members of the Quabbin staff added fuel to the fire by agreeing with this nomenclature.

Changes and Reactions

Chairman: This is a good opportunity to deal with the change phase at Quabbin. It is quite apparent at this point that the public was making its feelings known. As a result of public disappointment and reaction to cost, what kinds of pressures were placed on the school committee and administration and what alternatives were pursued?

Supt.: It was, as I recall, the end of the very first year when we got the message from the taxpayer, "We're not going to buy any 'new' proposal."

I can recall vividly meeting with the principal and the school committee to promote additional guidance personnel, an additional reading teacher, three additional teachers and being told "NO, NO, NO!"

The first budget preparation we went into had touched off a message of reality. I think I also have to share another thing that was happening. I conceived myself to be a type of a change agent. If you all recall, one of my activities was to generate copies of written materials: articles that were dealing with kinds of alternatives. The idea was to throw out to the staff thought-provoking ideas from the literature.
I can recall one of the first curriculum disputes that I wrote. It dealt with the whole theme for the need for a common frame of reference in curriculum and instructional kinds of activities. With the structure we had, my work was cut out. We had a principal and department heads, and we agreed that they would be the real decision makers. I felt I was playing a role of feeding information to the staff. To be sure, in reflection, it was distant kind of broadcasting.

It was very early then that I put my energy to work with the principal and department heads on in-service training. My focus was upon in-service activities and you'll remember some of the early exploratory workshops that were introduced. This was, I think, before any pressure from the financially minded, and I was fighting for summer curriculum staff involvement. In my naive way I can recall standing up and fighting for 1% of our budget to go into research and how logical it seemed to me, and yet, it was like talking to the moon at that stage. I interject this because I really think that it was a basic input from me as a superintendent independent of the financial aspects, yet the financial case along with the real club that threw us into the change phase. This initial innovating ended up in producing some of the problems that we faced.

School Comm. Member: I want to tell Mr. Trask that I had spoken less than a month ago with a friend of mine who was on the original school committee at the time he was hired. It seemed the reason the committee chose him over and above
retaining a man, who had then been in one of the town systems, was Mr. Trask's innovative abilities. They wanted him here at that time for the sole purpose of innovating and functioning as a change agent and give new ideas to the staff.

Learn'g Coord.: But this was never communicated to the staff. In fact, I would have to say, if there had been communication, it was done in a rather subtle manner through the articles which were pushed into the school. There, of course, generated criticism of the superintendent.

QRTA Pres.: Not at first, I think, Mr. Trask, as far as your being a change agent and giving material to the staff, they more or less threw it to one side. In the first place, they were busy; they were happy; they were almost smug in their own self-satisfaction; and they were sure it did not apply to them. Besides, if it were anything important, their department heads would interpret it for them because most of the information on decisions and policy filtered down to them this way. They were perfectly content to accept the role of department heads in this respect. Anything else was more or less casual reading. I believe they really missed the point. You were rarely in the building. We talked with you occasionally.

Learn'g Coord.: Please keep in mind, too, that at this stage the superintendent was primarily an outside agent, coming in and beginning to disturb some happy families.

Jr. High Manager: True. However, when the superintendent began flooding the school with 'ed articles,' teachers
began to suspect that perhaps we were beginning to get on a
"bandwagon."

Learn'g. Coord.: Yes. It was at about this time that
the heavy educational jargon which over-powered much of the
staff and department heads became apparent in the superintend-
ent's dialogue with his faculty. Hence the word *brainwash*
was coined to symbolize attempts at communicating that burden.
This early idea seeding was certainly designed to prepare a
change climate. Consequently, understanding and comprehension
were needed for support.

When the articles became numerous—and people began to
package them—I think there were teachers who were happy with
the articles. I personally enjoyed going over them, But I
do know that many department heads took offense at the constant
amount of mail coming down from the superintendent's office.

Chairman: What was there in the superintendent's
approach that bothered you and other department heads at the
time?

Learn'g Coord.: One thing that bothered me in particular
during that third year was the feeling that something different
was happening at Quabbin. I sensed that the superintendent
was trying to prepare in a very subtle way his department
heads for what was later to be called "the crunch." Nobody
came out and said that the problem was. It was sensed that
Quabbin was going to have to change. There were problems
here, but nobody really knew what that change was going to
affect. Also, nobody knew who was going to be a part of the
change.

The feeling was that it was going to be directed from the superintendent. And for the first time a certain amount of insecurity began to creep into Quabbin. This insecurity began to haunt the ranks of teachers who had been extremely secure for at least 2½ years.

Jr. High Manager: I'd like to react to that. I think that was true for the first three years, before any type of structural reorganizing was considered. I'm going to attempt to concentrate on the change in leadership positions and most of this is from an internal viewpoint.

The Quabbin Regional Junior/Senior High School operated under a department head structure for three years. During the latter part of the second year and throughout the third year, more and more literature showed up at the school from the superintendent's office. This dealt with innovations in education such as: behavioral objectives, individualizing instruction, differentiated staffing, and other alternatives regarding educational change. At one point a consultant was brought from California to explain behavioral objective writing and conduct a workshop in the area of education change. Also, we had added teacher aides and interns to the staff.

Through administrative efforts curriculum development stated in the behavioral objective approach became a reality at Quabbin. In fact the process is still going on.

In the fall of 1969 a Federal project was submitted which dealt with the concept of differentiated staffing.
This was conceived by the superintendent, and he had the help of a consultant from the University of Massachusetts. Subsequently, the project was rejected, but the decision was made to change the organizational structure of the school. The new concept called for the division of the school into units rather than departments. Hopefully, this would provide more linking and integrating of the various subject fields.

Things seemed to happen fast. Department heads agree, though somewhat reluctantly, to give up those positions and go along with the new idea. They had no guarantee of a leadership position under the new structure and no evaluation of the old had been made. Early in December, 1969, applications were made available to all teachers desiring to apply for the position of Learning Coordinator. 38 staff members applied.

The plan was to hold a 20-hour sensitivity session with breaks coming only for meals. Applicants would be evaluated on the basis of behavior during this session. The superintendent, principal and project-writer consultant would do the evaluating. Most of the department heads disapproved of this method and let their feelings be known to the administration. They felt that their input of three years should be considered in the evaluation process.

During the Christmas vacation of 1969, six staff members, including four department heads, were called to the school for a meeting with the superintendent and principal. At the meeting the six were told that they had been selected to become learning coordinators because of their past accomplish-
ments and leadership behavior. This selection process had been done by the superintendent and principal. Also at this meeting the six selected were asked to assist the superintendent and principal in selecting the other six coordinators. This was readily agreed to and through lengthy discussion the task was accomplished.

The original six Learning Coordinators assisted the principal in explaining to the other applicants the reasons why they were not selected. This complete change in the selection process, which came about while teachers were on vacation, created much discussion among the staff. Distrust toward the Learning Coordinators and the administration became more evident.

The QRTA had not been a strong organization and did not have to be so for the first two years. All groups concerned with the school got along very well. However, changes in the school committee brought in some axe-grinders, people who had sought positions in the school and, failing to get them, looked for the negative aspect of the system.

The QRTA became a strong organization and began to question the directives of the administration. Teachers were preparing to enter the second year of a two-year contract and were saddled with a poor salary schedule. Efforts to reopen salary negotiations were turned down by the school committee. The salaries of the new Learning Coordinators had to be adjusted for the year 1970-71. Though they were members of the Quabbin Teachers Association, they negotiated
on an individual basis with the superintendent who acted as agent for the school committee. Apparently none of the Learning Coordinators received as much as each hoped, but agreement was reached.

Chairman: Were the Learning Coordinators pleased with the salaries each had negotiated? It seems as if they may have placed the teacher organization in a tenuous position.

Jr. High Manager: After much discussion the Learning Coordinators concluded that their salaries increased because they were being paid for an additional four weeks work. Through the efforts of the superintendent and principal, the Learning Coordinators' positions were assigned to various units within the school.

When school opened in September, 1970, teachers found that their supervisor was, in many cases, an individual completely different from their former department head. Though loyal to their department head, they now distrusted their new leader and even in cases where they worked with the same individual, they questioned his motives and integrity. The superintendent and principal held many meetings with the Learning Coordinator group with no teacher involvement. Teachers became more suspicious than ever because of the selection process, and the individual negotiating on the part of each Learning Coordinator. Administrative meetings increased the hostility between teachers and the leadership group.

The Learning Coordinators soon found that they had little
to say about the management of the school. At meetings with the superintendent and principal, the Learning Coordinators were heard, but the decision-making was still done at the top. Role-ambiguity of the Learning Coordinators created problems. They were pseudo-administrators and supervisors on the one hand and classroom teachers and members of the QRTA on the other. Learning Coordinators were caught in the middle.

Eventually, dissatisfaction with the system prevailed at Quabbin. Programs were competing with each other, and people were quarrelling with one another. The enthusiasm and energy displayed by the staff when the school opened had about disappeared. As far as teachers were concerned, communications down to them were perceived to be innovative, "band-wagon" stuff, though most of this was meant to be used as generators of thinking. It was further perceived to be administrative gospel. This led to rumors, threats, insecurity and tension.

Supt.: I think that's a good description; the only thing missing is the change in the Guidance. Guidance is a very important part of it.

Jr. High Manager: Yes. I believe teachers, Learning Coordinators and the principal formed the pupil personnel services in the school. Teachers became unhappy about their added guidance responsibilities and increased class sizes due to the decision to eliminate a traditional guidance structure and six other teaching positions.

Chairman: Would you, as superintendent, care to comment?
on the change in the guidance program itself?

Supt.: The thought I had here from a communications point of view was that similarly now we have which burdened the teacher with the role of the teacher-advisor and the corresponding responsibility of the Learning Coordinator to be whatever leadership needed in guidance. Here was another hat for the Learning Coordinator. The pattern of communications needed for a structure like this, we didn’t have. We lost department heads and we created Learning Coordinators who had responsibility in the area of curriculum and instruction, but in an interdisciplinary way. Communications from a teachers’ point of view raised many questions: “Where is my leadership? In what form is it coming?” I felt this should be mentioned as to the Learning Coordinator structure itself.

Learn’g. Coord.: It might be of interest here to back up and examine the development of the QRTA while the change was taking place. In examining very carefully the change of posture, i.e., watching this group transformed from a basically weak organization to a very strong monitoring association, one could sense a commitment to protect the education climate as one saw it at Quabbin.

QRTA Pres.: I would be happy to comment on that.

During the honeymoon days of the first two years, the QRTA came into existence as a functional, but weak organization. Contract negotiations were carried on between the PR & E committee and the school committee in an aura of good-faith

Little concern over contract provisions was exhibited by the teachers, as morale was high and academic freedom furthered teacher interest in expanding and developing the then current course offering for the student body. Teacher contacts with parents were mainly limited to parents night and communicating occasionally through administrative or guidance department sources.

Quabbin seemed a little world of its own for many people. For local teachers, though, rumblings and discontent in the community were real things, but loyalty because of a personal obligation to a place of employment and because of a demand by the administration, forbade them from talking outside. Very little inside questioning took place about things such as poor discipline, and others.

In the fall of 1969 the school committee, either in response to public rumblings or mounting school costs, or in response to a superintendent who wanted to promote innovative educational ideas, decided to try for a Federal grant which would finance major staffing pattern changes at Quabbin under the name of differentiated staffing. The staff was not informed of the details. Rumors were rampant as terms like learning coordinator, master teacher, intern and teacher aide became familiar. Much material came down from the superintendent's office, but most people took little time to peruse it. A feeling of mistrust about anything the superin-
tendent said or did had now developed among the teachers.

The feeling grew that the superintendent had a master plan. So everyone speculated and waited. During this period of waiting, the superintendent issued a notice of new positions to be established under the name of learning coordinators. Learning coordinators would be placed in supervisory positions and a new unit set-up was to replace the traditional departmental system. The units were to be made up of related academic fields and the coordinator of each unit would have more responsibility, more work, and earn more money. About 25 teachers, some former department heads, applied for the rumored 15 openings, although few admitted to doing so. The prevalent feeling throughout the staff was that the Learning Coordinators were already selected, and an attempt was being made to pacify teachers by the formality of an application routine. Rap sessions were scheduled weekly by the superintendent for those who were interested in learning about possible changes that might occur at Quabbin.

Chairman: What was the response of the faculty?

QTA Pres.: Little interest was generated among the teachers and attendance at the meetings was poor. The selection of the coordinators—14 in all (2 additional) was to have been made by means of a very democratic process and on the basis of ability. When the names of the 14 selectees became known to the staff, there were few surprises, as the majority were those whom the staff had felt could have been selected even without the form of the application and selection.
procedure. At least 12 of the coordinators were QRTA members who, with little compunction, negotiated individually and separately for new contracts; as members of the QRTA, the QRTA was supposed to be the sole bargaining agent for its members.

The teachers who were QRTA members were under the leadership of Learning Coordinators who, in the position of the QRTA Presidency, had no desire to and did not inform the members of the possibility of protecting a contract violation. The teachers in turn were unaware of their right to protest contract violations and did nothing. To add to the confusion, the staff was notified a short time after the selection of the coordinators that the school committee had decided to cut back on programs and personnel and that the Learning Coordinators would help to decide the programs and staff members to be cut. Information finally filtered down to the staff that the guidance department was to be eliminated and that further teacher cuts could be anticipated.

Chairman: I guess I could predict the reaction.

QRTA Pres.: A state of shock set in as people waited to see what could happen. The incentive to improve education for the students fizzled out. A sense of fear and impending danger began to grow as few teachers were on tenure. Teachers suddenly became withdrawn and suspicious of each other, Learning Coordinators, and the administration. In fact, everyone not on tenure felt that he was vulnerable if the cuts actually materialized.
At a later date the cuts were announced and expanded to a total of eight staff members. Teachers who were being dropped left Quabbin with much bitterness. Those who remained did not feel proud of themselves, for they seemed helpless to aid those being cut. The school year ended in June, 1970, on a very confused and unhappy note as far as the staff was concerned.

School began in the fall with little more settled than when school closed in June. Teachers were made aware of the new unit system when they met periodically with Learning Coordinators, many of whom were now mistrusted but were still trying to live up to their new responsibilities. At times, Learning Coordinators were unable to give much needed help to now over-loaded teachers with larger classes. The previous staff cuts led to new guidance responsibilities for which many teachers were untrained, study hall assignments with related clerical work, and administrative demands for curriculum writing and planning—all in all a heavy burden on the teacher. Teachers grew resentful even though they were occasionally listened to, but with few results. Negotiations were under way for a new contract.

At the suggestion of the superintendent, the QITA requested MTA assistance in negotiations because the school committee had given the superintendent permission to engage a professional negotiator, who turned out to be the Worcester Attorney, Matthew McCann. He had gained a reputation in this area for being hired by school committees who were
desirous of breaking teacher associations and for negotiating contracts without the binding arbitration clause. Lack of this clause in a contract left decisions on controversial issues to the school committee or the court. With the school committee and Mr. Trask taking a hard line, negotiations for a contract proceeded at a slow pace as the two negotiators spent most of the time trading insults. After numerous almost fruitless negotiations meetings, the QRTA finally requested fact-finding in an attempt to move negotiations along. However, prior to fact-finding, mediation must be tried; therefore, a state mediator talked to both sides and got both sides to agree to resume negotiations without the professionals.

At length a salary schedule to become effective for the year 1971-72 was mutually agreed upon; even though the remaining terms of the contract were still being negotiated. During the lengthy contract negotiations leadership in the QRTA underwent several changes, as did the membership in the PR & R committee. Some of the changes were due to the large turnover of staff in 1971-72 at the close of the school year while other changes were due to rumored pressure on learning Coordinators who held QRTA leadership positions.

The QRTA, which began as a weak organization, now became the screen behind which teachers could safely register their professional concern over the deteriorating educational climate which existed at Quabbin. Teacher reaction to the climate occurred in the form of grievances, one after another. Perhaps the most important one was leveled against
individual and group counseling as mandated by the administration. This grievance reached the fourth level which was binding arbitration before finally the school committee agreed to the spring of 1971 to make all guidance counseling a voluntary part of one's job. With good faith in the school committee's word, the grievance resolution was accepted by the QRTA and the grievance dropped.

Membership in the QRTA attained new heights as school opened in 1972 with teachers once again faced with guidance responsibilities or study halls. By this time discipline had become so bad that many teachers could not face the prospect of supervising study halls; so, even though many were against the concept of guidance as it was being implemented by the administration, they chose guidance over study halls. A split occurred in the faculty over the issue of guidance, as a minority approved the new system although the majority of the staff were against the system. However, most teachers were given no choice. They were told that without a contract for 1971-72 they could be and would be assigned as the administration saw fit in the best interest of the school.

Insubordination and loss of a job faced those who did not conform. When it suited administration purposes, they said the terms of the old contract still held because past practice becomes the basis for present practice. In turn, when the administration chose to ignore the former contract, the statement was forthcoming that, the teachers had no contract and could be told what they were to do.

The QRTA really began to exert its strength to protect
its members and let the public know of conditions here at the school. An unfair labor practice suit was filed against the school committee for not bargaining in good faith and for violation of terms of the former contract. While waiting several weeks for the processing of the unfair labor suit, the QRTA voted an unanimous "no confidence" vote of the superintendent's educational policies and their implementation. (The Superintendent was notified of this "no confidence" vote prior to a press release of the vote.)

Numerous grievances were filed in the order stipulated by the former contract, but the school committee failed to honor them as they said there was no contract. The QRTA again decided to go to press. Many torturous hours were spent preparing numerous press releases explaining that most teachers felt that above all else, the guidance of young students in the school by teachers untrained in guidance being asked to assume a guidance role was insufficient, and that the students' academic training was being sacrificed because of the added responsibility of guidance duties.

Another feature had been added to a chaotic scene. A new budgeting technique, was introduced by the superintendent. Budget money was being pinpointed and allocated to individuals and programs. For example, 40% of the principal's salary came from being director of the guidance, or pupil personnel program. Naturally he pushed for the success of the program both from a monetary position and a personal conviction that such a system was workable and could be a tremendous success.
Chairman: Specifically, how was teacher time taken up?

QRTA Pres.: Teachers were pressured from all angles. Faculty and department meeting time was devoted to curriculum writing with objectives stated in behavioral terms. Release time, not previously granted, was now provided for guidance, curriculum, or self-evaluation purposes. The 1971-72 school year covered the period of the school's self-evaluation to be followed by a formal evaluation by the NEACSS. Discontent was rampart within the staff; the word strike was heard more often. One had the feeling that most of the teachers were looking for another teaching position or would take almost any other job, if one were available, rather than return to Quabbin for the school year—1972-73.

Apparently press releases, rumors and student complaints alarmed some parents in the four communities. A new group called the Quabbin Regional District Parents Group was formed to involve themselves with their children's educational program at Quabbin. This group, though small, was very active. Members held public and private meetings and invited speakers to lecture on topics such as guidance in secondary schools. They attended school committee meetings and invited school administrative personnel to their meetings to dialogue with them. The upshot of all this was that for various reasons, three school committee members either resigned prior to the expiration of their term or chose not to run again for another term of office. The three newly elected members were from the Parents Group.

Help was on the way. QRTA members took heart and
continued their long uphill fight, even though the labor suit filed against the school committee had been dismissed prior to the Christmas recess. The QRTA and the school committee went back to the bargaining table. Mr. McCann still represented the school committee, but the superintendent never again returned to the table after the "no confidence" vote. The QRTA was now represented by a MTA negotiator, Mr. R. Moriarty. Bargaining in good faith really seemed to take place especially after Mr. McCann was released at the end of June, 1972.

Many meetings took place during the summer vacation and teachers approved almost a whole contract on the opening day of school in September, 1972; only two items remained in question. These were later resolved and a formal signing of a contract by both parties took place on October 19, 1972. Over two years of on and off negotiations, an unfair labor practice suit, impasse, and resumption of negotiation finally ended when a two-year contract between the school committee and the QRTA became a reality for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74. Actually the working conditions of this contract were very similar to those of the first two-year contract, since many of the innovations failed and were replaced with the former traditional set-ups.

Chairman. It might be of value, at this point, to have the superintendent address himself to the issues he faced. Also, it would give us an opportunity to look at his perspective, which certainly was unique and perhaps one not able to be shared with others at the time.
No one could conceive the problems of establishing which became established when we started in with the practice for innovation. We did try to conceive of ways in which the staff could get together and react to promotions that were being made. The hope built into our Federal project with all kinds of plans to have in-service training, which really was communicating itself, failed when the project was turned down.

In January after the Learning Coordinators had been selected we got word from the Federal government that they couldn't support our program. Reflecting back now, I ask myself, "If we had to do it over again, would I go to the Learning Coordinators to ask them to make a decision to continue on?" I had to be the one at that point though to make the decision. Yes—we were going to push on with the changes that were started.

Learn'g Coord.: If the Government project had gone through, do you think it might have had a different effect on the changes that took place? Did you envision success for the programs that you were trying to implement: the differentiated staffing, the different types of programming, the different types of staff alignment, the unit structure? From my perspective, I had a tremendous amount of faith in the project.

Supt.: Yes! Fundamentally this was a process project. It was a communication project designed to deal with the problems that leadership would face. I think the thing the Federal project would have been was to have created a climate where
staff and administration would have been best able to communicate. We would have had a summer of intensive in-service training where we would have had people together working at the ideas behind the change and actually making the decisions about the change.

I have to go back and use guidance as an example. The original intent was really to have the staff involved in making decisions about the roles they play and, I think, this is where we got all fouled up because we didn't have the time and didn't have the setting. As I can recall, there were a couple of staff members who worked during the summer for two weeks, that was all, and these two staff members described the role of 45 other teachers. In my opinion that never should have happened, but we didn't have the where-with-all during that whole spring to generate what we conceived earlier as an important involvement with the staff.

Learn'g. Coord.: I'd like to deal with one more issue. You brought up a point that I felt was very important from the perspective of the Learning Coordinator, and from the point of view of the teacher in dealing with communication. This was the change in your behavior. The type of behavior that you were communicating to the staff, initially, was one that said "I'm for teachers. I'm a person who feels teachers ought to be getting $15,000 to $20,000 a year." This type of behavior, and I've got to admit it was a favorable one, implied that here's a man that looks at teachers as professionals who deserve to command decent salaries.

Once the Federal project had gone you found yourself
communicating primarily through the only means of communications available; the QRTA— at the negotiating table. What happened here was that your behavior at the table, or at least the behavior that people perceived you to be displaying, was brought back to the QRTA and the staff portraying you as a different kind of person to teachers than they had seen back in 1967. This was now a superintendent who was tending to say, "Maybe teachers aren't professionals? Maybe teachers can't begin to call shots for themselves? Perhaps they aren't prepared to do this!"

This is the point where perhaps your image was beginning to change with the faculty. It may have been an outgrowth of the negotiating table contact.

Supt.: It is true that the faculty were slowly made aware of the innovations. They had the opportunity to engage themselves in much of it. Also, the administration and Learning Coordinators had the responsibility to gain support from the staff. I never really had the opportunity to interact with the staff. We had agreed that the principal was the person, along with the Learning Coordinators, who would have the responsibility for implementation of ideas, etc.

Learn'g. Coord.: Changes in the positions caused some confusion. There was a time when the principal and vice-principal were considered Learning Coordinators. Looking back, I detected in the principal, in particular, a certain amount of fear of what was happening to him; consequently in many of the discussion groups that we had, concerning the changes the school was to undergo and trying to determine certain goals at that particular point, the tendency for the principal was
to back out, almost to move to a corner.

I'm not clear on whether the principal ever realized exactly what his position was or if he was trying to behave in the old mode as a traditional principal with the fear hanging over him that he might have to become a learning coordinator, generated a certain amount of fear in this person.

Supt.: This may have been part of the communication problem. There is a distinction between communications for making decisions and communications for implementation of roles. We had a lot of dialogue, a lot of interaction about the whole notion of what I chose to call diffused decision making, and we agreed that somehow there was going to be a delegation of the diffusion of decision-making within the structure of the Learning Coordinators. How was this going to happen? At least the principal and I agreed that he had the key role in deciding how that was going to happen. He and the Learning Coordinators were going to work out how that was going to evolve as the school's managers.

Jr. High Manager: I'd like to react to this whole process. If you look back, the administrator had a lot of confidence in department heads because they were hired for their expertise in their subject field. But, then, when the Learning Coordinator positions were created, and filled, there were Learning Coordinators who had not been department heads. Those who had been were suddenly expanded off into other areas. I think the administration and especially the principal, where he felt he could rely on the department heads in the past to take care of things in definite subject areas, no longer had the confidence in his leadership that he formerly
had. I think, because of his behavior, he now felt the burden more on his own shoulders than he had in the past. This, undoubtedly, contributed to a breakdown in the Learning Coordinator concept.

QRTA Pres.: I'd like to interject something here. As Learning Coordinators left, they were not replaced. This both placed a greater burden on those who remained and left some areas such as Math/Science practically uncovered. This in turn caused much uncertainty among the teachers and a feeling that no one cared about them.

Supt.: Let me interject another element here, which is related to this. It was the unanimous vote of the committee in 1969 to support the Learning Coordinator program and innovative changes. What happened? The changeover of members on the committee within a six-month period really changed the whole tenor of support to one of doubtful confidence in the innovative changes. This put pressure on the superintendent. For example, when one particular Learning Coordinator left before the end of the year, the opportunity to replace him was not there as far as selling a replacement to the new committee. This is another element, which I would call a communication problem. I guess, the greatest mistake I made as a decision maker and as a superintendent was not anticipating the communicating problems of innovation that are created with a turnover at the school committee level.

Learning Coord.: You did work hard to sell the
innovative changes. I can remember one particularly innovative change through Dwight Allen, who was Dean of the School of Education at the University of Mass., to meet and talk to the school committee at the University about the movement in education toward differentiated staffing. Dwight Allen did a good job of selling this concept. The school committee members, who were there, walked away with a feeling that "Yes, Mr. Trask and Quabbin are definitely moving in the right direction." Granted, this was the old committee.

Supt.: As far as the local system and local community were concerned a lack of confidence had developed when the Federal Government turned down the project and wouldn't put money into it. It made little difference to them why the project was turned down whether from lack of confidence, money, or whatever.

ORTA Pres.: I think here, too, we have to realize that teachers are very sensitive to feelings and moods. As the work load became greater for Learning Coordinators with the reduction of their numbers, teachers wondered at times if the plan would carry through and if Learning Coordinators were really skeptical of its success. Also, these feelings didn't do anything to create confidence in the whole program.

Learning Coord.: One thing that bothered me, in particular, was that initially when the Learning Coordinators positions had been set up and meetings scheduled, Learning Coordinators met but without the principal. I'd have to say that he was absent from three-fourths of the initial meetings we had. This began to generate a certain amount of
doubt and consternation within the Learning Coordinator ranks. Here was a man operating the school in a very traditional mode, trying to hold onto his position and also trying to cope with Learning Coordinators who were communicating with the superintendent directly.

The Learning Coordinators felt the communication they were getting from the superintendent was actually going to be honored by the principal; but keeping in mind that the behavior of the superintendent was completely anti-ethical to the behavior of the principal, this was not the situation. I think this is very important in dealing with the structure and perhaps tantamount in dealing with the collapse of some of the innovation change that went on here.

Jr. High Manager: I can't speak for the principal, but I think he, perhaps because of the superintendent's involvement at Quabbin at the high school level, wondered just what his role was. I feel that the principal suddenly felt that the superintendent was assuming the role of the principal. Also, teachers perceived this to be happening.

Supt.: I know this to be the case—because he and I dealt with this and substantially he, in evaluating me, felt that I was a frustrated principal. He felt I wanted to be principal. The reality I guess is that I as superintendent felt the frustration of being the outsider. I didn't conceive the role of superintendent to be one of "hands off." I think it is relevant and we ought to deal here with the expectation of the superintendent.
When it came to the issue of the taxpayer telling the school committee, "NO, you can't have money." I think perhaps the staff expected the superintendent to rise up and battle for more money. I knew the principal discussed this with me. He felt my role as a superintendent should place me out there battling with the school committee and the community to get the staff that we needed.

I believe that the School Committee was reflecting the honest position of the community in that it couldn't afford to be up in the 85th percentile as far as the per pupil cost was concerned for schools of comparable size and characteristics.

Chairman: What was the town's ability to pay in terms of percentile?

Supt.: Down below the 20th percentile. Nevertheless the point I'm making here is that by not reacting and battling for money to meet the staff expectations, the superintendent acquired the image of being a deserter of teachers. I had to take the position with the school committee, with the community, and with the teachers that I would fight when we got down below the state average per pupil cost for regional schools. Then I would take the position of fighting, but until we got down to that level I honestly had to take the position that we had to reorganize within our school.

Learning Coord.: I'd like to address this to one situation that might be important to other institutions.
undergoing change. Initially I thought a lot of the planning was valid. First of all, you aligned yourself with a consultant from the University of Mass., a man who had good credentials and who had been close to change psychology. He had been directly involved with the examination and approval of government projects. In fact this was the person who wrote our project and played a very important part in it. Now I feel a large number of teachers had their confidence shaken in the University.

Somehow, somewhere along the way, the alignment we had with the University just broke away because the project didn't go through. Perhaps if it had gone through we would have been in a position to utilize some personnel from the University to help guide us through the change. I was wondering how much commitment they had because the University had played an important role in influencing many of the changes implemented. Once we got started, I felt we had been deserted.

Supt.: This is where I have mixed reactions to communicating among ourselves. Remember the Timber Doodle experience. We went outside and brought in a consultant that dealt with human engineering. The experience was good, and yet, I don't know if many people realized that I was pushing to have someone like this come in and work with the

*Timber Doodle* was a hunting lodge in New Hampshire where the Administration, Learning Coordinators, and CITA met with Dr. Leland Hammond from the University of Massachusetts to spend a weekend in human encountering to attempt to communicate with one another.
staff. There were reasons why it was rejected although I still don't know them.

I personally pushed for this kind of an experience beyond that of Timber Doodle.

Jr. High Manager: There was very little follow-up to that entire experience. I thought in that two-and-one-half-day period there was a very open discussion.

Supt.: We seemed to close right up after we came back.

Jr. High Manager: There was no follow-up at all.

QRTA Pres.: Was a report ever issued by the consultant on his impressions of that meeting?

Supt.: Not as an evaluation report. We did get a summary. I refer to it as the miracle of dialogue, for it seemed to me that a miracle did take place at the end when Prof. Blanchard, after all of the two days of interaction, said, "What are you personally going to do to improve things when you get back? What is the one recommendation you'd make to someone else?"

Learning Coord.: He did a fine job—he came primarily as a human-relations engineer in that he was going to lead this session for two-plus days. As far as follow-up, we didn't give him that opportunity because he was cut off after that retreat. If he had been given the opportunity to come back, I think he could have worked closely with bringing the QRTA and administration together. I think perhaps he could have perceived and isolated some of the problems we were faced with, the human relations, the communications problems...
and even the behavioral problems.

QRTA Pres.: It was my understanding at that time that he was to come back after a certain period of perhaps 3 months, 6 months, or weeks, and talk further to the people who had been there. To my knowledge this never happened.

Supt.: I talked with him about the notion of a follow-up, but the response was just: "Blah!". I didn't get the response I was hoping for. This is what happened relative to a follow-up.

School Comm. Member: This is what it looked like outside. The teachers reacted in 1971. They rallied behind the QRTA and turned a former token organization into a loud spokesman in behalf of their professional reputation. The climax of the QRTA's push to right themselves in the community came with the publication in the local press of a NO CONFIDENCE VOTE to the superintendent. Then the QRTA again turned to the local press and published a statement that their concern was not money but quality of education given to the children. To prove that personal enrichment was not their goal, they agreed to ask for no pay raise for a year. They further agreed to a pay cut if the administrators would match it. This schism between educators was heard in the community, and the seriousness of the crisis was realized by concerned people in the district. Moreover, these people were for the most part professionals who met regularly in their daily business.

They found that the Quabbin situation was occupying
more and more of their conversation. They reasoned that such mistrust could not be left to work itself out without inflicting damage on their children's education. The teachers' morale had fallen so low that some of their attitudes bordered on carelessness. It did not look to them as if the administration was in contact with the teachers. It was then that they agreed to form a parents group in an attempt to investigate the problem at Quabbin. Volunteers agreed to survey the parents of the Quabbin community and find out what their feelings were about the situation at school.

The results clearly showed that the community was displeased with the teacher-guidance program. Teachers said they had found the program unworkable. It was not working, and the public knew it.

The parents group brought the findings of the survey to the school committee from whom they had originally gotten the consent to conduct the survey and asked that they take action to remedy the situation. Then they turned to survey the teachers. The return showed there was no communication between the majority of the teachers and the principal.

It was then obvious that there was a double blockage of communication: first, a reluctance on the part of teachers to tackle the administration, and, second, a resistance of the principal to bridge the communication gap. The group brought their findings to the school committee as they felt that any attempt on the part of an individual teacher to contact an administrator would stigmatize him as meddling.
Thus, it was not likely to occur. It seemed that the administration's morale was just as low as the teachers.

Several members of the parent group ran for and got on the school committee. They continued to discuss the problem—out of committee meetings as well as in. The situation looked hopeless; then, the principal resigned. His resignation left an opportunity to plug the communications gap between the administrators and teachers. Much debate took place on the committee before finally enough agreement was reached to try an administrative team approach.

Chairman: I suppose the superintendent should answer this—what is this new administrative concept? Is it working?

Supt.: Well, first of all we have backtracked in that the traditional department head structure has been restructured. Teachers appear pleased with it. They like the idea of a curriculum home base.

On the administration level, however, we have an administrative team composed of a superintendent/principal and three assistant principals: one for grades 7 and 8, one for 9 and 10, and one for 11 and 12. They are actually associates to the superintendent/principal. All of the administrators were taken from the inside. Believe me when I say that communicating and humility are by-words at Quachini.

The initial response to the team was pure skepticism, but the Q7A graciously decided to give it a chance. To use it appears to be on the way to total acceptance. The school committee had decided on this structure and it has asked that
it be under constant evaluation. Response from the students to it has been very good.

**Retrospection**

Chairman: Are there perhaps gaps that you would care to fill before closing this dialogue?

QRTA Pres.: In retrospect the past three years destroyed part of the teachers' good faith in the administration. Perhaps this is good as today's teachers are more realistic, militant and wary of new ideas. Many good teachers have left the system. The guidance department is back in the school. Learning Coordinators ended their term of supervision in June, 1972. The traditional department head setup is back, some new faces fill old positions, teachers seem happy, students again seem happier than for the past three years, and the previous principal and assistant principal are gone.

In their place, one new innovative idea is in effect, that of an administrative team consisting of our superintendent/principal and three assistant principals—who were former department heads, Learning Coordinators, and are now assistant principals. Old scars are hard to heal, but everyone is trying to forget and forgive and move forward professionally to a better educational climate for the students.

Jr. High Manager: A comment I'd like to make; it may be a criticism and I guess it is but the parents in these five or six years have had very little to do with the school
until a crisis presented itself. It seems to me, that the parents' group, which was instrumental in making some of the changes that recently took place, should not just be crisis-oriented, but get involved in all of the school affairs at any time. I think there is a communications gap here.

I know it is very difficult as educators to get parents involved. When we have an open house you see the same very few parents each time. The only time you may see them otherwise is if we are having a concert of some type. Many times we have said the school is open for visitation at any time, but very seldom do we see any visiting parents.

Lear'n'g. Coord. : You have to realize that parents have a tendency to view education as a pretty closed system in that they do not have an opportunity or dare to probe it, since most to them don't feel adequate or confident enough. Consequently, if their youngsters are happy and seem to be getting an adequate education, they don't feel they have to bother the educational establishment.

One of the things we have done at Quabbin is to invite the public to come in and take an active part, but I honestly feel that if a good environment is reflected in the attitudes of the kid, there may be a tendency on the part of the public not to get involved. Maybe it is the nature of the public to come forth only when a crisis develops. I do have to say, though, in 1967 at the first open house we had 1200-1400 parents here. But that was the only time we ever drew so many at one time except, of course, for our music program.
School Comm. Member: I'd like to interject a thought here. I tried in my summarization to express the opinions of the public. I didn't try to inject my own, but as far as visiting the school, you people must feel like charging me rent. Most parents are not conscious of the changes of which have taken place within the Quabbin School structure. They are only conscious of the fact that there has been a change. They have heard of the team.

They do not get that involved. They have heard of or read what was published in the newspaper and so were aware of this information, but they didn't and still don't understand differentiated staffing, Learning Coordinators, and they are not about to get involved with it. They are frightened by the educator's terminology.

Supt.: Let me kick off on that because I think there are some things we have all concluded and that is that innovation, change, or whatever, adds confusion for everyone.

There is a fear of new labels that has been carried to the new structure. We ran into the question of what to call the assistant principals. We really felt that function deserved the title of associate principal, but the conclusion was, you'd better call them assistant principals because that is a title people had experience with in the past.

Another thing along this same line is that I'm most guilty of using terminology that is referred to as foreign language.

Learning Coord.: Another thing that appears real here is the difficulty you had communicating with the school.
committee, the faculty, and, in particular, even the community, but I think you have made the move to slow down and attempt nothing more until we are able to communicate. This is one of the things that has been an outgrowth of this kind of an experience.

The language would certainly be appropriate in an educational environment, probably at the university level, but never at this level. Many of our teachers criticized you because of it. Think of some of the terminology, some of the acronyms, that came out. PPBS, for all these people knew, was some great system somewhere, but their understanding of its local application was nil.

School Comm. Member: How many times when parents attended these meetings, afterward they would come to me, or someone else who was familiar with the educational terminology and ask, "Would you please interpret what they said in that school? These people are speaking a foreign language."

QRTA Pres.: I think the school committee members sometimes find themselves in this same situation and, since they are elected officials who do not want to lose face with their constituents, would rather more or less vote in a vacuum of knowledge—for or against something, without rhyme or reason—than plead ignorance.

Supt.: This has troubled me for by nature my intent is to cover a topic thoroughly. I ask if it isn't one of the problems in communicating? As for strategy of change, I have been told by people to leave the important things unver
cover some place. Leave the labels as they are, and go ahead and do it. Yet, this binds me somewhat, too, because what's happening shouldn't be disguised.

Jr. High Manager: I did notice that at the last school committee meeting when we got into the discussion of the budget, they are used to the old line item type budget. When you passed out the (a) instructional program, (b) supportive programs, and then you still had the old line item budget, suddenly they had three pieces of paper they had to refer to and I think they were really lost by the whole process.

Learn'g. Coord.: I can think of one situation that bothered me particularly as I reflect back. It certainly displays some misunderstanding. When I questioned something that the superintendent had brought up, he said to me "You weren't programmed to do that." This was a turning point in my function as a quasi-administrator at Quabbin because I wasn't programmed. If so, for what?

Supt.: Was I serious?

Learn'g. Coord.: I thought you were serious. It bothered me at that point because this again wasn't your behavior pattern. Perhaps you were undergoing a great deal of frustrations.

Supt.: Let's respond to that because I think we haven't talked about what I think is a tremendous change in communicating, that is the idea of negotiation for the role of the Learning Coordinator. In theory, we really tried to tackle the process of having the superintendent and principal, who
represented the educational enterprise, sit down with individual Learning Coordinators and through negotiations come up with a role that fit each personality, interest, and demands on the institution. But that process—from a communication point of view—was not very successful. How many Learning Coordinators said, God, look at the allocation of tasks here, We all had to confess that Jesus Christ himself could not have done them. But the process was attempted.

Learn'g. Coord.: Even though role descriptions finally got down on paper for all of the Learning Coordinators, we never saw your role description as superintendent or, as I recall, the principal's. The principal, however, did give us something about 50 pages long but this was put out by the Mass, Association of Secondary School Principals. After we generated our roles, there were tasks added later by you back at your office.

Supt.: We really did try with the school committee at a couple of sessions to get onto the definition of the superintendent's role, but you see—the problem of a school committee sitting down and defining the role of the superintendent becomes an impossible task for them. Yet, the truth is that I could sit down and describe my own role, but this isn't the process of negotiation to meet the expectations of the school committee. It was tried, but we added more problems than we already had among ourselves.

Jr. High Manager: In a paper I had written quite some
ago, one of the suggestions I made was that the superintendent and principal should write out their own role descriptions as they perceived them and then, in conjunction with a committee of teachers with their expectations, formulate jointly what the roles are for the superintendent and principal. However, that never occurred.

School Comm. Member: Do you realize that if there were clear job descriptions throughout including one for the superintendent that he could no longer play Super-man? I think this was driven home very clearly by one of our member's statements that we should hire administrators, let them flounder about until they make a mistake, and then fire them.

Supt.: That's the kind of accountability pattern that I'm trying to eliminate.

School Comm. Member: But this is exactly the position the school committee sits in. If we ever define a role we then no longer have the right to criticize the man if he is operating within our definition. You'd never get them to do it.

Learnig's. Coord.: After having gone through the experience, I have some second thoughts about being willing to sit down and rehash this again.

Jr. High Manager: I think many of us really felt frustrated by the whole thing as the atmosphere became dark.

I think one of the things that happened over the past five years was the development of what we called an "avoidance
techniques. Any time a problem came up, we discussed it. In the discussion problems were created. We just kept discussing them and just kept creating new problems. I hope now that throughout all of our discussions we can get somewhat task-oriented, not just keep discussing, but in fact get on the right track and make some decisions and say this is the way it's going to be.

Learn'g Coord.: Change was implemented, for the most part, top down, and never evaluated. We didn't touch it until we had a conflict. Take the guidance program, for instance. Many parts of that program had merit while others didn't but it was never evaluated.

All of a sudden a crisis would flare up then we would have to face it; consequently, it seemed to me that we were facing one crisis after another. One of the things with which I'm concerned now in the new structure of the team management is that we'll have a chance to deal with issues before they become crises.

We all have to compromise. I can see efforts along this line being made as I perceive a tremendous change in the behavior of the superintendent, the ORFA, and teachers who I also think felt a tremendous amount of frustration. We are at a point right now where there's only one place to go—and that has to be up.

ORFA Fred: I think the ORFA was very relevant, from its own educational philosophy of a teacher's role, to ever
the power which it acquired from necessity. It tried for two years to be heard. When all else failed, it had to resort to the press to inform the public of conditions at Quabbin for the sake of the students. I, for one, in being president for part of the two years, am very proud of what I feel was the honorable and restrained process they used. I now feel that the QRTA perhaps never again will be a weak organization, but I think it would prefer to work with the school administration for the good of the students, rather than to continue to exert power just for the sake of exerting power. Our teachers who are concerned with the welfare of their students.

Supt.: This is where I would contend if we want to see good, the good is there. I submit objectively, candidly, that coming out of this experience is what I would call a soil-reliant teachers' organization. They surely are going to be monitors—monitors of administrators' behavior. I would contend this is a very respectable role which they should be playing. Probably they wouldn't have gained this status if we hadn't had this experience.

I would say that what was promoted was heavy concentration of organizational behavior while we overlooked personal human behavior. At least we weren't sensitive to it. In human behavior the name of the game is communicating. Somehow we took it for granted that everyone understood when in reality they only felt intimidated and frustrated.

Chairman: If one concludes that the Quabbin experience
amounted to conventional educational behavior being altered with accompanying tensions and then being restored with accompanying equilibrium, then, the point of the Quabbin story becomes lost. What changed during the 1967-1972 period isn't nearly as important as what was learned about the process of change in that interim. The importance of communicating has been established at Quabbin! With this understanding in hand, subsequent attempts to alter school practices at Quabbin are likely to proceed carefully, deliberately, and meaningfully.

If only this lesson can be shared with other groups of educators about to embark upon a change effort, much progress and "esprit de corps" can result for the sake of better education for all children and young people.

Summary: Taped Interview with the Superintendent of Schools

The interview with the Superintendent of schools was designed to gain a better understanding of the following:

1. A more comprehensive picture of the Superintendent by having him share his ideas on the following:
   A. change and innovation in education
   B. change process
   C. management's responsibility in the leadership of educational change

2. The Superintendent's assessment of the Quabbin change experience in terms of the problems, successes, and failures.
Within the range of these two items, it was possible to capture the essence of the lengthy interview with the Superintendent (see Appendix A). He was most gracious and willing to give his time hopefully to contribute to a study that he was confident would help others concerned about educational change and innovation.

When asked about the nature of change in education, the Superintendent was quick to point out that change is the lifeblood of society, especially in this day and age. His primary commitment to education carried with it an equally significant commitment to change as the agent of systematic growth and development. In no way, however, did he feel that change be predicated on the trite expression: "change for the sake of change." He pointed out the need for the system to maintain itself, but good maintenance is contingent on development of what is to insure existence. This is also to say that ideas, concepts, and programs may have to be discarded if either one or all fail to meet the objective for which they were created. He projected these ideas while pointing out that change and innovation, although professed to be important by all, carry with them tremendous pressures for the persons within the change atmosphere because security is threatened. To overcome this obstacle would be, in his eyes, a tremendous task.

The process of change in any system is for him a situational question. He would not argue that existing conditions
and personnel somehow determine when and in what manner change will come. Successfully planned change will not occur automatically without considering the intervening variables, and success is dependent on whether or not it is possible to acknowledge and treat appropriately those variables that could threaten the health of change and innovation.

The change process, then, may take a number of forms. It may be quick and vast, slow and piloted or any combination thereof. What is significant in terms of success in changing, as has been stated by the Superintendent, is the need to have leadership in the school that can carry the ball. In Quabbin's situation the leadership was to be in the ranks of the Principal and the Learning Coordinators. Through their maturity and self-directiveness intervening variables as well as process could be adapted to the set and setting of the system.

In the paragraph above, it becomes clear that the Superintendent links process and change management together. He viewed change preparation as the outgrowth of shared decision making on the innovations to be implemented and the nature and form of the change process to be used.

The change experience at Quabbin encountered problems. From the Superintendent's perspective it would appear that first of all the L/C's did not behave as managers of change. Next, the faculty was not supportive of differentiated staffing and the innovations that fell under its umbrella.
Also, the financial base of the community required that alternatives be pursued. Finally, particular issues like the teacher/counselor may have brought about the ultimate death of others innovations that could have worked.

The real successes that evolved from the change, as cited by the Superintendent in his interview, would be the restructuring of the library into the instructional media center concept and the differentiating of responsibilities of staff in that area. Also of significant success would be the existing practice of using para-professionals as instructional and clerical aides.

In terms of failures, the Superintendent saw the L/C concept as a viable alternative for department heads. The idea of having learning generalists and facilitators stimulate curricular and instructional changes was based on the premise that teachers would be encouraged to take more leadership into their hands without being threatened by the narrow limitations of their training and subject matter expertise. The hope was to see cross-curricular programming catch fire. This did not happen.

The Superintendent’s concern for change and commitment to changing has not been dampened. For him the knowledge and experience that Quabbin gained will serve to help it grow. Change is and will continue to be a significant path to provide "what ought to be."
Summary: Taped Interview with the President of the QRTA

The interview with the President of the teacher's union was provided to open up, in particular, the following questions:

1. What part did the faculty play in the selections of innovations and in the manner which the innovations would be implemented?

2. How did the faculty react to the change and implementation of innovations under the differentiating staffing concept?

Within these two questions it is possible to summarize the opinions of the President of the QRTA. She was eager to be involved in the interview (see Appendix B) and has been most helpful in aiding this researcher in this study.

It was her contention that the change and innovative process which Quabbin experienced was something that never gained the sanction of the faculty. Only a limited number of individuals shared in the decisions governing this movement. The faculty served as recipients of some idea the Superintendent probably got from the University of Massachusetts on some article he read. The students however were guinea pigs.

Things got off to a bad start when eight faculty members were released to begin staff differentiation. She felt this was done arbitrarily. No needs assessment had been run, and there appeared to be no discernible reason for the changes that were to follow.

It seemed to her that all faculty could do was cope with
the tide. The Superintendent has successfully split the staff when he selected the L/C's through a questionable process. Therefore, out of fear of security, the teacher's union was born as a force to seek help to deal with what had become a serious concern of teachers.

There were innovations that actually helped the school, for example, the change in the library and the employment of aides. But on the other hand, the decision to fragment the teacher's time and role was not something to allow without a fight. The issue the President addressed here was the teacher/counselor concept. It was on this idea that the QRTA gained its basis to work hard to bring certified counselor back into the system. In the time that followed counseling became the issue.

Beyond the very significant reaction to contest what was felt to be "dangerous and inferior" educational practices, the QRTA had gained the support of many of the L/C's who became disenchanted with their roles. This was viewed by the President as a move to give the issues raised by the union more credibility.

Like the faculty, the majority of the L/C's were not able to behave as the new role required because no one was sure of the expectations. From the President's perspective, L/C's began to adopt their old role behaviors which, for most, was that of a department head.

From the counseling issue the atmosphere within the
school became hostile and tense. The union brought its case before the public through the press and the students had been turned on to the guidance issue. A student strike in the cafeteria caused considerable concern.

As the President of the QRTA stated the union used every means available including help from the state association to come in on the problems. Ultimately, enough pressure was brought to bear on the most influential sources (e.g., public, and school committee) with positive results. Counselors were hired, L/C's eliminated and department heads reinstated.

Out of this the President of the QRTA felt that change would be received well were it to appear again at Quabbin; however, she was quick to say that it would be essential that faculty share in the planning implementation and decision-making phases.

Summary: Taped Interview with a Quabbin School Committeeman

The interview with the School Committeeman was intended to round out a triangular perspective of the Quabbin change process and innovations. To gain a good substantive summary of the interview (see Appendix C), it would be necessary to come in on the following questions:

1. What part did the historical development of the school have on the changes that were implemented at Quabbin?
2. As a member of the parents' group and later the school committee, how were the changes at Quabbin being registered in the public and how did the public react?

As stated by the School Committee man the idea to build the regional high school was never a popular one. In fact, it took over twelve years and much political in-fighting to finally make the idea a reality. However, in the wake of all this, many bitter and irresoluble conflicts developed. One thing would be sure, the watchful eyes of many would be on the school. Also, the hiring practices used by the first superintendent caused resentment and fear in the ranks of the teachers within the old systems. This produced anything but a positive first step for the infant school.

When the difficulties at the school hit the public, there were mixed reactions. But as time went on, the intensity of the conflict between teachers and administrators became as real in the community as it was in the school, especially after the students had gotten in to it.

A parents' group was formed to question and in time survey the atmosphere in the school. The School Committee man was involved in this action, and he related the frustration in the community because the school appeared to be failing in its mission.

Ultimately, significant pressure was brought to bear on the members of the school committee not only from the parents' group but also from the selectmen in the feeder
communities. To heighten their effectiveness, members of the parents' group got themselves elected to the school committee. As related in the interview, the rather new school committee committed itself to making some changes, two of the most important being: (1) hire certified guidance counselors, and (2) replace the old administration with a new one. The Superintendent, although he offered to resign, was asked to stay on.

Throughout the interview a careful assessment of the role of the administrators was pursued. There was a theme woven into the words of the School Committeeman which questioned the effectiveness of the school administration to manage change. The real issue, then, was not so much a matter of poor innovation selection as it was poor management of implementation.
THE SELF-ADMINISTERED TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHER INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT AND RESULTS
PART I

Introduction

1. I'm very interested, as you know so well by now, in educational innovations primarily from the teacher's perspective. You may think it's corny to say, but I really appreciate your willingness to help. Without your openness and frankness I could never hope to understand the effort to innovate in this school from your point of view.

2. While everyone is talking about introducing new ideas and programs into schools, very little is known about what happens when innovations are brought in.

3. Since it is my belief that this is one of the most important but neglected problems in education, what I have been doing here is trying to get a much better picture of the practical realities and problems arising in schools where innovations are introduced.

4. From my observations and informal talks I feel that I have a very good general understanding of what has been happening here. There are, no doubt, questions asked here that you have dealt with before.

5. However, now I want to see this process from the teacher's point of view but in a much more systematic way. That I mean is beginning at the time when you first heard about the innovation up to the present.

6. Be sure that a name does not appear on the answer sheet to insure anonymity.

7. I welcome your afterthoughts about this instrument, be they additions, corrections, or deletions, so any time afterward please don't hesitate to tell me about any changes you'd like to make.

8. Please attempt to answer each question within the range of the choices given. However, if you feel that the choices are inadequate, leave the item blank.

Transition Note I

Let us go back to when you first heard that Quabbin was to be involved with large innovation called "Differentiated Staffing" which contained numerous additional changes such as learning coordinators, teacher/counselors, etc.
1. When was that?

Responses
Percentage of Total
15 - 75.00%  1. before it actually took place
2  - 10.00  2. when it took place
1  -  5.00  3. after it took place
0  -  0.00  4. never informed
2  - 10.00  5. unsure
20

2. How did you first learn about it?

8  - 42.11%  1. at a meeting
3  - 15.79  2. communicated to you individually
2  - 10.53  3. accidentally came across it
2  - 10.53  4. a dispatch from above
1  -  5.26  5. unsure
19

3. Who communicated the innovation to you?

12 - 63.16%  1. the Superintendent
0  -  0.00  2. the Principal
1  -  5.26  3. a department head
1  -  5.26  4. a fellow teacher
5  - 26.32  5. unsure
19

4. Were any reasons given for it?

10 - 50.00%  1. yes
1  -  5.00  2. no
8  - 40.00  3. vaguely
1  -  5.00  4. incomprehensible
0  -  0.00  5. unsure
20

5. In general, what was your overall reaction to the way the innovation was announced or proposed?

1  -  5.00%  1. very positive
6  - 30.00  2. somewhat positive
2  - 10.00  3. ambivalent
7  - 35.00  4. somewhat negative
1  - 20.00  5. very negative
20
6. Let's be a little more specific about your initial reactions.
   a. From the way it was proposed or announced, did you get the impression that:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1. this was a proven educational innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2. this innovation was being treated as an experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3. you had to try this out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4. this had really been thought through carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5. there were specific plans for putting the idea into effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far we have been talking about the way the idea was introduced and your reactions to it; now let’s turn to the nature of the innovation itself:

7. When innovations are introduced into schools, many teachers may differ in their reactions to them. How did the nature of this innovation strike you when you were first aware that it was going to be introduced here?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2. somewhat positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4. somewhat negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5. very negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Now, let’s explore this in greater detail. After the innovation was first described to you, did you feel that you had a clear understanding of it?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What, at that time, did you think the Superintendent hoped to accomplish by introducing it?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. personal prestige or satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2. put the school into the 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3. save money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4. give students a better education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Did you feel that there was a need "for this particular innovation" in this school?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2. perhaps a part of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4. don't remember a needs analysis being done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. After you first heard about the innovation did you feel you had a clear picture of what you were expected to do in carrying out the innovation?

1 - 20.00%  1. yes
14 - 70.00  2. no
20 - 10.00  3. unsure

12. In order to do this, did you think that you would have to make any change in your behavior?

13 - 65.00%  1. yes
3 - 15.00  2. no
4 - 20.00  3. unsure

13. What were those changes in behavior?

5 - 27.78%  1. more self-direction
3 - 16.67  2. more direction from above
1 - 5.56  3. complete faith in the innovation
8 - 44.44  4. knuckle under to mandates from above
1 - 5.56  5. unsure

14. When new ideas are introduced into schools they sometimes have positive consequences for teachers, sometimes negative consequences, sometimes both. What consequences did you think there would be for you?

1 - 20.00%  1. positive
7 - 35.00  2. negative
6 - 30.00  3. both
1 - 5.00  4. none of the above
2 - 10.00  5. unsure

15. What about consequences for other teachers?

0 - 0.00%  1. positive
3 - 15.00  2. negative
13 - 65.00  3. both
0 - 0.00  4. none of the above
4 - 20.00  5. unsure

16. What about consequences for students?

1 - 20.00%  1. positive
6 - 30.00  2. negative
5 - 25.00  3. both
0 - 0.00  4. none of the above
5 - 25.00  5. unsure
17. We have been talking about many different aspects of the initial period when you first heard that this innovation was going to be introduced here. What was your basic feeling, how did you honestly react to the whole notion of bringing it into this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>somewhat positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>somewhat negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What were overall reactions from other teachers to the innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>somewhat positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>somewhat negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Did it appear that they had a clear picture of what this innovation was all about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Did they agree with its objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Did they express a need for this innovation here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did they believe that this was a top priority in this school?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.12</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4. do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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23. Did they believe the innovation would work here?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>4. do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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24. Did they think they knew how they would have to change?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>4. do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>5. not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25. Did they believe that they could either make or adapt to these changes?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>4. do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>5. not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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26. Did they believe that this was really worth their while to do this?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4. do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>5. not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Now let's focus on that period of time between when you first heard about the innovation and when it began to be a part of your environment.

27. How long was this period?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>more than a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>less than a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a matter of weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. How much thinking, reading, writing, or talking was done about the innovation at this time?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>considerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Was there any preparation for teachers in the form of workshops or in-service education concerning the innovation?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>considerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. What were communications concerning the innovation?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. It may be late to pose this question, but who or what was the prime mover (change agent) for this innovation?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quabbin School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Did the administration try to find out what your feelings about the innovation were?

   6 - 30.00  1. yes
   13 - 65.00 2. no
   1 -  5.00  3. unsure

33. Was an attempt made to answer any questions you had about the innovation?

   10 - 50.00  1. yes
   6 - 30.00  2. no
   4 - 20.00  3. unsure

34. Were any of the questions or reservations you had effectively dealt with to your satisfaction during this period?

   6 - 30.00  1. yes
   12 - 60.00 2. no
   2 - 10.00  3. unsure

35. Now, as a result of what went on during this period, did your feelings change about your understanding of what the innovation was all about?

   5 - 25.00  1. yes
   14 - 70.00 2. no
   1 -  5.00  3. unsure

36. Did your feelings change about the need for such an innovation here?

   5 - 25.00  1. yes
   15 - 75.00 2. no
   0 -  0.00  3. unsure

37. Were your feelings altered in terms of your desire to change?

   1 -  5.26  1. yes
   13 - 63.42 2. no
   5 - 26.32  3. unsure
38. Is it correct to say at this stage of the implementation of the innovation your opinions about it were basically the same as the ones you held at first?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.683</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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39. At this point what was the feeling you held about the potential success of the innovation?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1. positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>97.89</td>
<td>2. negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>3. both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4. none of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5. unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Let's shift our attention to that time in which the innovation was operational.

1. How much effort did you put into trying to do it at first?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>considerable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What attempts did you make to help the innovation on?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attempt</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sought help from the administration or LC's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sought training not provided</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>offered criticism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>remained puzzled about the entire matter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Were there any obstacles to the innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Was any attempt made to deal with the obstacles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attempt</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did it appear that the innovation was under competent control?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Who did you feel had control of the innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was there an evaluation system associated with the innovation that you were aware of during this period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
<th>3. Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Did you know how the innovation would be evaluated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
<th>3. Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Did you know who would evaluate the innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
<th>3. Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Was any attempt made to feed back data on the innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
<th>3. Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Who made this attempt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1. Administration</th>
<th>2. LC's</th>
<th>3. Faculty</th>
<th>4. None of the above</th>
<th>5. Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. To whom was the feedback data directed?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-35.00%</td>
<td>1. Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>2. Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-35.00%</td>
<td>3. LC's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-30.00%</td>
<td>4. School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Was the innovation in any way construed as a violation of the teachers' working conditions contained in the contract?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-66.12%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-31.58</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Was there a feeling that the teachers' professional competence was being violated?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-72.22%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5.56</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-22.22</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What was your feeling about the state of the art of the innovation during this period?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-63.16%</td>
<td>1. confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-21.05</td>
<td>2. angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-10.53</td>
<td>3. satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>4. happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5.26</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What was the feeling of the faculty about the state of the art of the innovation during this period?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5.26%</td>
<td>1. happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>2. satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-17.37</td>
<td>3. angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-17.37</td>
<td>4. confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Was any action being undertaken to deal with the environment the innovation had generated?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-57.69%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-31.68</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5.63</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. What was the nature of that action?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>1. complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>2. grievances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>3. discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>4. unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Was any attempt made to ameliorate the environment?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Who, in your opinion, had the authority to do this?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>1. Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2. Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3. LQ's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4. faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Where was the innovation headed during this period of the innovation?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1. toward success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>2. toward failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What positive effect did the innovation have on the school?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1. added to the learning environment of the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>2. increased the knowledge of the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3. brought the school into line with 20th century educational practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>4. increased service to the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What negative effect did the innovation have on the school?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>1. hurt the learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>2. decreased staff effectiveness overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>3. split the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4. hurt the image of the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transition Note h

This final phase of the questionnaire will deal with the total effect the innovation has had on the school and community from the time the innovation was operational to the present.

24. What effect did the innovation have on the student body?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1. good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>2. bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. What effect did it have on the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>1. good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>2. bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. What was the ultimate action taken by the faculty to deal with the innovation as it affected them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>1. discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>2. grievances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3. court action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>4. cry to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. What was your final opinion of your experience with this innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>1. good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>2. poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3. bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>4. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. What was the final opinion of the staff after its experience with the innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1. good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2. poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3. bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Who, in your opinion, was responsible for the overall success or failure of this innovation?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 75.00%</td>
<td>1. Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5.00</td>
<td>2. Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5.00</td>
<td>3. LC's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 15.00</td>
<td>4. faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.00</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. What seems to be the overall feeling concerning the innovation?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.00%</td>
<td>1. it was successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 15.00</td>
<td>2. it was somewhat successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 55.00</td>
<td>3. it was a failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 30.00</td>
<td>4. it was devastating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.00</td>
<td>5. none of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition Note E**

The final questions will deal with attitude toward innovation and change after one has had experiences in this domain. It is important to attempt to assess the degree to which one feels that change is either important or dangerous in the educational setting.

31. At this moment how do you feel about change as a viable force in education?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - 35.00%</td>
<td>1. very positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 25.00</td>
<td>2. somewhat positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 25.00</td>
<td>3. ambivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 15.00</td>
<td>4. somewhat negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.00</td>
<td>5. very negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Are changes from the top worthy of consideration?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 - 70.00%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 20.00</td>
<td>2. no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 10.00</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Is it essential that all changes come from the teacher rank?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - 20.00%</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 80.00</td>
<td>2. no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.00</td>
<td>3. unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. Is it important how an innovation enters a system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>19 - 95.00%</th>
<th>1. yes</th>
<th>2. no</th>
<th>3. unsure</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. Is it important who brings the innovation into the system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13 - 65.00%</th>
<th>1. yes</th>
<th>2. no</th>
<th>3. unsure</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

36. What is the single most important element needed for change to be successful in an educational system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 - 30.00%</th>
<th>1. communication</th>
<th>2. trust</th>
<th>3. confidence</th>
<th>4. a strong leader</th>
<th>5. training</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. Did the Quabbin change environment have that ingredient?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - 5.00%</th>
<th>1. yes</th>
<th>2. no</th>
<th>3. unsure</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. Would you be a part of a whole-scale change if given the opportunity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 - 15.00%</th>
<th>1. yes</th>
<th>2. possibly</th>
<th>3. no</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. Would you consider being a part of a pilot project that would bring change into the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 - 30.00%</th>
<th>1. yes</th>
<th>2. under certain conditions</th>
<th>3. no</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


40. How many years have you taught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 1 to 5
2. 6 to 10
3. 11 to 15
4. 16 or more

41. Sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>60.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. male
2. female

42. What was your position during the innovation phase?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. administration
2. LC
3. teacher

43. How many years have you taught at Quabbin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 1 to 4
2. 5
3. 6
4. 7

44. Will you continue to stay on at Quabbin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>75.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. yes
2. no
3. unsure

45. Has Quabbin grown from this innovative experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>60.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. yes
2. no
3. unsure

46. Have you personally gained from the experience in terms of knowledge about change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>90.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. yes
2. no
3. unsure
47. Has your position in the school changed since the innovation period?

12 - 60.00%  
8 - 40.00%  
--- 20

1. yes
2. no

48. What is the psychological state of Quabbin at this moment in terms of its staff's commitment to current practices, etc.?

4 - 20.00%  
10 - 50.00%  
6 - 30.00%  
0 - 0.00%  
0 - 0.00%

1. very positive
2. somewhat positive
3. ambivalent
4. somewhat negative
5. very negative

49. In your opinion, how long will it take before Quabbin works as a totally cohesive unit in an attempt to meet its goals and objectives?

4 - 20.00%  
4 - 20.00%  
2 - 10.00%  
0 - 0.00%  
10 - 50.00%

1. we are there?
2. 1 year
3. 2 years
4. 3 years
5. unsure

50. Have you personally instituted a recent change of any size in curriculum, etc.?

12 - 60.00%  
7 - 35.00%  
1 - 5.00%

1. yes
2. no
3. unsure

51. Did you see yourself as a potential change initiator in some phase at the Quabbin school operation?

15 - 75.00%  
2 - 10.00%  
3 - 15.00%

1. yes
2. no
3. unsure

52. When changes are now contemplated for Quabbin, what is your immediate reaction?

4 - 20.00%  
6 - 30.00%  
6 - 30.00%  
2 - 10.00%  
1 - 5.00%

1. openness
2. receptivity
3. criticism (constructive)
4. ambivalence
5. fear
SECTION I. On the sheet attached, please list in priority those things that were favorable in the change experience (innovations, feelings, people, etc.) and those things that were not favorable.

SECTION II. Also, on the attached sheet, please list in priority favorable and unfavorable forces impacting on the environment and associated effects of these forces.
I. THOSE THINGS IN FAVOR

1. professional staff
2. student body
3. staff rapport
4. community concern
5. staff desire for involvement

THOSE THINGS NOT IN FAVOR

1. involvement by staff
2. communications with staff (language barrier)
3. role conflict for administrators, LC's, and staff
4. teacher/counselor concept and additional responsibilities
5. Learning Coordinator concept
6. administrator's attitude/Superintendent and Principal
7. inflexibility of innovations
8. frustration

II. FAVORABLE FORCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORTA Identification/</th>
<th>UNFAVORABLE FORCES</th>
<th>ASSOCIATED EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational change</td>
<td>Confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confrontation/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cliques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political leverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORM #1: FACULTY ASSESSMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT

SUPERINTENDENT LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE: REAL

The following items describe aspects of "real" leadership behavior. READ each item carefully. THINK about how frequently the Superintendent engaged in the behavior described by the item. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item. CHECK the appropriate column to show the answer you have selected.

Contained on the following page is the consensus assessment of the Superintendent's "real" leader behavior by twenty-two faculty members who were a part of the Teacher-Bin change experience.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He makes his attitudes clear to the group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He does personal favors for subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He tries out his new ideas with the group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. He does little to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He rules with an iron hand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He fights the subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. He gives the subordinates rather than keeps in himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. He criticizes poor work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. He assigns subordinates to particular tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. He looks out for the personal welfare of the subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. He schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. He explains his reasons to subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. He maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. He assigns subordinates to particular tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. He makes subordinate before action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. He backs up subordinates in their action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. He encourages the use of uniform procedures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. He treats all subordinates as equals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. He is willing to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. He asks that subordinates follow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. He is friendly and approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. He tells subordinates what is expected of them</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. He makes subordinates feel at ease when talking with him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. He makes sure that subordinates are working up to capacity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. He puts suggestions made by his group into action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. He sees to it that the work of subordinates is coordinated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING

Total checks in each column of the previous page and enter in square below each column. The columns on the left hand represent the Initiating Structure values. The right hand columns represent Consideration values. Record the column totals in the Initiating Structure and Consideration boxes below. Multiply each of these totals by the scoring factors indicated. Add these for a grand total representing the Initiating Structure value and Consideration value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 x 6 = 0</td>
<td>1 x 6 = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x 3 = 18</td>
<td>3 x 2 = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x 2 = 6</td>
<td>1 x 2 = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x 1 = 6</td>
<td>1 x 1 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x 0 = 0</td>
<td>0 x 0 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORM #2: FACULTY ASSESSMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT

SUPERINTENDENT LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE: IDEAL

The following items describe aspects of "ideal" leadership behavior. READ each item carefully. THINK about how frequently the Superintendent engaged in the behavior described by the item. DECIDE whether he should always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item. CHECK the appropriate column to show the answer you have selected.
Contained below is the consensus assessment of the Superintendent's "ideal" leader behavior by twenty-two faculty members who were a part of the Quabbin change experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER BEHAVIOR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He makes his attitudes clear to the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He does personal favor for subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He tries out his new ideas with the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. He does little using to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He rules with an iron hand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It takes time to listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. He criticizes poor work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It takes time to accustom rather than keeping to himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. He assigns responsibilities to particular tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. He less for the personal welfare of individuals in his group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. He schedules the work to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. He maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. He consults superintendence before action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. He is a leader in a large group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. He is a leader in a small group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. He cares for subordinates in their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. He encourages the use of uniform procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. He treats all subordinates as equals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. He makes sure the subordinates are kept in organization in understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. He is willing to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. He sets and maintains fellow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. He is friendly and approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. He tells subordinates to know what is expected of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. He treats subordinates like other employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. He is a part of the organization and working on in it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. He is an example to his group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. He sees to it that the work of subordinates is coordinated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL:     |     |     |     

TOTAL: 93.8
DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING

Total checks in each column of the previous page and enter in square below each column. The columns on the left hand represent the Initiating Structure values. The right-hand columns represent Consideration values. Record the column totals in the Initiating Structure and Consideration boxes below. Multiply each of these totals by the weighting factors indicated. Add these for a trend total representing the Initiating Structure value and Consideration value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td>10 x 5 = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>6 x 3 = 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
<td>3 x 2 = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
<td>2 x 1 = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>0 x 0 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td>5 x 5 = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>3 x 3 = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
<td>2 x 2 = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
<td>1 x 1 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>0 x 0 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORM #3: SUPERINTENDENT'S SELF-ASSESSMENT

SUPERINTENDENT LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE: REAL

The following items describe aspects of "your real" leadership behavior. READ each item carefully. THINK about how frequently you engaged in the behavior described by the item. DECIDE whether you always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item. CHECK the appropriate column to show the answer you have selected.

The Superintendent reacted to the LSDQ in the following manner:

This leader behavior profile is difficult because the relationships express an association.
with a group. My leadership involves significant numbers of different groups: Quabbin administrators and supervisors, faculty task forces, a number of school committees, negotiations team, etc. I prefer to be seen through something like the "Life Cycle Theory" which calls for situational leadership styles. I hope this helps! The relationship is linked primarily to faculty and LC's during the change phases.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He makes his attitudes clear to the group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He does personal favors for subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He tries out new ideas with the group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He rules with an iron hand</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He is easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. He limits time to listen to subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. He criticizes poor work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. He gives subordinates rather than keeping to himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. He assigns subordinates to particular tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. He looks out for the personal welfare of individuals in his group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. He schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. He explains the action to superiors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. He maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. He consults superordinates before action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. He emphasizes the making of deadlines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. He lacks in superordinates in their matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. He encourages the use of uniform expression</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. He treats all subordinates as equals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. He is willing to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. He asks that superordinates follow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. He is friendly and approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. He lets superordinates know what is expected of them</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. He makes superordinates feel at ease when talking with him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. He sees to it that superordinates are working up to capacity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. He rules subordinates made by his group into action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. He sees to it that the work of subordinates is coordinated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. He can accept criticism in important matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 1012
DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING

Total checks in each column of the previous page and enter in square below each column. The columns on the left hand represent the Initiating Structure values. The right hand column represent Consideration values. Record the column totals in the Initiating Structure and Consideration boxes below. Multiply each of those totals by the weighting factors indicated. Add these for a grand total representing the Initiating Structure value and Consideration value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 x 4 = 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 x 4 = 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 x 3 = 36</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 x 3 = 27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 x 2 = 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 x 2 = 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 x 1 = 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 x 1 = 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 x 0 = 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 x 0 = 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **40** | **TOTAL** | **36**

FORM #1: SUPERINTENDENT'S SELF-ASSESSMENT

SUPERINTENDENT LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE: IDEAL

The following items describe aspects of your "ideal" leadership behavior. READ each item carefully. THINK about how frequently you should have engaged in the behavior described by the item. DECIDE whether you should always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item. CHECK the appropriate column to show the answer you have selected.
Contained below is the Superintendent's self-assessment of his selection of "ideal" leader behavior during the Quabbin change experience.

### LEADER BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He makes his attitudes clear to the group</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tries out his new ideas with the group</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He rules with an iron hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He speaks in a manner not to be questioned</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He criticizes poor work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He assigns subordinates to particular tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He encourages the use of uniform procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees that subordinates follow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He lets subordinates know what is expected of them</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees to it that subordinates are working up to capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees to it that the work of subordinates is coordinated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 163
**DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING**

Total checks in each column of the previous page and enter in square below each column. The columns on the left hand represent the Initiating Structure values. The right hand columns represent Consideration values. Record the column totals in the Initiating Structure and Consideration boxes below. Multiply each of these totals by the weighting factors indicated. Add these for a grand total representing the Initiating Structure value and Consideration value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td>1 x 1 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>6 x 3 = 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasionally</strong></td>
<td>3 x 2 = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seldom</strong></td>
<td>5 x 1 = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>0 x 0 = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Always** | 2 x 1 = 2 |
| **Often** | 11 x 3 = 33 |
| **Occasionally** | 1 x 2 = 2 |
| **Seldom** | 1 x 1 = 1 |
| **Never** | 0 x 0 = 0 |

TOTAL: 33

TOTAL: 33
It is surprising how frequently we resist the idea of assessment. We will deplore some existing condition or state that a problem exists without being willing to undertake the necessary effort or even to recognize the necessity for a quantitative assessment of the existing situation.¹

This chapter contains an analysis of the data compiled in the previous chapter. The nature of that analysis, however, evolved from considerable transactions with both people and materials concerned with contemporary skill development and methodologies for forecasting trends and "futuribles." This does not mean to say that these are the only methods employed in the analysis. First of all, lest we place the cart before the horse, it is essential that the analysis work its way around those questions which serve to form the heart and soul of this investigation done in case study fashion.

Then it is appropriate for this writer to say, "I have determined the best means of analysis contingent on the data available and the questions to be examined."

Questions Central to the Case Study

First of all, to remain in concert with the intent of the study, the presence of the change agent must be analyzed. Questions No. 3 and No. 31 of Part I of the Self-Administered Teacher Questionnaire address this item and points out the superintendent (63 percent said he communicated it; 90 percent said he moved it, the innovation) as the catalyst for change and innovation in the "Quabbin Story." The Superintendent himself states that he initiated the interest and awareness of the innovation known as differentiated staffing; however, he is quick to point out that many of the innovations and acts associated with this organizational change were, in fact, done in a participative manner. This does not alter the perception held by the majority that it was he who promoted the particular changes that touched Quabbin. The question to be analyzed, then, is "What was the management style utilized by the Superintendent as the promoter and implementor of change as depicted in the available data?"

Next, it is essential to remain in concert with the intent of this study, to analyze the various phases associated with the change process as it worked on the implementation of innovations at Quabbin. The superintendent in his interview is extremely vague about the change process utilized to bring about organizational changes at Quabbin.
He views the process not so much as one designed to cope with changes and innovations, but rather as a systems approach which addresses itself to newly defined goals and objectives. The perceptions of the staff and their consensus asserts, call it what you will, that there was a change process that did involve interest and awareness, implementation, and operationalization of the innovations. The question to be addressed here is, "What was the nature of the Quabbin change process, and how does that process compare with that expounded by Ronald Havelock?"

The third area of concern settles on the key events which constitute the "Quabbin Story" and the impact that each had on the other. The situation does not merely contain a number of independent events. These events are associative and somewhat interdependent on one another in much the same way that the ripples from the impact of a thrown rock into the water influence the immediate environment. The question to be analyzed is, "How did particular, significant events in the 'Quabbin Story' impact on one another, and what was the significance of each impact on the total environment?"

The fourth question centers on the transaction between the administration and the faculty. The Self-Administered Teacher Questionnaire illustrates a particular concentration. The question, then, to be addressed, is "How did the administration and the Quabbin faculty transact through the
various phases of implementation of organizational changes?"

The next item for analysis concerns the forces that evolved from the various stages of the change experience. This data has been compiled in the last section of Part II of the Self-Administered Teacher Questionnaire. The forces are listed in both the "favorable" and "unfavorable" domains. A consensus process was utilized to set the priority of each force. The question to be analyzed is, "How did the selected forces impact upon the organization in its desire to change?"

Throughout the analysis of these questions in this chapter, the writer will be utilizing his own position of "participant observer" as a respectable and unique perspective from which to conduct this analysis. As stated in Chapters I and III, the concept of participatory observation is of significant importance in particular to the case study method, and also as the monitoring or feedback agency on the nature of human interplay and activity. The president of the teachers' union was adamant about the need for this position in the change environment. It is her contention that this writer played that part. The writer would acknowledge that fact and further state that his role was one that was encouraged by the Superintendent up to the point of intense confrontation and conflict which resulted in communication problems. This matter, however, will come to light during the analysis.
Analysis of Question No. 1

Statement of the Question: "What was the management style utilized by the Superintendent as the promoter and implementor of change as depicted in the available data?"

Part III of the TEACHER INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT is devoted to the leader behavior description of the Superintendent. The mean score results of each phase of this particular assessment are plotted below in Figure 5.1 which contains four quadrants whose two means are based upon the pooled samples of administrators and aircraft commanders and may be construed as coordinates which define these four quadrants.2

Superintendent Leadership Style

FIGURE 5.1

FACULTY ASSESSMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT: REAL CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>Below Mean</th>
<th>Above Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Mean</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>(W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Mean</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 49.9

---

FIGURE 5.2

FACULTY ASSESSMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT: IDEAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>Below Mean</th>
<th>Above Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Mean</td>
<td>c-</td>
<td>c+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s+</td>
<td>s+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Mean</td>
<td>c-</td>
<td>c+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 49.9

FIGURE 5.3

SUPERINTENDENT'S SELF-ASSESSMENT: REAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>Below Mean</th>
<th>Above Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Mean</td>
<td>c-</td>
<td>c+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s+</td>
<td>s+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Mean</td>
<td>c-</td>
<td>c+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 49.9
FIGURE 5.1

SUPERINTENDENT'S SELF-ASSESSMENT: IDEAL

The quadrants which are represented in the figures above hold that a leadership style with a mean scores of 49.9 or above on the CONSIDERATION dimension would be considered high on that dimension. A mean score of 48.6 or above on the INITIATING STRUCTURE dimension would be considered high on that particular dimension.

FIGURE 5.1 which is the faculty's "real" assessment of the Superintendent's leadership style represents a mean score of 39 on the INITIATING STRUCTURE dimension and a mean score of 19 on the CONSIDERATION dimension. Both scores fall well below the mean scores of successful leader behavior as reported by Halpin and lie within the quadrants indicative of low structure and consideration. It is essential to note that the CONSIDERATION dimension, although low, is better than one-third below the total for INITIATING STRUCTURE which, as has been previously mentioned, is already low. There is a significant difference between the two means.
Halpin's researched successful and Quabbin Superintendent's.

Further analysis of these figures reveals that the particular leadership style described in quadrant I is evaluated as highly effective, whereas that in quadrant III, whose behavior is ordinarily accompanied by group chaos, is characterized as most ineffective. Quadrant IV represents the martinet and the cold fish so intent on getting the job done that he forgets he is dealing with human beings. Leadership described in quadrant II is also ineffective. This leader may ooze with the milk of human kindness, but this contributes little to effective performance unless his CONSIDERATION behavior is accompanied by a necessary minimum of INITIATING STRUCTURE behavior. 3

FIGURE 5.2 which represents the faculty's "ideal" assessment of the Superintendent's leadership style reveals that they would prefer a leadership style that resembles the one represented on the coordinates of the four quadrants. A score of 51 on the INITIATING STRUCTURE dimension and a score of 49 on the CONSIDERATION form the basis of this response. The leadership style sought here would be one that provided more delineation of the relationship between the Superintendent and the faculty in an endeavor to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

3Ibid., p. 98.
The scores displayed in FIGURE 5.3 show that the Superintendent's self assessment of his "real" behavior is 40 on the INITIATING STRUCTURE dimension and 39 on CONSIDERATION. This would place his perception of his particular leadership style in what Halpin would consider ineffective leadership behavior that could erupt into group chaos. On both dimensions the leader would display not only a management style that does not clarify the issues but also a style that is below the recommended mean for success in initiating an atmosphere of warmth and mutual trust.

The Superintendent's self assessment of an "ideal" leadership style is revealed in FIGURE 5.4. Here he scored a 33 on the INITIATING STRUCTURE dimension and a 44 on the CONSIDERATION axis. This would place his perception of the ideal leadership behavior in the quadrant of low Consideration and low Structure.

Contrasting the scores on FIGURE 5.3 with those on FIGURE 5.3 pits the faculty's assessment of the Superintendent's real leadership style against his own. It is apparent that there is a significant variance. On the Initiating Structure dimension the faculty scored the Superintendent 10 points lower than his perception of his real leadership style. This would hold his leadership style on this dimension in the low quadrant. The Consideration dimension offers an even greater contrast. There is a difference of 20 points between the faculty's perception and his.
There is also a contrast between the Superintendent's idea of ideal leadership behavior as illustrated in FIGURE 5.2 and FIGURE 5.4 which represents the faculty's perception. A significant difference of leadership behavior is seen on the Initiating Structure dimension in particular. In this case the faculty perceived a score of 50 as being ideal while the Superintendent went with a score of 33. This would indicate that the faculty's perception of the ideal leadership behavior on this dimension would be one of high structure while the Superintendent would prefer low structure. Again, the faculty and the Superintendent are at odds in the perception of ideal Consideration with the faculty giving a mean score of 49 and the Superintendent 44.

A contrast of FIGURE 5.1 with FIGURE 5.2 which allows us to overlay the faculty's assessment of the Superintendent's real leadership behavior on to his ideal indicates a significant difference in terms of real and ideal perception of leadership behavior. On the Initiating Structure dimension there is a disparity of 21 points between the real and the ideal leadership behavior which indicates that the real perception is that the Superintendent employed a leadership style which was low structure and that the ideal would have been high structure.

Along the Consideration dimension an even greater disparity exists between the real and the ideal leadership behavior. There is a difference of 30 points which says that
the Superintendent's real leadership style was low Consideration and the ideal as seen by the faculty would have been high. The real leadership behavior on both dimensions shows that low Structure and Consideration were used while the ideal would have been high Structure and Consideration.

Contrasting the Superintendent's assessment of his real leadership style in FIGURE 5.3 with his ideal in FIGURE 5.4, it is apparent that there is little disparity. The Superintendent's assessment of his real leadership behavior places him somewhat near the coordinates of successful leadership behavior. This would still give him a perceived real leadership behavior that would be ineffective. It would indicate that he was low on Initiating Structure and low on Consideration. It would be his opinion then, that the ideal leadership behavior would have been low Structure and low Consideration.

Summary

In reality, it becomes quite clear through this analysis and the available data that the Superintendent initiated a great deal of involvement on many issues only to back off quickly once things seemed to be in motion. This was, perhaps, the most significant characteristic of his leadership behavior. Because he rarely stayed to delineate relationships and establish well-defined patterns of organization, it is only appropriate for chaos to take over. It would appear that the
faculty made this quite clear when they suggested more initiation of Structure than Consideration although both mean scores on the ideal leadership behavior are in a healthy quadrant.

The leadership style of the Superintendent is carried over a considerable period (three years). From the beginning he chose to behave in a most amicable way toward teachers, and he was successful. His warm personality and concern certainly contributed heavily to an initial change atmosphere that would have lead anyone to feel that Quabbin was prepared to innovate. What is important, and this is bourne out in the literature, is the need to develop an environment that is receptive to new and different thinking. On the other hand, the actual movement into the implementation of an innovation demands the initiation of structure in a consistent manner. This is where the leadership behavior of the Superintendent suffered.

Careful analysis of the Superintendent's leadership philosophy, which is the basis for his behavior, would illustrate his desire to promote leadership within others in the system. This was developed by him in the form of the LC concept. The LC's, however, failed as leaders, and their inability was augmented by the Superintendent who over-zealously and intermittently came forward to help. This, then, would account for the faculty's concern for more structure rather than consideration.
Analysis of Question No. 2

Statement of the Question: "What was the nature of the Quabbin change process, and how does that process compare with that expounded by Ronald Havelock?"

The contextual map used with this question will form three charts each of which focuses on one aspect of the change process viewed in an abbreviated manner. Chart #1 maps out the awareness stage of the change process. Chart #2 lays out the context of the implementation stage. Finally, Chart #3 moves to the operational stage of the innovation. In this instance innovation is regarded as an umbrella phase under which many other changes and innovations either took place or resided. The innovation at Quabbin which formed the backbone of all changes and innovations to follow was differentiated staffing, the Quabbin model.

Also important to the question is its concern to compare or contrast the change process put forth by Ronald Havelock in his recent book, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education which has been discussed in detail in the first chapter of this study. It is essential, nonetheless, to look critically at a limited number of important elements which constitute the heart of Havelock's guide. This should be attempted only after the contextual map has been explained as it related to the actual elements contained within the three stages it attempts to map.

Each frame of the contextual map will be linked to the Teacher Interview Instrument. In this way it is possible to discuss each frame in terms of the perceptions of those who worked within its context.
Chart #1 expresses the contextual map of the interest and awareness stage of the innovation. Frame 1-1 concerns itself with the perception that 63 percent of those completing the questionnaire regarded the Superintendent as the catalyst for change. He was responsible initially for the communication of the innovation to the staff. It is through his efforts that other sources and resources would be made available to enable this stage of the change process.

Within frame 1-2 the focus is directed to the first instance of a perceived trend. First of all 75 percent reacted to the overall introduction of the innovation in either an ambivalent, somewhat negative, or very negative way. When asked about their reaction to the nature of the innovation, 63 percent fell into the range, ambivalent to very negative. On the other hand, 37 percent felt either somewhat or very positive about the innovation itself.

Frame 1-3 directs itself to the understanding that the innovation would be handled on an experimental basis. 50 percent responded in this manner. An experimental program would have presented itself as a pilot study which would have been used with a small portion of the school in one or more areas. In any case the innovation was felt to be implemented on a limited scale.

Concern for the understanding of the innovation forms the basis of Frame 1-k. 75 percent said that they had no clear picture of the innovation or that it was at best vague in their eyes. Later, within this phase 80 percent felt they did not have enough information about the innovation to enable them to carry it out with any success. Beyond this, 50 percent
Chart #1: Contextual Map/Awareness Stage

1-1
Interest and awareness are stimulated within the school's environment. Information is seeded through departments and a government project is in the making. The Superintendent is the catalyst and resource linker.

1-2
The projection of a potential innovation is viewed with a certain amount of ambivalence or negativity.

1-3
Initial reaction from those in the environment is that any innovation would require preparation and training. From this perception the innovation was construed to be experimental.

1-4
The staff is unable to comprehend the nature of the innovation as it is being filtered into the school. In particular, there is no reason given.

1-5
There did not appear to be a discernable need for the innovation at this time. In no way was a basic get to determine need. If there was, it was not apparent.
Chart #1 (continued)

1-7

The nature of the behavioral change for staff would appear to be more in line with a mandate to knuckle under rather than a collaborative guiding.

1-8

It is apparent that there is no clear picture of the way the innovation would work in the school.

1-9

The objectives, the need, priority and workability of the innovation are to be questioned. The functionality of the innovation remains remote in light of preparation. The push is made to go forward with it in this phase.
respond that initially there was no reason given to them why the innovation should be implemented.

Frame 1-5 centers itself within the need sector of the map or the importance of a needs analysis or assessment which would form the basis for the implementation of this particular innovation. 68 percent responded by saying that there was either no apparent need or a basis for an innovation to enter the school.

An important concern resides within Frame 1-6 which directs itself to the changes in performance required to meet the expectations of the innovation. 65 percent said they would have to alter their behavior as an educator to meet the demands of the innovation while 20 percent said they were unsure and 15 percent said they would not have to change in any way.

Frame 1-7 contains a context that shows that those changes that must take place, real or otherwise, perceived by the staff, would be of a nature that would cause the staff to knuckle under each expectation. This would be comparable to driving round pegs into square holes. This was, at least, the impression given to 68 percent of those completing the questionnaire. On the other hand, 28 percent saw in the behavior changes an opportunity for self-direction in terms of acquiring the skills needed for a new role.

Back into the need sector, there is information in Frame 1-8 that says a clear picture of the innovation is not available. Nor is there information comprehensible to the extent that one could understand how the innovation would function within the Quabbin school environment. This would imply that no model was available of the innovation. The Teacher Interview Instrument shows that 20 percent said that a clear picture of
the innovation was non-existent. Within this figure, however, there are some who do not know or are unsure.

The end of this stage of the context map rests within Frame 1-9. Here the objectives, priority, and workability of the innovation come under fire. These are elements that represent the functionality of the innovation. Yet, 65 percent respond that they either did not agree with the objectives inherent in the innovation, or they were ambivalent, did not know, or unsure. Only 10 percent said they agreed with the objectives. 5 percent felt that this innovation should have top priority in the school. 68 percent said no while 27 percent fluctuated with uncertainty.

In no case did anyone feel that the innovation would work in the school. 47 percent were adamant on this point while 21 percent remained uncertain, 26 percent did not know, and 6 percent were unsure. When asked if they knew how they would have to change, 42 percent said, "no," and only 5 percent said, "yes." Finally, 5 percent felt the innovation would be worth their while to implement it, and 47 percent said that it would not be worth their while. This would leave 48 percent who are uncertain of any value to be gleaned from involvement in this innovation.

Chart #2 contains the contextual map of the implementation stage. The map moves from the decision to make the innovation an integral part of the school climate to a point in which the organizational climate becomes unhealthy.

Frame 2-1 points out that heavy seeding and discussion were underway at this time to get the innovation through the door. 70 percent felt
Chart #2: Contextual Map/Implementation Stage

2-1
This stage offered considerable seeding and discussion of the innovation in its initial impact when it was decided that it would be part of the school's working climate.

2-2
The communication climate is closed and operates on a one-way channel, top-down.

2-3
No preparation is apparent after the Title III project had been turned down. Yet, it is decided that the innovation would still run.

2-4
The basic feelings expressed in the interest and awareness stage remain. The climate is now more tense with apprehension and confusion.

2-5
The Superintendent and administrators fail to clarify the nature and need of the innovation. There is much talk, most of it directed at LC's and teachers. Few answers appear to be forthcoming.

2-6
There is a lack of communication in the change atmosphere. Things happen within a small circle. Confidence has been shaken in the potential success of the innovation.
that this technique was employed to enhance understanding, acceptance, and readiness of the innovation.

In Frame 2-2, 95 percent view communications as a top-down device to bring about change. The communication channel open is one-way. This item is very significant because "The Quabbin Story" grew out of the recognition of many, in particular the Superintendent, that lack of communication was, indeed, a significant problem that impacted negatively on the implementation process at Quabbin.

Frame 2-3 falls within the need sector as it brings into the context for analysis a concern for preparation not only for implementation, but also for operationalization of the innovation. The federal project (see Appendix D) had been rejected; nevertheless, it was decided that the innovation would continue full-scale without outside financial assistance.*

A trend is being sustained in Frame 2-4 in which the basic feelings of the participants about the innovation remain unchanged. Referring to Frame 1-2 of Chart #1 which dealt with this item initially reveals that 75 percent of the staff was either ambivalent or very negative. In this situation 70 percent responded that their feeling remained the same and 5 percent were unsure. Also, 90 percent see the Superintendent taking command of the operation at this time. Oddly enough, the remaining 10 percent felt that the University of Massachusetts was the prime mover (change agent) of this innovation.

The functional area of the context map houses frame 2-5. This frame holds information that says that the skills needed to sustain the

* 75 percent felt that preparation must take place to enhance the implementation of the innovation.
implementation stage are lacking. 60 percent responded they could not get satisfactory answers to their questions concerning the innovation. 50 percent said that an attempt was made, however, to answer questions. There is also the feeling that the same position is being maintained concerning a perceptible need for the innovation. 68 percent responded at the interest and awareness and saw no apparent need for the implementation. At this point, 75 percent say that they perceived no change in their perception of a need for differentiated staffing.

Frame 2-6 maps a context that shows that the innovation is not in a healthy state because the organizational climate is not. In particular, 58 percent of those filling out the questionnaire feel that the potential success of the innovation is negative. Only 5 percent sense that the potential success of the innovation is positive while 37 percent are walking the fence with the belief that the success of the innovation could go either way.

Chart #3 holds a contextual map of the operationalization stage which, for lack of a better term, determines that the innovation is now implanted in the system. In no way does operationalization insure that the particular innovation will be sustained. This chart begins with operational problems that touch on competent control and moves to the need to select alternatives.

Frame 3-1 works around the context containing the amount of effort that was put forth by those completing the questionnaire to get the implemented innovation operational. 63 percent said they put forth either considerable or great effort, 32 percent gave some effort, and only 5
**Chart #3: Contextual Map/Operationalization Stage**

### Basic Trend

**3-1**
There is a feeling that some considerable effort was made to get the implemented innovation operational. Also, there were obstacles and it did appear that things were not under competent control. It was further felt that the Superintendent was the innovation controller.

### Functional Area

**3**

- **3-2**
  Working conditions of the teachers' contract are felt to be violated especially by the differentiated responsibilities outside of the classroom.

- **3-3**
  Feedback on the innovation was attempted but to little or no avail. The attempts were made to LC's, administrators, and to the Superintendent. The lack of response from these persons will result in the problem going to the public through the press and on to the School Committee.

- **3-4**
  An evaluation of the innovation at this stage was essential. However, one did not take place.

### Need Sector

**3-5**
Action is taken by the QRTA in the form of grievances, court suits, and pressure on the public. The staff at this point is angry and confused.

**3-6**
The state of the innovation at this point is quite precarious. It is failing in a number of areas. There is nothing positive to be seen in the innovation. In particular, staff effectiveness seems to be hurt considerably.

**3-7**
It would seem apparent that no alternative exists now except to STOP and ASSESS very carefully where we should be, and how we hope to get there collaboratively.
percent offered little. To enhance the innovation at this stage, 65 percent have said that they either sought help from the administration or LC's, 35 percent said they offered criticism while 10 percent felt they remained puzzled about the entire matter. At least 75 percent said that there were obstacles to the innovation at this time. However, 45 percent said that an attempt was made to deal with these hindrances while 30 percent saw no attempt and 25 percent were unsure if an attempt was made. What is significant is the impression that the Superintendent was the person controlling the operationalization of the innovation. 85 percent viewed him in this capacity. It is important to note also that the perception held here at the final stage of bringing the innovation to Qual'bin has remained relatively the same throughout the entire change process. Finally, there were 80 percent who said that the control of the innovation at this time was not in competent hands while 5 percent felt that it was and 15 percent were unsure.

The information mapped out in contextual Frame 3-2 serves to bring attention to a critical matter that could have a very deleterious influence on the innovation and the personnel working with it. 63 percent felt that the working conditions set forth in the teachers' contracts had been violated. 32 percent said that they had not. This particular issue becomes more aggravated when 72 percent respond that their professional competence is being violated while 22 percent were unsure and 6 percent said it was not.

Frame 3-3 further supports the notion that a communication problem had surfaced. 80 percent offered feedback on the effectiveness of the
operationalization of the innovation. The majority of the feedback, 33 percent, came from the LC's while the faculty only contributed 11 percent. There is, however, 22 percent who did feedback information in the form of criticism but not to those within the school. The feedback was directed to the following person or persons: 35 percent went to the Superintendent; the principal received none; the LC's gained 35 percent; and the School Committee was given 30 percent. It would appear that feedback was purposefully directed, evidently offered to the person or group that could do the most with it. This would imply that the criticism, although constructive, was directed more so to problems and not improvements.

The first frame to touch the need sector on this map is 3-14. Initially, a needs assessment or analysis was regarded as a moot point; however, it was never given the consideration that evaluation got. One LC commented out of frustration that evaluation was something like the weather, everyone talks about it, but nobody does anything to change it. 65 percent responded that they were not aware of an evaluation system, 15 percent said they were, and 20 percent were unsure. When asked if they would know how the innovation, the success or failure of it to date, would be evaluated, 75 percent said, "no." On the other hand, 5 percent said they did know how it would be evaluated and 20 percent were unsure. What becomes quite interesting to carry this particular issue further is that 70 percent said they had no idea who would evaluate the innovation if this were to be done. 10 percent responded that they knew who would evaluate and 20 percent remained unsure.
Frame 3-5 contains the culminating effect of a trend that began with ambivalence and has resulted in anger and confusion. When asked about the state of the operationalized innovation as it affected each individual, 63 percent said they were confused, 21 percent were angry while 11 percent felt they were satisfied and 5 percent weren't sure how to respond. This same question was directed to the impression that each participant had about the innovation as it touched the general body of individuals within the school. It is the feeling of 47 percent that most were angry, and another 47 percent said that most were confused while almost 6 percent felt that most were happy. It would appear that a strong majority felt the innovation at this stage and resulted in anger and confusion. When asked if anything was done to deal with the environment, 50 percent answered, "yes," while 32 percent said, "no," and 10 percent remained unsure. The nature of that action fell into the following: 21 percent said complaints, 42 percent saw it as grievances, 27 percent discussions, 5 percent were unsure, and 5 percent felt that other alternative actions were pursued. It is significant to note that 40 percent said that no attempt was made and 25 percent were unsure. Interestingly enough, 90 percent responded that it was the Superintendent who had the authority to intervene during this time. The other 10 percent saw the Principal as the person with the authority to better the environment. In any case, the organizational
climate is in a most precarious situation at this moment.

It would be fair to say that the health of the innovation was identical to that of the organizational climate. This becomes ever so clear when 95 percent respond that the innovation at this moment is headed toward failure, while 5 percent are unsure. Opinions at this time held by all those who completed the questionnaire are that the effect of the innovation as it has been phased into the system has resulted in the following: damage to the learning environment, damage to staff teaching effectiveness, and conflict within the area of inter-personal relations especially amongst teachers and also teacher and learning coordinator.

The final frame, 3-7, falls into the need sector as it exhibits a context in which help is essential to bring about awareness and action in terms of problem-solving, decision making, and sensitivity. What tomorrow will bring if the contextual map is expanded, undoubtedly will resemble today if the problem is not addressed. An expanded map would illustrate a period of intense conflict fought within the school, the community, the press, and the courts. Pressure and power politics form a part of that map in that change is the servant of any master whether he be reasonable or otherwise who can employ the most effective strategies to meet the situation at hand.

It is necessary to examine the fundamental components of the Havstock system to change and innovation implementation.
The other half of the question to be dealt with in this section of the chapter is the comparison of the Quabbin change process to the one extolled by Havelock.

To begin with, Havelock is much concerned about keeping "in phase" when contemplating change and innovation. The uniqueness of each system will certainly contribute to the type of transaction needed for effecting healthy (accepted) change. In particular, it is paramount that a good working relationship be established by the change agent or agency with the client system. In this study, this relationship would be the one established by the Superintendent and the Quabbin Regional Junior Senior High School. There is nothing in this study to suggest that the initial relationship of the Superintendent with the client system was anything but healthy.

The next item of importance suggested by Havelock is the need to work with the client system to diagnose the relevant problem areas. This would imply, then, that change should be predicated on a perceived need. Hopefully, that need would evolve in such a manner that the client system would have no question about its existence. This particular phase appears to have been eliminated at Quabbin. There is evidence that the Superintendent did his own diagnosis and that the information associated with it was never disclosed.

---

to the client system.

Ideally, on the basis of the information which has been retrieved from diverse resources, it is possible for the change agent and the client system to decide on a potential innovative solution. Once again, the Superintendent selected the innovation, differentiated staffing, that he felt would meet the particular needs that he faced as chief educational administrator in the system. In his interview he points out the financial "crunch" that had to be faced immediately; however, there is no evidence to support the ideas that anyone else in the client system was aware of the problem except in an "ex post facto" way.

What Havelock purports to this point would represent the ground work for the actual installation of the innovation in the client system. It would seem that if the criteria asserted here had not been met, then, transforming intentions into action would be most unwise. In no way is it ever too late to stop, shift gears, back up or go ahead. The idea to move ahead and translate intention into action would represent the heart of the plan for change. During this phase all the preparatory work is put to test, and it is in this phase that it is learned whether or not there is a workable solution that can be accepted and used effectively.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., p. 111.
by "all" the members of the client system. There is, perhaps, more deviance here at this point when comparing the two processes than elsewhere.

During the period of installation Havelock would insist that each individual involved in the change program must be allowed to become familiar with the innovation. He must learn how to use it, and he must come to accept it as a part of his routine behavior. In the Havelock change process what usually follows is a six-step sequence: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, adoption (with adaptation), and integration. This process must be understood by the client system. With this in mind the relevant "facts" about the innovation must be conveyed to the relevant audiences clearly and accurately. Also, the change agent must be willing to review and reassess any or all aspects of the change program. "Therefore, every attempt should be made to prepare a schedule which is both flexible and schematic--a difficult balance to strike, but a crucial one."10

The Quabbin change process contains essentially all of the elements described in the Havelock process in varying degrees. What Quabbin placed most emphasis on was procedure

7 Ibid., p. 111.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid., p. 112.
10 Ibid.
which is only one aspect of the process. Procedure is mechanical. The dimension not evident was careful and clear communication which would allow for action and reaction.

Havelock has set forth some critical points not to be overlooked. For instance, it should be clear that "rejection" can take place at any stage along the way. Also, individuals must be encouraged to progress through all the adoption steps in sequence. Specifically, the change agent should keep these hazards in mind:

1. Skipping steps (e.g., "trial" without "evaluation" or "adoption" without "trial").

2. Changing the order of steps (e.g., "trial" before getting sufficient information or commitment to try).

3. Hurrying through the stages just to meet a schedule. (Most people need time to think things over before they make a change that will affect their lives in a significant way.)

4. Ignoring individual differences in adoption rates (e.g., assuming that everyone in the client system is "aware" of the innovation,11)

**Summary**

There are numerous conclusions that may be drawn from this analysis. In particular, there is much evidence to suggest that not only the approach to change that was utilized but also the management employed was inappropriate. Little or no evaluation was in process to assess the progress of

11Ibid., p. 40.
change and the relative success of the innovations. The contextual map illustrates quite clearly a trend of dissatisfaction, confrontation, and conflict associated with each advent of an innovation within the d/s frame. In particular, L/C's did not function in a mature and self-directive way. The Principal ignored the changes and kept to himself while the Superintendent flitted in and out without holding reins long enough to set up direction.

The maps constitute a clear indication of the problem areas associated with the implementation of the innovation. It also provides for the researchers a way to trace the development of problems which might hinder the successful implementation of an innovation at any particular level. For Quabbin, the absence of careful planning and, in particular, the omission of a needs analysis would form the basis for a shaky adventure into the realm of change and innovation.

One significant use of the conceptual map methodology would be its ability to show the educational manager where he has been, where he is and, hopefully, where he is going. Looking at the maps as a composite of Quabbin's journey in change, it becomes evident why conflict developed. It may, on the other hand, serve to ameliorate that conflict once it has been apprehended and scrutinized. This, then, further illustrates the myopic position taken by the Quabbin managers of change. At no point in the implementation were they aware of where they were.
Analysis of Question No. 3

Statement of the Question: "How did particular, significant events in the 'Quacoin Story' impact one another, and what was the magnitude and significance of each impact on the total environment?"

A symmetrical matrix is provided to address the scope of the question above. As shown in Figure 2, the cross impact matrix systematically generates data concerning the possible relationships between events. The author will discuss those events that exhibit a relationship of significant impact. Those that include either a second order impact or an insignificant impact will be touched lightly.

Effect of Event 1 on Event 2. Event 1 has an impact on Event 2 in two ways. First, it was the federal project (See Appendix B.) that initiated strong concern for an educational staffing alternative to meet current demands, in particular, money. Therefore, the project prepared an embryonic map of things to be if financial backing were to come from the government. In this light, the impact was of a sort that it increased the probability of Event 2 taking place significantly. In the second place, Event 1 generated significant enthusiasm concerning in-service education for the entire staff with the internal incentive of greater pay for greater output. Two pay scales would be prepared. The top of second to be twice the bottom of the first. This would allow teachers to obtain salaries that would range beyond $15,000 per year.

Effect of Event 1 on Event 3. Event 1 had a significant impact on Event 3 because the project was predicated on "learning coordinators" (learning generalists) who would help the Superintendent oversee the
Figure 5.5: CIM of Selected Events Related to Quabbin Change and Innovation Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Federal Project Submitted/Rejected: Differentiated Staffing Model with Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Innovation Implementations DS to Include LC's and Teacher/Counselor Concepts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Selection Communication and Process for LC Appointments</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Brainstorming: Staff Cuts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hiring 17 para-professionals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Reorganization of the Teachers' Union (QRTA)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Contract Negotiations</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Grievances/Unfair Labor Practice Suit</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Student Strike</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Timber Doodle</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Public Involvement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N — no logical relationship indicated

↑↑ — a strong positive impact or relationship

↓↓ — a strong negative impact or relationship

↑ — a weak positive impact or relationship

↓ — a weak negative impact or relationship
implementation of the innovation. It was through the LC concept that the traditional department headship was eliminated. The manner in which LC's were selected generated substantial hostility because the selection process initially sought volunteers and advocated selection by group consensus. Because time was on the wing, five individuals from within the staff were selected to work with the Superintendent and Principal on a Saturday morning to bring on the other members of this prestigious group. The impact of this event and the long-term bitterness that followed would come to decrease the possibility of the concept working well.

Effect of Event 1 on Event 4 and Event 5. Event 1 impacted significantly on Event 4 and Event 5 because it enhanced the need to pursue a staff structure complemented with para-professionals. Eight staff members were released and this included, in particular, the total elimination of the guidance department. With the reduction of professional staff at their salary, it was essential to provide para-professional aid in particular areas at a lower salary figure (scale). This process of cutting professionals and adding para-professionals was accomplished during a twenty-four hour encounter session which was committed to building strengths and weaknesses of existing programs, and, through learning co-ordinator and administrative consensus, arrive at decisions that would maintain what we are now doing well and set priorities on those things that we feel are not, in fact, progressing well. Tantamount in this session was the need to alter the existing organizational structure in such a manner that the system would function better in terms of its ability to meet its objectives at a lower cost to the communities.
Effect of Event 1 on Event 6, Event 7, Event 8, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. Event 1 impacts to a limited extent on Event 6, Event 7, Event 8, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. Initially, the inherent implications of Event 1 were never understood adequately by the teachers' union, and this would explain why no significant impact resulted early in the game. Also, this particular relationship would build a strong case for the poor communications that would erupt in time in Event 6, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. One can say that the impacts illustrated here are probably viewed in a more accurate manner if seen as second order impacts. They were nurtured out of the conflict of innovation implementation. In each case, however, the event has to be ultimately traced back to Event 1.

Effect of Event 2 on Event 3, Event 4, and Event 5. Undoubtedly, the most important event linked to the success of the innovation was the selection of appropriate educational generalists (learning coordinators) to see the matter through the implementation process. Event 2 impacts significantly on Event 4 but in a manner that hurt the probability of success for the implementation of the innovation. In this situation, a select few began to make important decisions that would impinge on the total educational atmosphere in a way that would affect the effectiveness of each teacher. Event 5 represents a significant move to compromise the action taken in Event 4. If any event gained appreciation and lasting life from the changes made during this period, Event 5 did.

Effect of Event 2 on Event 6, Event 7, Event 8, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. The impact on all of these events is recorded as elements
important in diminishing the probable success of the innovation. It is only in Event 10 that one can distinguish any attempt to enhance the probability of success for the innovation. Each of the events mentioned aside from Event 10, which carries with it two impacts, contains a pressure strategy to restore the system to what it once was. Perhaps the most significant event is the last, Event 11. This was the event that provided the power politics necessary for counter change from the only unit in the system capable of doing just that aside from the Superintendent.

**Effect of Event 3 on Event 2.** The impact of Event 3 on Event 2 is significant in that Event 3 was the most essential step to get the total innovation in phase. Also, the selection of LC's was careful to give the important educational leaders in the system first consideration. Said another way, all department heads became LC's except two who were women in the two smallest units in the school, art and home economics. There was no female representation within the LC rank.

**Effect of Event 3 on Event 6 and Event 10.** Event 3 had a slight impact on Event 6 initially. There were many hard feelings because Event 3 was to have been accomplished through a democratic process designed to give consideration to anyone who applied for the position of LC when the innovative positions were advertised to the entire staff. These feelings developed into distrust of the Superintendent, in particular, and those selected to fill the "new" position. The impact of Event 3 on Event 10 surfaced significantly during the Timber Doodle meeting. Members of the QRTA felt that Event 3 undermined any faith that anyone might have had
in the proposed innovation. In other words, commitment from those outside of the rank of LC would be anything but favorable.

Effect of Event 4 on Event 2, Event 5, Event 6, Event 7, Event 8, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. There was a significant negative impact on each event mentioned above. It must be taken into consideration that this first act made by a clandestine and suspicious group shook the very foundation of security for nearly everyone in the system. The non-tenured, as well as the tenured professional, felt he was in danger of being either released or eliminated when his position went which, by the way, is a legal act in public education.

Effect of Event 5 on Event 2, Event 4, Event 6, Event 7, Event 8, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. Event 5 impacted favorably on Event 2 in a most significant way because Event 5 was to be a most important element in structuring the new staff pattern. No one would argue that professional replacement by para-professionals is not a good economic move. There are, however, other considerations to be met when addressing this item. It impacts on Event 4 negatively in that it injured from the start the effectiveness of the ability of the LC's to brainstorm. The effect on Event 6 is conflicting in that most saw the need in education for para-professional aid, but not at the expense of releasing a whole department which offered a special service to the system like guidance. The impact on Event 7, Event 8, Event 9, and Event 10 is not significant, but it must be registered because in Event 9, in particular, and Event 11 there was an image being cast that para-professionals were replacing teachers and that students were being short changed.
Effect of Event 6 on Event 2, Event 3, Event 4, Event 7, Event 8, and Event 11. All of the impacts on this axis diminish the probability of success for the innovation. Event 6 impacts on Event 2 as a means to halt many of the practices of the innovation on the grounds that those practices are violations of the teaching agreement, Event 7 and Event 3. In particular, the reorganization was a needed strategy for the QRTA to realize its own potential and to plan strategies to combat those things that individuals could complain about but not change. There were many common complaints, e.g., teacher/counselor concept. The issues to be dealt with effectively had to be brought before the public, hence the significant impact on Event 11.

Effect of Event 7 on Event 2, Event 4, and Event 5. Event 7 impacts most significantly on Event 2 in that any innovation, it now appears, will probably alter or affect working conditions of those touched by it. Working conditions are to be negotiated. Hence, the red light goes out from this point whenever the idea of an innovation is suggested. Event 4 was an event that had shaken the security most felt they had, and it also created a significant element of distrust. Event 5 presented some significant conflicting opinions. Para-professionals had helped, but there were professional responsibilities that not even the professional teacher could provide, e.g., guidance.

Effect of Event 7 on Event 6, Event 8, Event 9, Event 10, and Event 11. The impact on the events mentioned here in each case is favorable in terms of its ability to enhance Event 7. Event 7 gave the faculty a confidence it never knew before. This impacted favorably on Event 6 in that it illustrated the potential that teachers had to deal with problems they personnel.
Event 7 impacted favorably on Event 8 in that it formed the legal basis by which the QRTA could grieve items violated which were spelled out in the contract. In Event 9, it was apparent that student support of the faculty's claim that they were being hurt by the innovation could only aid the process contained in Event 7. Event 10 was also an event that had some impact on Event 7 because Event 10 represented an attempt to resolve conflicts that infringed on the teachers' working agreement.

The impact of Event 7 on Event 11 is quite significant in that the press was made aware and used by the QRTA to further its demands on the School Committee through public pressure to make concessions to improve the students' education.

Effect of Event 8 on Event 2. The action taken in Event 8 impacted most unfavorably on the health of the innovation because it was felt that the administration unilaterally had decided to impose new and unreasonable working conditions not covered in the contract. The impact of Event 8 on Event 2 becomes a greater issue when one understands that a school administration and its School Committee can be virtually bombarded by grievances from all corners that must be processed through four steps and ultimately resolved through binding arbitration should any or all not be resolved at either step 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Effect of Event 8 on Event 4, Event 5, Event 6, Event 7, Event 8, Event 10, and Event 11. The other events on this axis respond favorably to the impact of Event 8 except Event 5 which illustrates conflicting impacts. Again, in this event, the issue of the valve of the para-professional is being debated. On the other hand, remainder of the events are actions needed to help the QRTA win its fight to restore the system.
to an organizational climate and structure conducive to good education. The issue to be addressed here touches the nature of reality as seen by the QRTA and the administration. It would appear that there are probably three realities that need examination. The first is the QRTA's; the second is the administration's; and the third is what is. Without the proper tools and skills we have before us an ancient issue best illustrated through Plato's "The Allegory of the Cave." Need I say more.

Effect of Event 9 on Event 2, Event 4, and Event 5. Event 9 impacted on Event 2 significantly and in a negative way because students were now addressing the innovation from a limited perspective. Nonetheless, it was inevitable that their involvement would help the QRTA's efforts. Event 4 and Event 5 represented, in particular, the two events that moved the students to react in Event 9. Students are the clients and certainly their response would be taken under careful consideration. It is important to note that students as clients fall heavily under the influences of their mentors. Consequently, the genuine concern of the students would have to be examined with a certain amount of suspicion.

Effect of Event 10 on Event 2. There was a significant impact of Event 10 on Event 2. This impact illustrates that the innovation was in trouble and had been for some time because its history of implementation is a tale full of fury. This would be the event that could either send people away on the path to resolution or lead them to the ultimate conflict that could give the kiss of death to the heart of the innovation. The impact was not favorable.

Effect of Event 10 on Event 7 and Event 8. Interestingly, both impacts represent conflicting values because some good and some bad evolved.
from Event 10. The very issues that were suggested in Event 10 would, in time, be a part of the Quabbin environment. Many grievances would come to an end and, finally, a most favorable contract would be signed which would give the QRTA everything it had wanted "to improve" education including a handsome salary increase.

Effect of Event 11 on Event 2, Event 4, Event 5, Event 7, Event 9, and Event 9. Each event impacted on this axis represented a diminishing effect on the success as well as the life of the innovation irrespective of the fact that the innovation was in the door and designed by the Superintendent to stay. The impact of Event 11 on Event 2, Event 4, and Event 5 was significant because the outspoken, conservative element in the public saw in the innovation (or were lead to believe) a move to treat their children as guinea pigs, and they did not appreciate the simile. Event 9 further illustrated their need to take action because their children brought the conflict between the QRTA and the administration from the classroom into the home. It would be accurate to say that the public earnestly sought numerous ways to resolve the troubles it perceived in the school. Its primary mission was to restore peace and, hopefully, harmony. It would seem to them, and they said it, that children receive the brunt of a conflict like the one that was in their school system.

There is a total of eighty-five impacts registered in Table 2. Of the eighty-five, twenty-nine are such that they will help to enhance the probability of success of the implementation of the innovation, and fifty-six, or 65 percent of the impacts, are of an order that they will diminish the probable success of the implementation of the innovation. Within these figures there are twenty-one favorably strong impacts,
eight favorably mild impacts, thirty-seven unfavorably significant impacts, and nineteen unfavorably mild impacts.

The CIM illustrated in Figure 2 sets before the reader a series of relationships that constitute impacts that were either somewhat significant or insignificant, favorable or unfavorable in terms of helping the innovation survive as an important element within the system. But more important, the CIM also contains the capability to project what other events and their relationships could or will follow. If tomorrow will, for the most part, resemble today, what will tomorrow bring to the Quabbin change experience?

Summary

The analysis of the question through the CIM provides significant insight into the relationships that existed between the events that took place during the change period. In particular, the development and implementation of L/C structure and the teacher/counselor concept are, perhaps, the most explosive events to touch the change environment. These two events accounted for the birth of a strong and better teacher's union and conflicts that carried themselves into court and to the public. A projection to forecast the Quabbin future at this time could only spell doom. It is unfortunate that the CIM methodology was not available to the Quabbin Managers of change at that time. An extended analysis of the CIM would forecast a dismal future for Quabbin's innovations.
Statement of the Question: How did the administration and the Quabbin faculty transact through the various phases of implementation of organizational changes?"

Transactional Analysis will provide the methodology to be used in the examination of this question. In particular, there will be a focus on the organizational climate from the interest/awareness stage through the operationalization of the innovation.

1967 was the year that the Quabbin Regional Junior senior High School became operational. There was much symbolic, conditional stroking during this period. If anything, one must say that the stroke environment was very positive as portrayed in the interview with the QRTA President. The administration could not find enough right with the performances of the faculty. There seemed to be authentic stroking of the warm, fuzzy kind coming particularly from the Superintendent who appeared to be a staunch supporter for academic freedom, self-initiative, innovation, and, above all, better pay for professional educators. Each organizational transaction was permeated with warmth and understanding.

This particular stroke environment was maintained through the second year of operation. A time structure profile (see Figure 5.6) indicates that the two significant
structure that were pursued during this period were work (W) and intimacy (I). Ideally, these should constitute the most significant endeavors within an organization if it is to maintain its health and development. Conversely, it is essential that withdrawal (W) be held to a low degree because its intent is to take one from one's work. Rituals (R), also, deserve little consideration because they represent superficial exchanges.

Figure 5.6: Time Structure Profile
Initial Operational Phase
Innovation Interest/Awareness

Pastimes (P), on the other hand, are quite important in that they provided for talk with a particularly significant emphasis on content. Hopefully, much of that talk would be linked to the work being done. Games (G) like pastimes provided for healthy transactions. They offered limited intimacy.

What is essential was that the organization wanted to share
time in furthering its goals and objectives in a way that included the entire staff through a process calling for participation and consensus. In this way, it was possible to maintain a life position that said, "I'm OK--You're OK."

The ego states of the Superintendent/faculty during this period were primarily adult/adult and adult/child which would indicate that there was a clear understanding of the relationships, responsibilities, and ground rules of the organization. What is more significant is that these ego states, especially that of the faculty, was tempered by its child which provides feeling and emotion. Also, it is the child that is adaptive and intuitive. In this way, the ego states within the organizational environment were able to be cathexed, i.e., each got itself into contact with itself. This would mean that the faculty saw themselves as actors who were responsible for their actions in that they had choices. The Superintendent promoted a serious concern about the welfare of teachers and their worth from his adult. They in turn from the child responded by lauding him as an outstanding and warm administrator that understood them. Ultimately, this organizational climate projected itself as healthy and mature. Its institutional message was experiment, have fun because the system needs you, believes in you, and trusts you.

The implementation phase presented a different transactional relationship within the organizational climate. This
was the period that began with the decision to run differentiated staffing without any outside financial aid. It is also the time when LC's were selected and the change plan was launched. In TA terms the ego state of the Superintendent switched from \( A \) to \( P \), parent. The faculty, however, maintained its \( C \) ego state. There was no evidence to mistrust the Superintendent.

Superintendent

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \rightarrow P \\
C & \rightarrow A
\end{align*}
\]

"Quabbin is going to attempt to change its structure."

Faculty

\[
\begin{align*}
P & \rightarrow A \\
C & \rightarrow F
\end{align*}
\]

"This could be an exciting experience for us all!"

In a very short while that happy \( C \) became a disenchanted \( C \) looking for ways to hit back. The interviews and the Teacher Interview Instrument reinforced the researcher's judgments of the nature of the organizational climate at this time.

Here the stroke environment changed from warm fuzzy to warm prickly and eventually to cold prickly. All of the stroking became abstract which meant that it was vague and partially perceived. The emphasis shifted from faculty participation to cabalism. The individual became less important. The focus was directed to the innovation and the changes that it would place on the persons in the organizational environment.
From this point the time structure profile (see Figure 5.7) emerged differently. There was a significant increase in withdrawal (\(W\)) which was probably the result of insufficient information on the innovation, role conflict, and the need for role clarification. Conversely, activity (\(A\)) and intimacy (\(I\)) both dropped significantly which indicated a breakdown in organizational warmth, trust, and work. The release of eight teachers would certainly have contributed to this profile. Also, rituals (\(R\)) increased offering nothing more than additional superficiality to the communications within the organizational climate. In this condition the life position shifted to one that said, "I'm OK—you're not OK."

The ego states of the Superintendent and faculty also
changed. The Superintendent attempted to move between the A and the P which projected a rather cold and clear image of what must be done to make this phase successful as he perceived it. He also, however, through his P shook his reproving finger at the faculty and admonished it for its inability to meet expectations. Now it became impossible for the faculty to cathect itself with a critical P pontificating the "should's" and "don'ts." The faculty became reactors; from their bitter C they were not responsible for their actions; and, they had few choices. To respond in a responsible manner, the faculty was forced to leave its C and adopt the rational position only offered by the A.

The LC's, however, remained in virtually one ego state throughout the experience and that was the ego state of the C. The institutional or system messages carried numerous injunctions and drivers: don't make decisions, hurry up, don't question, be perfect, etc.

The final phase to be analyzed is the operationalization of the innovation. It would be fair to say that there was no clear cut time that one can call the critical point between implementation and operationalization. There was, however, the moment when management and its superordinates decided to maintain the innovation as a permanent part of the organizational climate, and this move constituted a freezing in of the innovation.

The stroke environment had not changed drastically.
Stroking became more abstract and plastic as it moved from the cold fuzzy kind to the cold prickly. This indicated a very bad relationship within the organizational climate. It further indicated a desire by those in the environment to avoid contact with one another, in this case, administration/LC--faculty transaction.

Figure 5.8: Time Structure Profile
Operational Phase

The time structure profile (see Figure 5.8) moved about as far as it could without completely disintegrating the entire relational climate. Withdrawal (W) and ritual (R) dominated the environment which implied a need to shun responsibility and hopefully abstract oneself at least psychologically from the work environment. This was further reinforced by the low degree of activity (A) which diminished initiative to meet goals and objectives of the system. Pastimes (?)
which provided talk and games (G) which offered needed but limited intimacy had either diminished or remained the same. Finally, intimacy (I) dropped like activity (A) to suggest that trust and communications were lacking even to the point of allowing the system to correct itself. Here the life position remained as it was in the implementation phase: "I'm OK--you're not OK." This further implied that the relationship between management and faculty had become asocial.

The ego state of the Superintendent changed significantly in that the A seemed to vanish and the P became the singlely significant ego state to dominate all thinking, especially decision making on the part of management. Without the A there was little chance to gain a reasonable solution to the problem. The computer quality of the A in its cold way does allow for clear insight into the problem. Within the P of the Superintendent, however, there was only one behavior and that was: "I know what is best!" The organizational messages did not change from those projected in the implementation phase. Only now the injunctions and drivers were more bitter, and the C in the faculty had no alternative but to act in an attempt to cathect itself. Ultimately, though, the faculty would maintain an A ego state to combat the rigid over-bearing P in the Superintendent.

What we have before us is a vast and rather intricate scenario. It is possible to see the screen, project yourself
on it and ask the question: "What is this, a tragedy, comedy, farce or adventure?" It is also possible to bring forth the cast of characters, their dialogues, the theme, and, in particular, move the drama to a predictable climax.

The relationships examined here are, for the most part, those that are not conducive to the welfare and health of the organization. There is a clear disintegration of human interaction/transaction which could only erupt in disorder and conflict. It would seem that little was done to maintain a healthy transactional relationship once the innovation got out of the interest/awareness phase. It is unfortunate, in particular, that the appropriate ego states could not have been maintained. This would indicate either an unwillingness or an inability for those involved to cathexis themselves in the situations that evolved through each phase or stage of the change process. When either party thinks less of itself or the other guy, it is fair to assume that the climate in which they transact or attempt to will be strained.

Summary

The TA approach has enabled the writer to open up and critique the relationship, in particular, between the Superintendent and the faculty. One point of information seems needed, and this would call to notice the frustration undergone by the faculty while wearing two hats through this ordeal: that of (1) a responsible faculty member, (2) a
responsible union member. The technique does work, however, to account for the hostility that arose and the ultimate breakdown of a communications system and a productive environment.

Analysis of Question No. 5

Statement of the Question: "How did the selected forces impact upon the organization in its desire to change?"

Through the technique of Force-field Analysis the question will be examined. This would require that the examination be done by examining each force against the questions set forth in Chapter III where the guide to force-description is presented.

Before presenting the conflict and forces working within the Quabbin environment, it is necessary to examine the set and setting which gave the educational leaders at Quabbin the confidence that the change and innovation being promoted by the Superintendent would work. That pre-change environment was examined by the newly appointed learning coordinators during a twenty-four hour, encounter session on January 9th and 10th in 1970. The purpose for this meeting was to accomplish the following:

1. examine the range of a differentiated staffing program in terms of its components,

2. examine the probable roles that IC's would play in the D/S scheme, and
3. assess where the school was at the moment by "brain-storming" out strengths and weaknesses.

The results of the brain-storming culminated with a list of the strengths of the organization in priority and the weaknesses:

1. **Strengths**
   
a. open-minded staff, talented, compatible  
b. academic freedom  
c. ground work laid for para-professionalism  
d. acceptance of innovation  
e. recognition of co-curricular program values

2. **Weaknesses**
   
a. I.P.I. (individualized programmed instruction)  
b. guidance  
c. integration of curriculum  
d. scheduling  
e. evaluation  
f. reading  
g. communications  
h. problem solving

What is particularly revealed from the two lists are the positive factors that would strongly support a system and/or

The information contained herein was taken from a communique to the staff dated January 15, 1970, and titled: "Brain-storming Session of the Learning Coordinators."
a person in a bid to change or innovate. Therefore, there is little question as to the timing of the Superintendent to promote change. The personnel within the system were not only supportive of change but also had at least tacitly bought the innovation, which in this case was a differentiated staffing pattern. There were para-professionals working in the school as supportive individuals which helped develop credence for the innovation.

The first force to be defined as listed in Section II, Part II of the Teacher Interview Instrument under favorable forces is QRTA identification/strength. This is an interesting force because it was an element which would in time set itself in opposition to the innovation. Prior to the innovation the teachers' union was an effete organization that had its big moment once a year at the shop party. With the initial impact of the innovation and its heavy requirement for staff cuts and behavioral change, the QRTA began to examine its potential as a protection agency. Throughout each phase of the change process an obvious growth in power and might was exhibited by the teachers' union. They surprised themselves because they never dreamed that they could or would have to counter the wishes of the administration.

There are dimensions to the force that made it an effective instrument. First of all, it was the professional faculty who had an excellent reputation in the student body and the community. Next, it was linked to one of the most
powerful state teacher associations in the country which was committed to help it grow in muscle and sophistication. It had access to the press and potential to appeal. Finally, as professional educators held in high repute, it could question its confidence in the administration's ability to lead. As a restraining force, community support for the QRTA, came from two groups. One wanted resolution of any and all conflicts handled immediately; the other saw in the conflicts an issue to cast before the entire Quabbin community with the phrase: "See, I told you so!" In particular, all criticism was directed at the administration as the individuals responsible for the "poor state of affairs." Pressure mounted on the Superintendent. The erratic leadership behavior of the Superintendent opened the way for more confusion. There was no question on the part of anyone that he was leading. It was, however, the nature of his leading that confused everyone. He would jump in hard whenever the school leadership seemed to be in trouble, kick like hell, and back off. This happened again and again.

A very unpopular force which began to restrain the innovation was the faculty's opinion of organizational change. It was seen as an experience to be avoided because it carried with it severe consequences for those that it touched. In particular it became a popular feeling that all change be grass-roots oriented, i.e., change evolve from the teachers,
and that it not be a top-down mandate. From the teachers' perspective change was a club to get new things going and to save money.

To counter the problems in the environment, the Superintendent drove administrative pressure on the LC's and teachers. There was nothing unique about this tactic except it was more pervasive than most forces. It was moved through symbolic shoving, goal shaking, and constant administrative reaffirmation of what must be accomplished. It was, also, forced through personnel evaluation based on expectations developed by the Superintendent. This was his way to kick the LC's into a responsible management unit. They refused, however, to respond. Then he came down harder and later backed off. Communications breakdown resulted from the Superintendent's displeasure and behavior to reinforce a "no-speak" atmosphere. Communication with the QRTA ceased and the anonymous third party moved between the two. People stopped discussing the issue and left the only arena where it was possible to gain resolution either through compromise or whole-scale giving. Reason left and gave itself up to emotion and a win-lose situation.

There is much evidence to support the notion that a good number of faculty, in particular LC's, knew little of what they were supposed to do throughout the various stages of the change process. Without LC support and leadership the innovation had the kiss of death. The Superintendent
made this quite clear in the project. It was his contention that the LC's had the maturity and know-how to get the innovation off the ground with his help. The LC's were not mature. Without the on-the-spot prodding of the Superintendent, they would fall back into a docile posture and cry "confusion." This caused the Superintendent to jump back in, shake their ranks, clarify his position, and move back to his office on the hill. Ultimately, he lost LC support and gained their enmity. They threw their lot in with the teachers' union of which they were a part, some even holding important offices.

Compensation was a restraining force that impeded the change process because it provided a financial carrot for a select few. The carrot went out to the LC's which placed their credibility with the faculty in jeopardy. The pay scale for LC's was well beyond that of the teachers which hurt the concept of a differentiated staff pattern because there was no differentiated pay scale.

Finally administrative pressure evolved into coercion. When the repeated behavior of the Superintendent rendered itself definitely ineffective, a threat to reorganize was shared with the LC's by the Superintendent. The reorganization would result in a cut in salary for some and a loss of prestigious position for others. As a driving force to counter apathy, the threat proved ineffective.

What is particularly interesting about the Quabbin
change experience was that each selected force had an associated effect that was negative. Organizational change brought on confusion; QRFA identification/strength resulted in confrontation, conflict, and grievances; administrative pressure brought on a climate of tension; communications breakdown turned people away from one another and consequently, allowed misunderstanding to develop; role conflict became synonymous with frustration; compensation created cliques and suspicion; community support created political pressure to come to bear on the school administration and the School Committee; and, coercion resulted in resistance. It was, however, the sporadic, driving force of the Superintendent and the immaturity of the LC's that hastened the collapse of the innovation.

The Principal's behavior posed itself as a restraining force. As the Superintendent pushed hard on the LC's he found it impossible to effect support from the Principal who, by now, saw the innovation as a personal threat. Little antagonisms arose between the two administrators which in itself restrained the progress of implementation.

Of the forces in the environment, there were none that supported the Superintendent's drive to keep the innovation in tact. Without the support of a responsible leadership element within the school, the management of change became a slippery item. Quabbin needed self-directed leaders who could provide support and foresight. This lack of leadership
and the Superintendent's sporadic over-compensation for the weakness resulted in a greater restraining of the implementation of the change.

Finally, it is unfortunate to deal only with surfaced forces. What is essential is the ability to utilize skills that allow for projection and trend analysis to either meet a force, defeat it, or else back off. It is important to seek the best pay off under any conditions. If the mind sets are known, it is possible to predict. If a power struggle is eminent, have your troops ready. The essence of dealing with forces lies in game theory.

Summary

This chapter has presented five methodologies to be used to examine five different questions central to this study. It is the feeling of this researcher that the uniqueness of each question required a methodology for analysis that would meet the challenge presented by each question. Consequently, each methodology was selected on the basis of its ability to meet the inherent nature of each question.

Fundamentally, it may be stated that the five questions and their examinations actually constitute five different ways to look at essentially the same problem. The focus is always on the Quahoin change experience. It is the perspective of that focus that provides different insights into the particular issues that evolved. Aside from the use of the
LBDQ and force-field analysis, the other analytical techniques are relatively new as methodologies to be utilized in educational research. They grew primarily out of military forecasting in the 1960's. More than this, all of the analytical techniques used have equal if not more promise in the hands of the public school manager as skills to help keep a system in its best health.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The change process is a complex phenomenon which is not limited to any one particular field of knowledge; it includes a vast number of fields of knowledge. Its major components are diffusion, dissemination, and adoption. Also essential to the process are management theory, decision-making, management science, psychology, and futuristics. Change is in reality an interdisciplinary field.

Viewed from a different perspective, change becomes the center of the hub around which many fields of knowledge revolve. It is, therefore, an intricate concept that is difficult if not impossible to examine as a single entity.

An examination of the literature concerning change by writers from various fields, in particular, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and management, illustrates that the rate of change and its direction are of primary importance. There is also overwhelming agreement around the need for meaningful change, the use of techniques to facilitate change (including technology, system approach and contemporary methodologies for analysis) and human interactional or transactional techniques which would include all participants in the change field. One very important concern lies with strategies for change. One promising strategy
of change has been identified (after a review of 7,000 items in the literature) by Ronald Havelock. He uses the linkage strategy as a representative of the best elements of the Problem-Solver, Social-Interaction, and Research, Development, and Diffusion strategies.

Underlying the entire change process and an item regarded by all writers on the subject as tantamount for successful change is the need for effective communications to effect dissemination and ultimately adoption and diffusion of innovations.

Within the literature is a well defined need for professional education to upgrade its programs to articulate programs with needs of schools, and to begin preparations for a curriculum to educate "change agents." Closely associated with this item is the need to bring the researcher, facilitator, and practitioner together so as to gain careful examination of an innovation moving through the change process. This particular pooled focus would serve the need to establish the researcher with information essential to R & D as well as give everyone involved the benefit of valuable consultative advice.

The intricate nature of the change process in education is so immense that it becomes essential that change not fall into the control of a single individual, rather, it be carried out by teams composed of the participants in the experience. There is sufficient evidence to cite changes
that failed even though the best guidelines and approaches were employed. This may happen because it is possible to miss significant variables in designing a change strategy which could jeopardize the success of the change as well as leave a permanent attitude against any form of change—and presently, there is more of that than education can tolerate to survive!

The author had certain assumptions at the outset of this study which should be commented on at this time.

1. "Public education will continue to be the major organization for schooling youngsters." There is a question about the survivability of the public schools in the literature, but it seems that there is still hope. That hope lies, however, in the change efforts of educators toward meaningful and planned change.

2. "The fields of anthropology, sociology, psychology, management, and the related studies of diffusion, and change contain many elements that can feed into a generic process for successful change." This assumption was correct, there was no lack of information, although only Havelock appears to have developed a process guide containing elements of others that is in need of testing, not as a foil by which to test changes and innovations of others, but as the process used in an actual change experience. As a foil behind the Quabbin change process, Havelock’s guide does show weaknesses, omitted omission of phases, and areas for
conflict to arise.

3. "The change process can be institutionalized in the public school system." This study bears witness to this assumption. Although glutted with areas of conflict, the Quabbin system did, in fact, adopt some of the changes that fell under the blanket innovation of differentiated staffing.

In addition to the assumptions, there were five questions to be answered. These questions are directly linked to five distinct needs set forth in Chapter I of this study.

1. "What was the management style utilized by the Superintendent as the promoter and implementor of change as depicted in the available data?" The leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire and quadrant analysis set up a quantitative approach to examine the Superintendent's leadership style quite accurately both in the "real" and "ideal" domains. The interviews and the Teacher Interview Instrument also served to reinforce the illustrated position on the quadrant analysis. Question No. 1 was satisfactorily answered.

2. "What was the nature of the Quabbin change process, and how does that process compare with that expounded by Ronald Havelock?" The process used at Quabbin was examined through events that were mapped contextually in three domains: basic trend, functional areas, and need sector. Through the analysis it was possible to trace the change
process from awareness/interest through implementation, to operationalization (or adoption). Also, key elements of the Havelock process could then be used to assess phases and phase sequence. In particular, the Teacher Interview Questionnaire played a significant role in substantiating the feelings, attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of the events on each area of each map. Thus, Question No. 2 was completed.

3. "How did particular, significant events in the 'Quabbin Story' impact on one another, and what was the significance of each impact on the total environment?" The author selected a limited number of significant events and utilized a symmetrical axis to allow an impact to take place, each event on the other. The methodology employed is Cross Impact Matrix. With the use of the data contained in the "Quabbin Story," the interviews, and the questionnaire, it was possible to gain consensus on the nature of the impacts although this consensus would have to be regarded as extremely subjective. So, this question, too, was satisfactorily answered.

4. "How did the administration and the Quabbin faculty transact through the various phases of implementation of organizational changes?" This question was addressed through a methodology called Transactional Analysis. It was through the author's participation in a TA workshop that he gained the skills and information needed to utilize this approach.
on the organizational level. It does serve to open up many stimuli that drive an organization and those in it. In particular, it offers an approach that is predicated on putting one in touch with oneself whether we are speaking of the individual or the organization. This was done and Question No. 4 was answered.

5. "How did the selected forces impact upon the organization in its desire to change?" The methodology employed here was Force-field Analysis, and it provided a unique manner in which to describe and analyze each force and its effect on the field or environment in which it worked. Consensus was used in the selection process to deal only with those forces apparent at all. Question No. 5 was adequately resolved

Conclusions

Based upon the review of the literature and this study, in particular, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Successful educational change is contingent on a well-defined communications system that is two-channeled and open. The Quabbin system maintained a one-way communications system that was top-down and closed.

2. Any change should involve as many of the participants in the change as is possible. At the very least representatives from groups affected by a proposed change should be included in the planning. The Quabbin system offered very limited participation for input, decision-making, and
problem solving.

3. The PRINCIPAL is the most significant member of the change team if the change is to touch his school and if he is considered accountable for the health of that system. Change may originate outside of the system; it may come through linkage with persons (change agents) or professional schools (change agencies), but it needs the endorsement and support of the chief building administrator if it is to succeed. The Quabbin Principal did not endorse nor support the changes and innovations that were implemented in his school. He chose to remain distant from the change and to lose himself in the other activities of the school. The innovation (D/3) threatened the security of his position.

4. The SUPERINTENDENT, also, is a very significant member of the change team as: (1) content initiator, (2) process initiator, (3) mediator, and (4) squasher. This allows him to adopt any or all of the roles that Havelock views in his discussion of the change agent. Even though an entire school system may accept or reject innovations, the Superintendent is the focal point in the decision process regarding innovations. He must, however, respect the distance and hierarchy between himself and the system unless traditional ground rules are to be broken. The Quabbin Superintendent occupied many roles in the promotion implementation of change and innovation within his system. He did not, however, respect the position of the Principal.
The school was taken into his custody for him to make change. His contacts with L/C's and teachers always circumvented the Principal. He alienated the Principal within the system. His style of initiating, backing off, and conflicting with L/C's was inappropriate leadership behavior and damaged the success potential of the changes and innovations. The Superintendent's leadership behavior because it was inconstant created instances of leaderless vacuums.

5. Knowledge of needed change does not insure that it will be made. A major need is for tools and techniques by which educational personnel can increase the probability that improvement will occur. The analysis methodologies employed in this study all constitute tools or skills that can enhance the probability of survival for an innovation. Through a multi-faceted approach of analysis, the Quabbin change experience is assessed from numerous perspectives.

6. Change adoption should be regarded as a process of adaptation. Rarely can a system adjust to a change. Therefore, the change should adjust itself to the system. Change and innovation at Quabbin was foisted on to the system. It came to satisfy an external, financial need, and completely disregarded its own personal needs to survive the change and make it work.

7. Commitment to change is directly related to the perceived need for the change. The Quabbin system had not undergone a needs assessment to promote change to ameliorate
weaknesses. The Quabbin change carried with it misunderstanding, suspicion, and fear.

8. To effect changes within a system, it is necessary to introduce new attitudes before introducing new practices. The Quabbin change experience placed little focus and time on sensitizing the faculty and school leadership to promote human interaction, behavior modification, or human relations skills.

9. Any change within a system, whether that change is in the area of technology, personnel, program, or finance, is bound to have an effect on all other areas of the system. The Quabbin system failed to comprehend and deal with the effects of its changes. For example, the elimination of department heads and the establishment of L/C's frustrated the teachers who had depended on the support and leadership associated with the department head position. The L/C position was new and poorly defined.

10. Models are essential in the change process because they offer a chance to predict system processes and outputs. Viewed in another light, models do not function so much as to predict the future, but by examining them it is possible to construct or at least take into consideration alternative futures. The Quabbin system at no time set before the faculty a game plan, schematic, or full-flowed model mapping out its direction and content to be followed through change and innovation. The question was constantly raised: "Where are
we going ultimately?"

11. Participatory observation is an essential ingredient in the change process if for no other reason than to increase the awareness of pain in a system. In this way a chronic illness which may be deeply repressed in the system must be made acute for identification, diagnosis, and treatment. The Quabbin system never accepted participatory observation as a feedback mechanism. It chose, rather, to avoid diagnosis and prescription.

12. Professional unionism (Is this phrase a contradiction?) in education poses a real threat to change and innovation. Should contracts become too specific in terms of working conditions and scope of individual initiative, the great strength of the American teacher as a catalyst to better education will certainly be diminished, if not completely contained within the group mind and conscience. Change and innovation to a large extent are predicated on personal commitments and individual endeavors. The Quabbin Regional Teachers' Union in its fight to preserve what it felt to be "good" education nearly wiped out every innovation that placed a demand on teacher time. It offered no alternatives.

13. The fight on the part of teacher unions to keep poor, suspicious, or dangerous practices out of the schools results in higher teacher salaries, greater benefits, and increased release time from teaching, but in no way guarantee
better education for the student. This represents the effects of the QRTA action to combat innovation and change at Quabbin.

14. Educational consultants who are able to offer particular, needed expertise in either the change process or the innovation to be implemented should be allowed to negotiate a contract with the client system that will insure adequate or better support to the system in its change effort. Limited consultant participation may be unreasonable and damaging. The Quabbin system on more than one occasion dropped consultative help at a critical point. The Timber Doodle encounter session which ended positively was never followed up. Therefore, no positive reinforcement or follow up was possible to bring about resolution of differences.

Recommendations

There are many possible recommendations which could be generated from this study that it will be necessary to filter them to some interesting possibilities.

1. Descriptive analyses of on-going educational changes need to be undertaken to provide more information concerning the implementation and adoption-adaptation process. This study which is ex post facto does not meet that objective.

2. Educational managers need training to equip themselves with skills needed in facilitating the change process, and this would include, in particular, decision-making. The
Quabbin study points out clearly that its decision-making was not processed in a way to account for existing, intervening variables and other factors which impacted on the changes.

3. The Havelock process guide to change needs to be utilized for empirical designs to test its validity, strengths, and weaknesses. The Quabbin study did not do this.

4. The value of alternative futures in selecting long-range programs needs to be studied to assess the predictive validity of alternative futures, the value of the scope of studies in existence, and the influence on long-range planning. The Quabbin system was weak in planning for its tomorrow. In fact, it found it difficult to project beyond its present.

5. Alternative methods of disseminating information to potential adopters need to be tested, empirically. The ERIC (Education Resource and Information Centers) system has not had the effect it was supposed to; many classroom teachers and even school librarians do not know about it. The Quabbin study resounded with the cry from the faculty for information or studies about related innovations.

6. Studies on the change process must submit themselves to research designs that are, in fact, scientific. This would require that each innovation has tied to it a research approach that would avoid quasi-scientific methods. The need
to change is broadly accepted. It is how to manage change scientifically that is the real dilemma. The Quabbin change experience lacked any scientific base. The process was more subject to whim than planning.

7. The accuracy of force-field analysis in identifying forces of resistance or facilitation of change needs to be studied.

8. The applicability of the cross impact matrix as a tool to describe an environment or forecast a future state needs to be examined in future studies,

9. The applicability of contextual mapping, likewise, is in need of study to determine its relevance to facilitate the change process.

10. The applicability of transactional analysis would find itself in the same situation. Additional studies need to be carried on to determine the worth of this technique.

The Quabbin study does provide valuable information, analytical tools, and danger signs for those that wish to research change and change studies. There is nothing within this study that may be construed as a panacea for successful change must be under the control of mature, responsible, and self-directed leaders. This is also to say that participation in no way is a guarantee to successful change implementation.

To the promoter of change and innovation, this writer wishes to say: "Do your homework; know the parameters that
govern the environment and those in it (variables); and, if the set and setting are right, make change." As an over-riding concerns, the manager of change must keep his people task oriented while at the same time maintaining the group.
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APPENDIX A

TAPED INTERVIEW WITH THE QUABBIN REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
TAPED INTERVIEW WITH THE QUABBIN REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Superintendent: He has been the superintendent of Quabbin from the first year of operation. He has had a number of years in education with experience in teaching, curriculum coordination, and administration. He is committed to management by objectives and systems approach to control. Presently, he is the superintendent/principal of Quabbin Regional High School in Barre, Mass. From his initial contact with Quabbin to the present, he is committed to change and innovation. His selection as superintendent was contingent on his adherence to innovation.

BHC: I would like to have you discuss, for a moment, the nature of educational change as you understand it and have experienced it over the past few years? How do you think that change works in the educational environment and what are some of the snags?

Supt.: I guess my reactions have to be based on my experiences in change. Yes, change in education is a needed element, but more than this, it should be an attitude. This has not been a typical expectation within the establishment or organization of a public school system. What I am saying is that change, that is, systematic change has not been a
part of the management practices of public education. Perhaps
it is too demanding or sophisticated. Anyone who conceives
change to be important, therefore, is running into a hell of
a lot of trouble. Change means confrontation and confronta-
tion can develop into conflict if the appropriate control
and direction is lacking.

BHC: What, do you feel, was the process of change or
the sequence of steps used to bring innovations into Quabbin?

Supt: I think I would have to approach this question
by putting it into this frame of reference. I held the
notion that when I came into the Quabbin system it would work
toward an attitude of accepting change or at least gain the
habit of seeking alternatives. I conceived my greatest
responsibility to be making the Quabbin system prepared as
an environment to accept change. This, then, became my
personal goal, but I did not conceive any vivid or clear con-
cept of a change process. What I am trying to say is that I
felt that my behavior as superintendent and, particularly,
one who was predominately change-oriented, could influence
a total system if that system were mature enough, and I felt
this one was.

BHC: Could you elaborate a bit more on this conception
of change as you felt it to be?

Supt.: I had hoped, in the beginning, that we were going
to develop a way of functioning that was built on a searching
behavior on the part of the total staff. The school was
brand new and I did not know the nature of the staff. Still
I held an ideal built on the theoretical premise that we could have a Quabbin staff that would take on the responsibility of searching. This would be a professional group of educators that could get excited about alternatives without determining what those alternatives necessarily were.

It became very obvious to me that there was pressure for a change of another sort growing out of a financial crisis in the community. This crisis immediately threw us into decision making, which, from my position, called for structural changes whether we were ready for them or not. Hindsight tells me that we were not ready, but the crisis was real, and I have data to back this up.

What I promoted in an in-depth way was the notion that the organizational structure of the school system must change, and that this, in and or itself, would lend itself to a process which ultimately would gear the school toward considering alternatives. But there is also, what I suppose I would call a deep conviction about what education should be, and that is that education is process. What I intend to say is that education is a process as opposed to education as a body of knowledge or content that we should be presenting to kids.

BKC: I would still like to back up a little bit without getting into the depth of change itself and look at the process. In terms of process what definitive steps did you think were necessary? You talked in terms of faculty that would search. Is searching one step in itself? Is part of
the process a realization there was a felt need for change, a need that would create a searching for alternatives. What other steps would be included in this process to make it work? I'm not concerned with the content so much as I am with the steps in your process to bring about alternatives whether they be in the domain of behavioral changes or procedural.

Supt.: I guess uppermost in my mind was the conviction that there had to be a nucleus of leadership which I conceived to be the change agents or a change agency. This, in what I was trying to promote and what ended up as being part of the now nasty concept of differentiated staffing was really a focus and a belief in a core leadership in the school that was going to become, hopefully, committed to the functions of a change agency.

BKC: Would you agree that changes were implemented before the change agency was mature enough to handle it? Wouldn't there have to be some orientation time to prepare this group for this particular objective?

Supt.: Well, in theory the group itself through self-analysis could determine what its own weaknesses were in leadership and, as you can recall, part of the approach, perhaps the main thrust of the federal project was in-service leadership training. Basically the essence of it would be the development of a capable, competent, sophisticated group of leaders after three years of training, primarily in service training which they would initiate and develop.
BHC: I think it's important to point out that the leadership itself never had that opportunity to get the background it needed to really function as the change agency you had hoped it would be. The question I would ask, then, who or what would direct changes or innovations at Quabbin while the leadership prepared itself to gain the training necessary to manage change? Seldom does change initiate itself. At least in this situation there appeared to be an implementation phase.

Supt.: Well, I guess this is where I had to resort to what I would call an eclectic approach. I didn't conceive myself to be detailing a step-up-step strategy or approach. I really conceived that given a wide-open, give-and-take communication's process within this "leadership," if we would have enough intelligence and enough interaction within itself so that it would find and determine those steps. So, I guess what I'm saying is that the main strategy was to promote wide open communications and stimulate interactions amongst the leaders themselves.

BHC: You mentioned the need for a change agency and its style of operating. I think it might be interesting to have you discuss what you consider to be your style as a change agent within the Quabbin system. It would be fair to consider you as a change agent?

Supt.: Yes, this is a image that I imposed upon myself, a role that I accepted as exciting and self-fulfilling. But I guess I conceived of myself to be a person who would also
be a catalyst for provoking thought about change. I would assume the responsibility of generating attention to a great number of alternative ideas and approaches within the framework of learning, how we should go about learning, and the priorities for learning within our institution. I guess, I know this generates also, a level of frustration. To ask people to open up their minds and react to any number of ideas or articles that I passed on, and there was a considerable amount of it. Lot of confidence in people. But it also suggested that what we're now doing is so damned inadequate. Through this approach I suggest that a level of frustration was developed in people who were asked to be reactors to a variety of ideas. A logical consequence, which I think I'm sensitive to, is that the impression was created that people didn't have ideas of their own. They were confronted so often with my ideas and reactions to them that it flooded their minds and buried ideas, creativity and imagination that they themselves wanted to develop and should have had the opportunity to do so.

**BHC:** Do you think that this was a general feeling?

**Supt.:** Yes, sure. If I can put myself in the position of the staff, and I have been in that position, for example, my relationship with the state department causes many things to be imposed upon me. I can well understand what happens to one's attitude especially if the imposed idea fall short in terms of priority.

**BHC:** How well did you understand the internal dynamics
of the Quabbin system before undertaking steps to change and innovate? By internal dynamics, I'm speaking about the kind of individuals that comprised the system. This would call for an understanding of personal expectations of the leadership and of the faculty within the system?

Supt.: I would have to admit that I didn't have any basis or frame of reference to really understand internal dynamics of the staff. I really operated from a theoretical base of what education ought to be. There was a void of comprehension, and I think part of this was due to the lack of time. I'm not making excuses. I think this is a problem for any institution. The conflict between a theoretical concept of where we ought to be and where we can be within an educational system in terms of the potential we've got working for us in light of the aspirations, personal expectations and professional concerns of the people involved, can create a complex problem. This is a constant problem! But I think in Quabbin's situation I wasn't in a position to be deeply involved with the school system and the personnel. I didn't hire them, I didn't know them. I was practically the last member of the staff to come into the school system. This was a couple of months before it was operational.

BHC: Shouldn't that have been reason perhaps, for you to have taken the initiative to know the staff, and the environment especially with what you had in mind for the system? I wonder if that should have been one of the initial steps? You implied that you knew where we were, where
education should be, and where we wanted to go. Also, I
think you have implied that where you wanted to go would be
so educationally sound that one could not dispute it.

Supt.: Yes, I think if we go back, and this is diffi-
cult to do, what I hung my hat on was a set of principles
related to what educational behavior ought to be. I think
I really sensed a spirit of enthusiasm within the staff,
even though I didn't know them. I came into a system where
I believed the youthful nature of the staff, one captured
from "all over New England," would be high on excitement
about a better level of education for the community than it
had before. I assumed, and I don't know if this is incorrect,
that we had a staff that was ready and willing to engage in
alternative thinking and was ready to accept change and work
with it. However, in no way did I assume that I really
understood the individuals within the system.

BHC: Was there a needs analysis to prompt the changes
and innovations that came? Also, were there other factors
to be considered which prompted change or problems to be
solved? You mentioned one definite situation which was a
financial one.

Supt.: Yes, a needs analysis, which was basically a
personal one, was documented. You know what we went through.
I managed the process, and it was probably more a solo flight
than it was any school-wide needs analysis. Yet, it was
there and it was documented as part of the federal project
proposal and it's been documented in the writings I've
generated. It was the basis for shooting at particular targets. Our main problem centered on expenditures which were too heavy for the taxpayer to bear.

BHC: The intent of the federal project which dealt primarily with differentiated staffing was to offer the system an alternative structure, hopefully, to cut costs? Do you recall how much money was involved?

Supt.: Yes, it was to initiate a differentiated staffing pattern. In terms of funding, I can't recall the exact amount. It was a three-year training program for twelve or thirteen leadership individuals which involved a couple hundred thousand dollars, I guess.

BHC: Would there have been training for staff as well to bring this thing along throughout all phases of the project?

Supt.: Definitely. But the broader aspects of change, and I don't know if you're getting into this later on, but some of the structural changes that did last were teacher aides, changes in the structure of our instructional media center, the experiment with the interns didn't materialize, but it all revolved around a core-idea that the process of learning could be engineered in a more educationally sound way. Also, it would exist in a financial realm which would be attractive to the community.

BHC: Initially how confident were you in undertaking this venture in innovation and change?

Supt.: I think I was more enthusiastic than confident.
I don't want to labor on semantics because I think my approach, style and belief in alternatives included the possibility that some of the stuff that we were going to do could fall flat on its face. This would imply that there would be other alternatives that we would have to pursue. The whole concept of alternative thinking in my opinion was an important part of my approach.

BHC: Could you give me a list which you consider to be significant changes that were promoted. Could you also relate what problem each change would tend to ameliorate? In the case of differentiated staffing, which governed numerous changes, this was basically intended to meet the financial problem. Am I correct in stating this?

Supt: Yes. I think there are successful changes that tend not to be recognized and yet are accepted. I really think there was and is a very strong spirit of inquiry amongst our staff. Some of the things I promoted in the very beginning were in-service activities purely for exploratory ends. We didn't put a binder on anyone except create a spirit of looking at the whole series of in-service activities that went on. I think we were very successful in the beginning, and I'm raising questions now as to how lasting it was.

We were especially successful in generating attention to behaviorally stated objectives which didn't bind a person's behavior by demand. It was an invitation to organize the curriculum to focus upon outcomes for kids. This was the
main focus that I was trying to promote. Let’s look at what kids are supposed to get out of education! I think that this innovation caught on in a large segment of the school program, and it was innovative in a sense, it was less threatening than some of the real "bombs" that came through the structural dis-organization and restructuring process that came later. But it was, in my opinion, based upon the notion that there was a readiness to organize structural patterns differently. Staffing patterns could be organized differently if we paid heed to the underlying base which demanded that we look at objectives of kids. In approach and theory, we wouldn’t need departments if we understood the concepts, skills and attitudes that kids were working on.

I felt it would be natural to recognize that inter-disciplinary approaches were obviously needed. Speaking of that kind of feeling, and I guess this is basically the core idea, inter-disciplinary approaches to organizing and dealing with learning hasn’t been abandoned as a desirable practice within Quabbin. As a matter of fact there is all kinds of evidence that department heads are anxious and eager to work on an inter-disciplinary approach.

BHC: Would you comment on some of the structural changes that took place? You’ve already alluded to this in discussing behavioral objectives as a self-directive means which might do away with a departmental structure and allow larger units to be organized.

Supt.: Well, this evolved out of a theory of learning.
The concept of smaller units was designed to give us organizational leadership units within the school that were broad. We ended up with 12 or 13 ex-departments boiled down to five units with the idea that they would strive toward an interdisciplinary approach. Humanities was a major theme area, career skills another, math and science another, the health and physical education being another and so on. Underlying all of this was also another threatening condition. This was a personal concern I had, and I haven't shared it publicly, but I felt that the future of Quabbin's health as an educational institution depended upon maintaining high-powered leadership. This in fact was accomplished. I think that most of the good leadership within the Quabbin system is still there.

This fact was accomplished by promoting leadership in the name of learning co-ordinators within this new structure. I assumed also that this was going to be basically leadership that developed from within the system. We weren't going to destroy the potential of the people within the system, rather we were going to put it into a new structure.

BHC: Salaries that went along with these new positions were designed to keep these people?

Supt.: Yes, salaries were set to compete favorably with the high aspirations of the leadership. At that time, I believe the records would show that there was a move by the staff to look outside of Quabbin for employment because we felt an economic crisis and there was a strong possibility
that people were going to move, people with capability. That's why I felt that we would lose what I conceived to be the source of our leadership within the system.

BHC: Do you think that maybe too much emphasis was placed on retaining Quabbin core leadership as opposed to let's say emphasis on keeping staff?

Supt.: Not in my opinion. I think the mistake was made in combining the focus upon attracting or keeping the leadership and at the same time modifying drastically expectations for them. Let me amplify that because I think personally what really happened to sour the "general" group of teachers against leadership was more the destruction of the typical, traditional expectation for that leader. The relationship within the group was changes dramatically. I don't think it was necessarily the elevation for the financial rewards for the leadership. It was the destruction of human relationships. The confidence of the staff in the leadership was destroyed because there were dramatic changes in all role expectations. As some of them so candidly stated, they didn't respect a leader that was not trained or didn't have background in their subject field. This didn't happen, did it, in P.Ed? It didn't happen in some other areas were there wasn't that dramatic a change.

BHC: Do you feel that professionals should be obliged to commit themselves to educational change?

Supt.: Yes. I think this is part of my basic premise as to what a professional person is and perhaps it's a
distinction between the professional and non-professional. The whole concept of being self-directive, to me implies a habit of initiative, a habit of aggressive inquiry into problem-solving and it involves suspending judgment at times. This is a whole way of life to me. This constitutes a professional attitude. I guess what I'm saying is like the old cliche: you accept change as a desirable and necessary way of life.

BHC: I'd like to have you discuss some of the snags that you were encountered in trying to implement change and innovation.

Supt.: Well, there were to me several very, very significant snags and without spending too much time going back over it, I'll try to bubble these into some order of priority. To me the biggest snag was a community resistance from those people who were in a position to agitate against change, in particular, one member of the school committee. I've said publicly and openly that the greatest mistake I made was to assume that a school committee could deal in indepth with problems within the system, particularly when it got into the organization structure aspect or the educational process itself. I assumed that the school committee not only wanted to but also could devote the time and had the insight that was necessary to back up change.

I think that the nature of the school committee, and its responsibilities to education must include an element of pure blind faith and acceptance of the administration.
Yet, I was operating on another premise that they somehow had to get below the surface and understand problems and issues. This caused a great deal of frustration. But the biggest obstacle, in my opinion, was the reality that there were people that were against change without even trying to understand what was behind it. The very fact that it was a change irritated them. There was also an antagonism toward the idea of a high-paid leadership.

BHC: I wonder if the fact that the committee itself was subject to change caused much of the frustration?

Supt.: Well, yes, and I think the two fed on each other. I think the time involved, the frustration of dealing with innovation in education prompted some of them to back off for various reasons. Then they were hit not only with natural negotiations, but also complicated negotiations which got wound up in a struggle against change which was viewed as a conflict. So, I believe, as I said that these things fed on each other, and the promotion of change moved some school committee members away from their prime responsibility and thrust them into frustration. For lay people, this became a nightmare.

BHC: Were there other snags that should be discussed?

Supt.: Yes. I guess it that would have to be in the area of communications, lines of communications, styles of communications, and the demands that changes of a magnitude that we undertook create. You either have to use an approach where you are convinced that you can sell people on change
or you have to use the approach, which I thought I was using, that much of the change itself would come as a result of the people involved making decisions all the way along. This is not a selling job, but a promotion job which makes sure that people are involved in decision-making.

Also, I would like to deal with a rather deep concern which is the problem in education of creating false expectations for various positions. I feel that the expectations of the superintendent in the Quabbin system from the staff was quite different than the expectation, I had for myself. I think that the general staff, and particularly the personnel within the teachers' association who had a concept of what the superintendent should be doing, was in contradiction with what I expected of myself and in terms of my behavior. Fundamentally, I'm saying that I think that there was an old traditional expectation of the superintendent to be a wise decision maker and to pass those decisions on with a great deal of finality. I believe that my mode of operation was one of assuming that I didn't have the wisdom. I was a catalyst to generate thought, and I wasn't a person who was making final decisions, nor did I feel that I had the ability to translate those decisions into a plan of action.

BHC: I wonder if you believe that the faculty perceived you as being that way?

Supt.: No. In hindsight I don't think they did. As I perceive my behavior now, what I thought was an aggressive, thought provoking behavior came through as, perhaps, an
aggressive, demanding, imposing kind of behavior. I guess, thought imposing, rather than thought provoking. If those two words describe the distinction, I think I probably come across as being one way. I find it difficult for me in conferences and discussions to gain what I hope is dialogue. I really think that I listen, that I react to other people's ideas. I also think that I am impulsively aggressive in tangling up those ideas with my own. I suspect that people that haven't worked with me long enough and therefore, see a "traditional aura" of power which would tend to subordinate their ideas.

I conceive to be a promoter of real openness. Perhaps, it's not really acceptable as a behavior for a superintendent, yet, I think there was a nucleus of people that understood that this was where the whole concept of trust lay. Communications do not exist without trust. If for any reason there is a distrust of the leadership, communications are not going to exist, and I think this developed. That it was my fault, our fault, the fault of something beyond us, I don't think there's any answer, except that it happened.

BHC: Was there any point in the change experience, where any particular innovation should have been stopped? I guess what I'm saying is did you feel you were in a position to stop, to shift gears or to back up? Were the innovations so inbedded that it was impossible to seek other alternative?

Supt.: This is a difficult question for me because I
think that I was part of a decision to abandon the whole experiment.

BHC: At what point?

Supt.: At the point when we had a three year commitment to follow through with the new leadership structure.

BHC: Would you elaborate on this?

Supt.: I'm thinking of two main thrusts that got us embroiled in conflict, and the great deal of questioning and reexamination that the leadership structure got into concerning itself and the units. Going from departmental structure to the units and the change in the leadership into learning coordinators, was too much for the faculty to bear. It had what I have called a rather traditional expectation of the leadership. Then there was the dramatic change in expectation within the school system that teachers would function in the role of guidance counselors. These became conflict areas, as you well know, because the leadership expectation for guidance all of a sudden became paramount. I could speculate what would have happened if we had kept the leadership, learning coordinators, away from guidance. If we had retained a guidance unit, would learning coordinators and the unit concept still be alive today? This was the most bitter conflict area to be dealt with as far as teachers were concerned because they saw themselves as counselors.

BHC: What you're saying is if we had backed off on the innovation of teacher/counselor there is a possibility
that many of the other changes and innovations might have survived?

Supt.: Yes. I think, and this is Monday morning quarter back, if I had been in a position to change this situation in order to keep the others, I would have.

BHC: How would you have handled the situation?

Supt.: I would have promoted from the beginning, if I had been a decision-maker, a different structure for guidance in the beginning. I was personally convinced that teacher involvement in guidance was critical, but the style of involvement I would have promoted would have been different than the one that evolved.

BHC: Who did promote the teacher/counselor concept?

Supt.: It came out of the decision of the high school principal, and as I understand it, the interaction he had with the learning coordinators at an early stage. I think I personally favored LC's involvement in guidance. Their involvement as far as I was concerned was important. They were decision-makers and should help to decide how they would become involved in a guidance leadership role. I though there were all kinds of options as to involvement of teachers. As a matter of fact, I don't know if you've ever seen it, but I generated a paper with some of the alternatives which were quite different than what actually took place.

BHC: Why weren't the alternatives considered?

Supt.: I think that this goes back to one of the characteristics of the relationship between the principal
and superintendent and the staff. I didn't impose my thoughts and they weren't accepted by the principal.

BHC: What you are saying very clearly is that you looked at the teacher/counselor concept as one which was undermining many of the other innovations. Do you feel that you had an obligation as chief administrator within the system to stop what was going on?

Supt.: I didn't feel that I had the alternative at that stage because we had a structure and expectations for the leadership. We did have to follow through for the year. We didn't have the alternative of abruptly cutting the teacher out without carrying some kind of involvement of substitute/alternative to provide guidance services to kids. I did impose a strategy for reexamining the whole guidance process. I guess this did come out of management by objectives. I set up a process to evaluate and come up with an alternative. To me it's rather vivid that I did impose such a restriction on the alternatives for the next year. One of them was that it had to be accepted by the teachers; it had to be a viable alternative. Yet, we went through a very frustrating process to arrive at an agreeable decision.

BHC: That was after the conflict had gone into its late stages wouldn't you say? It must have been disheartening to watch those things be destroyed that you had promoted because of something which you had little faith in i.e., the teacher/counselor role.

Supt.: I think the point I would like to make is what
we were caught up in was that guidance was so much an integral part of the entire structure. Much of the emphasis on re-examining the curriculum was to promote a "guidance-based curriculum". You couldn't take that one element out without influencing the whole in some way.

BHC: Would you discuss the type of management that you are interested in promoting within your system?

Supt.: I am committed to scientific management in the sense that I really believe that educational planning and decision-making ought to be based upon an adequate system, a conscious system of management. I guess that is the work I am searching for. Those who are making decisions in education ought to be conscious of a decision-making system. I often said that flying by the seat of your pants is all right as long as you've got fine weather and you can see where you are, but it seems to me that as far as change is concerned, and I guess this is probably one of the problems we ran into, we found we had no system that we were conscious of.

BHC: What would you say are some aspects built into your scientific management system? I believe that PPBS was one component.

Supt.: These are all concepts that had the reputation of coming out of industry. They are related to a very definite set of objectives, a process of evaluation and feedback which is constantly and consciously related to one another. As I saw it, it was a rather sophisticated process of making
decisions and establishing objectives.

BHC: At this point I would like to set an important question before you. What did you perceive the role of the principal to be in the change process?

Supt.: My chief expectation of the principal would be that he really understand the decision-making process, and the way in which you can involve people in the decision-making process. He should be a facilitator of sound decisions, with the understanding that there are levels of decisions that have to be made. I would conceive of him as educator in that he would have the possible vision within the school system as to what education ought to be. To me he is an educator, seen not in the typical sense, but a facilitator within the system itself, a facilitator who utilizes resources, human resources. I've often used the term "coordinator", as opposed to the concept of manager. In education I don't like the word manager as much as I do coordinator or facilitator. I guess this has to go back to another concept I have of the professional as a self-directing, role-oriented person. The principal becomes the person who helps clarify goals and spends most of his time in this kind of a climate "bugging" people, if you will, to clarify their goals and to fit these goals into the institution's. So he's a goal-clarifier, a person that coordinates the sub-system within the whole system. You might use him as a harmonizer.

BHC: Did your principal function this way?

Supt: I think this is where a major conflict of
expectation existed. I don't think that the principal could conceive this to be his role. This is hard to deal with because I think the main difference in our philosophy, or expectations, came within the category of delegating responsibility or delegating decision-making. I think I'm too idealistic in my concept of decision-making as a democratic process. Words are difficult to use here, but the whole concept of involvement, of making decisions at a point close to the arena of where those decisions have to be carried out is the best. The principal felt an inherent pressures to be responsible for the decisions other people would make and this was difficult to accept this kind of responsibility.

Getting the whole system to assume a democratic participation in decision-making, generated some heated debates between us. There was a conflict between our two positions. I've often asked myself, and yet we haven't had a chance to discuss it openly, whether or not what we promoted as LC, leadership participating in the decision-making process, was worth it. Do people really want to get involved? What kind of involvement do they feel comfortable with. It seemed that LC's had as much difficulty as the principal in believing in a democratic type management. The school principal didn't like to delegate responsibility or decision-making. To him he abandoned a responsibility that people wanted him to assume. Let's not fool ourselves, alternative thinking and shared decision making are frustrating. Tell me what you want me to do and I'll be satisfied to do it! That's
the kind of expectation most have.

BHC: Do you feel that there might have been a conflict not only between your personal philosophy and style and that of the principal, but also a conflict between the principal and the other leadership, the LC's. You were coordinating both. Both groups were to assume a certain amount of leadership in terms of trying to diffuse information and help prompt change. I thought that in many ways the LC's with the principal would be an extension of you as the change agent in the system.

Supt.: I conceived us to be a team operation. I guess I must confess that I was out of phase with the very notion that the superintendent could be an operational member of the team with his ideas being no more potent than others. The traditional structure seems to work against that. I think this is the kind of thing I'm talking about in terms of the principalship and the expectation that the principal is suppose to be more potent with his ideas. He's suppose to have, hopefully, a deeper insight into a lot of things. What I'm saying is that the style that I conceived demanded a change of expectation of staff as well as all the people involved.

The expectation of staff of the principalship and of the LC's, just dealing with feelings now, was one of the key things that got in the way. You know I think of the experiences we had together. Ten people could sit down together, and we could talk about and become intensely
involved in the theoretical expectations, but then you've got a whole staff to work with that hasn't had that kind of experience. They lost sight of what we conceived ourselves to be. I don't know if this is true or false, but I got the feeling that the staff conceived there was a kind of a council here that was a closed shop. I sense there was quite a bit of resentment about that. What's the difference if a group of 8 or 10, and the principal himself made decisions. All you've got is the old principalship concept, but now it's a group.

I didn't conceive that the decision-making process itself could really materialize without the principalship being changed, and the behavior of the person involved in the principalship in my opinion should be one who is willing to delegate a great amount of the decision-making.

BBC: Did you think at some point, perhaps even initially, about changing position of principal or of eliminating it?

Supt.: My real concern did not focus on titles but on job specifications that would provide a particular kind of atmosphere. The time spent in defining and coordinating roles, and this a very important part of differentiated staffing, was inadequate and unreal. The behavior of those involved, including the principal, should have been quite different. Does this happen automatically when the role changes on paper? This is a matter of individual, behavioral
flexibility.

BHC: Do you feel that a conflict might have evolved between the principal and the superintendent over the kinds of innovations that were tried? Phrased another way do you think the principal approved of all of the innovations that fell under the broad umbrella of differentiated staffing?

Supt.: I know that if the positions of the superintendent and principal had been reversed things would have been different. It's important that I say it this way because I think that the principal had a very traditional respect for the decision-making of the superintendent as one who makes ultimate decisions with him respecting them and not challenging them or telling the superintendent that he's out of his cotton-picking mind. This, I think, has to be understood because I believe that if principal had been superintendent the real issue with guidance could have been avoided. On the other hand, if we would have kept the department head structure as it was I think probably the principal could have pulled off the guidance movement because there would have been the staff confidence in the department head leadership. The LC structure and its demand for shared-decision making was certainly the factor that threatened the principal. Actually, the principalship was seen initially as one other LC position.

BHC: The next question I knew has been raised before you before. Was there a master model toward which the system
was working?

Supt.: Yes. As a matter of fact I think the model had been drawn. I don't think people recognized it. It was a process model; a process model that involved facing learning through a careful analysis of the needs of our students. The needs would then be generated into a set of objectives. From here we would have to develop a system for implementing that kind of system which is an on-going, process model. It also implies a whole set of processes that are needs-assessment oriented.

This is my biggest criticism in education, including Quabbin. We don't base our curriculum upon careful assessment of the needs of our kids. We work only in a general sense, not a specific one. This general sense is based on content. It's a needs assessment, but the kind that says kids need basics. You miss getting into the basic needs of our kids. We haven't had this process and I'm not sure that education is ready to deal with it. That was the ultimate concept that I had. It implied that professionals had full-time commitments, not 180 days of work. It also involved, and I tried to promote it, the idea that at least 1/3 of our staff was going to be working all summer.

This was more than the idea that where teachers were trained, arrived, taught, and, therefore, all they had to do now was that thing for which they were trained. I don't think this is a fair criticism of our teachers. They don't know how to assess the needs of kids. If they were sitting
here, I know many teachers would take violent issue with this. I'm not saying they don't know kids. Rather, they don't understand the process of assessing those needs and somehow generating them into a helping, developmental curriculum: This is a man-size task.

BHC: You did spend considerable time and effort in diffusing much information. This could be called seeding. Would you discuss your intent to the faculty in promoting school-wide involvement in this way? I know that it was not always well-received.

Supt.: There is a false concept amongst educators related to a self-expectation of maturity. Teachers have been traditionally beyond question as far as authority. We, therefore, imposed upon ourselves an assumption that a teacher is all-wise. He possesses great wisdom. So, when you start saying to a corps of teachers, I suppose any professional group, that you're not all-wise and that there is a heck of a lot you have got to learn, that there are better methods available to us, it implies something many teachers would rather not hear. I can't help but say that I impose this questioning upon myself as well as others. I know that the answers are not all in yet as far as the best way to deal with organizing instruction or deal with motivation for learning. I had hoped to open up good alternative thinking by sharing ideas. As it turned out, only a few saw any value in this move, others were insulted or felt I was wasting tax dollars.
BHC: Had you made plans to involve other groups in the change process? I'm thinking about the community, the student body, and faculty. On the other hand, did you feel that you did have additional involvement from one or all of the other interest groups?

Supt.: The desire was there. The intent was certainly to have involvement. I wanted a style of involvement that was real all the way along. I felt that good involvement was missing. I think involvement of faculty, to begin with, was missing. I still think it's missing. Attempts were made on a number of occasions to get faculty and community involvement. Somehow, their style of involvement was weak.

BHC: You made a move to involve faculty with other innovations in the early stages with Monday and Wednesday afternoon sessions. How were they received?

Supt.: They were a royal flop, but the thing that was, perhaps, even more disappointing was the needs assessment which involved the faculty. We were at the point of gathering consensus about innovations, and to my disappointment, no one followed through with that as a basis to improve the climate.

BHC: You felt that you had brought the faculty to a point where they were involved in taking a needs analysis of the system whether they knew it or not. These being real needs, you were in essence inviting a different kind of change to come in to help the situation?

Supt.: Sure!
BHC: To what extent could the faculty influence change?
Supt.: They would not necessarily determine the kind or the priority. This is what I felt would be a problem, and yet it was beyond my control. I guess it is a criticism of the principalship, again. One activity that was most vivid to me was the whole day of released time for the staff. I think it was February 13, 1971, and the whole purpose was to gain a grass-roots approach to generating and understanding the concerns of the staff. I've got all the records. The concerns of the staff were to be handled by a task force to the staff who planned the program and generated a list of concerns. These were needs. It was, in fact, a needs assessment, and they put them into priority. Yet, what happened? Maybe things did happen, but I don't think they were conscious of it. Things were merely discussed and left up in the air. Where was the leadership? Was I supposed to act on the needs by myself? Here I question the maturity of the leadership which would include the principal and the LC's.

BHC: Do you think too much was tried too soon?
Supt.: Yes. I've heard it before. The question whether too much was tried too soon is a very difficult one for me to deal with. Part of the problem that I face is if we didn't have the financial crisis, what kind of strategy would we have used? Would we have behaved differently? Would I as superintendent have said, "well we've got ten years to make some changes, so we will promote a strategy where there aren't any dramatic changes in structure"?
I don't believe I would have. I think that it was probably an insensitivity on my part, an ignorance on my part, as to how to cope with many of the variables involved. But I think the whole process of change itself as far as what I was promoting implied some dramatic changes.

We get back to this question of organizational versus behavioral changes. I just conceived that organizational change had to be rather dramatic. How else could you lean toward a change in leadership structure other than the way we did it. It had to be abrupt. Yet, if we could have had more control over some of the need, we might have made it. I think this is where we fell flat on our faces. We were unable to follow through with some of the services that were needed by the staff and services that were needed by the leadership.

BHC: When you talk about services are you referring to training?

Supt.: Right!

BHC: Was there a wholesale lack of understanding of change process at Quabbin?

Supt.: Definitely. This was one of our primary weaknesses. We were very unsophisticated, very unscholarly and unknowledgeable about change process, as such, and therefore, I think there was a tendency for many people to construe change to be bad—to be threatening. One of the most agitating and most needling comments that I received was: "What proof do you have that what your promoting is
better than the old?" That's a harassing kind of comment because you don't have any proof, and you don't know how good or bad the old was in the first place. So, I have learned that one characteristic of change, wherever it is, is that it carries with it human resistance.

BHC: Don't you think it's also important to build change like decision-making on evaluation.

Supt.: No question about it. Of all the areas in education to deal with, evaluation is the most difficult because it is the most comprehensive.

BHC: Would you say that there was a rather apparent contradiction between the things you verbalized and your actions? I am thinking specifically of things that you had said when you first came to Quabbin. For example, teachers are worth $15,000 or $20,000 a year, and teachers need to be given adequate time to do the thing they are best at—teaching. Yet, it was a general feeling that, if anything, teachers and their security were being threatened, never mind teaching time.

Supt.: Yes. I think if you analyze my behavior that's true of it with regards to teachers. I can understand why this feeling existed. I said that we could run our school system with ten less teachers under differentiated staffing with high powered leadership and a different concept of the teacher and teaching. I think this concern for another concept of teacher involvement might have lead to the general
impression that the teaching profession per se, was not all that hot. I did note some reactions to my suggestion that some teachers might get $8,000 a year while others could earn as much as the superintendent. I was interested in teachers as people. I don't think that I ever conveyed contempt or lack of respect for them.

BHC: Initially, you came across as being a very nice individual. You had a high regard for the human being and his rights. This you verbalized and displayed at initial meetings. Yet, the actions you had to take as superintendent lead many of the faculty members to believe that you didn't mean what you had said. One of the most discussed issues was with negotiations and feedback from the teachers' negotiating team that the superintendent was negotiating for the school committee in such a manner that he wasn't willing to give the faculty a fair shake. Also, they felt that you were to blame for the teacher cuts.

Supt.: I would contend that this was a translated image, not an image from personal interaction with me.

BHC: Your personal, interaction image was positive, and you are right when you say translated image. You were the distant person from on the hill. Here, the thought, was a man you could meet with and have an earthy conversation, and, yet, it seemed that when you acted as superintendent your behavior was far less than humane.

Supt.: Are you speaking particularly about my image as a negotiator for the school committee?
BHC: Yes.

Supt.: That was, I think, an extremely grave error. I don't know if I had an alternative at the time. I conceived of myself as a resource person for both sides, but it ended up that I was the aggressive person at the negotiations table. This happened for two reasons: first part of the crises in negotiations focused upon some of the promotions that I made. I had to be the defender of this point of view since I had initiated. Along with this I was also responsible for the hard-nose approach to find ways to curb spending.

BHC: Do you feel that when any administrator puts himself in the position at the table he's putting himself in a tough situation?

Supt.: Yes, he might as well abandon other leadership kinds of expectation for himself because you cannot divorce the two. We know that negotiations are here to stay.

BHC: Would you say the day will come when the school committee will ask the superintendent to get involved in a different way in negotiations?

Supt.: This must happen, otherwise, the position becomes compromised. I think the superintendent is clearly a member of the management team, and his primary responsibility is toward sound advice to the school committee. But, he isn't, in my opinion, and shouldn't be, responsible for that interaction called negotiations. He is not the negotiator.

BHC: Do you really feel that you might have been a victim of circumstance or just sucked into that thing without
really comprehending what the devil it was going to do?

Supt.: Yes. I think I lacked wisdom, experience. It was a mistake on my part because I think I was in a position to back off. I got sucked in, in a sense. There was a beginning approach to negotiations which was very friendly and quite informal which encouraged the superintendent to be a part. In those early days we would sit down and it was more professional negotiations than hard-nose bargaining. Then we got into the collective bargaining.

BHC: I'd like to look at the change process, again. Was there a feedback mechanism built into it. Perhaps, a feedback mechanism that could, in essence, be criticism or maybe some minor form of evaluation.

Supt.: I think there was a feedback mechanism, but it wasn't adequate. I think there was a great deal of openness within the realm of the LC group. You as a participant observer offered much feedback. This open behavior was not welcomed by the principal. I allowed it to happen with the hopes that real needs would be met. It was this openness that brought on the self-destruction of the LC's and the change in the guidance structure. Even the total faculty had in-put.

BHC: If you had eliminated those that would be considered as dissident within the LC structure, do you think it might have proved advantageous?

Supt.: No, because it would have destroyed a basic premise of mine in the beginning that worthwhile change, has
to be what the people involved want and can live with. I think we have to face the reality that there were people who were against what was happening for various reasons, and it wasn't because they wanted to do their own thing.

My conclusion is that for a variety of reasons the input from the LC really generated the change. I believe that if the LC's at the final crisis when they had to decide to go on, or destroy, that if they had said we will go on, we would be still be pulling today. I don't think that the School Committee's agitation to return to the old would have destroyed us. So what I'm saying from my perception is that it wasn't a question of self-destruction, rather, it was a question of taking another alternative for survival.

BHC: Why wasn't it essential to deal with alternatives at an earlier date and not at a point when all hell is blowing loose? We're talking now about a change process that lasted from 1969 through 1972. With all this behind us Quabbin is still very much in a change attitude.

Supt.: This question of alternatives is one of those critical kinds of questions. I conceived the generation of alternatives to come from within the group.

BHC: This would be what is called conflict management.

Supt.: That's a new term that I've not heard of before, so you'll have to describe it.

BHC: This is a process or a behavior that can be injected into the system the moment it finds itself in conflict, and it moves the system immediately to begin to generate
alternatives.

Supt.: OK. Now I'm with you. The question remains, though, who is sensitive enough to know when intense conflict exists to the point where alternatives should be pursued? Should it have been the LC's, the Superintendent or some kind of a nerve center? Undoubtedly, a more precise system of participant observer would have been in order if the principal, in particular, could have accepted this. I guess one of the expectations of the LC's might have been that the superintendent was going to make that kind of a decision. I know there wasn't wholesale agreement and may have been a fact that led you to believe that maybe things could go as they are.

Here is where we would get into my expectations. If there had to be one person that would suggest alternatives that would be the principal, not the superintendent. Yet, maybe the LC's conceived that to be the role of the superintendent, and I can see why because I threw myself into interaction with them in intense dialogue and analysis. This should have led to rather definitive conclusions as to whether we change direction, or whether we continue. It hurts to note that quite often the principal divorced himself from these sessions. I guess in hindsight I conceived that the principal had the key role in that he in theory, should have been more sensitive than the superintendent to the time to jump to an alternative.

SME: And, yet, in respect to him, he probably agreed...
with the LC's that it was the superintendent's role. It probably should have been the superintendent's responsibility because it was felt that he mothered the innovation.

I wonder if you initially had too much faith in the people you were dealing with. Maybe you should have had, perhaps, less faith and more muscle if the group could not react maturely.

Supt.: Was it a question of too much faith or whether blind faith? I ask myself this question all the time because I accept in theory the premise of high self-initiative and high self-direction. I wanted our people to have an analytical way of behavior because this is essential for people in leadership.

BHC: Please comment for a moment on feedback as information for decision making. For instance how, when, where and by whom was evaluation to take place concerning the innovations?

Supt.: I think on my behalf there was a very strong thrust in this direction. Part of the strategy was to have a carefully designed evaluation system, but as far as carrying out the evaluation, I think you know we lacked any thorough system of follow through. I think the main reason was that no one felt adequate or competent in the process of evaluation.

BHC: I would tend to say that some type of evaluation was going on which was more gut feeling than data collecting.

Supt.: Yes. As far as I'm concerned evaluation includes
what I would call a consensus gathering, and I think we did quite a bit of this.

BHC: This is true when one considers the number of meetings that were scheduled to do just this. I wonder if your approach with its deep commitment to faith in people and the humanistic concerns that are apparent is dangerous for one who hopes to initiate changes and innovations?

Supt.: My honest opinion is that humanism in education is the only thing that will help us to survive and grow. It may be one effective way to cope with what is a developing threat, and I hope it's just temporary, to individuality which has its implication as far as innovation is concerned. Specifically, the pressure from teachers' unions may cripple innovation and change if all changes have to be acceptable to the collective bargaining position of the union. It's difficult for me to get into this specifically, but I think there are pressures, directed at any individual who strives to change the "status quo." The very essence of creativity and innovation means that you're stepping out of a mold which is a part of the common behavior.

It seems to me that one of the characteristics of a real professional is whether he is behaving as a part of the collective mind or whether he is behaving the way his mind and conscience dictate. The professional of today must deal with this problem. No matter how you look at it, the administrator has all that he can do to cope with the muscle that unionism is exerting on the innovative practices of the
school. Negotiations today is a different game than it was five years ago. The game, the rules, and even the ball park have changed.

BHC: It may mean, too, that the public school administrator is going to have to take on a new style.

Supt.: I'm convinced of that. I have said before that professional negotiations is one of the best things to happen in education in a long while because it forces attention on some of the critical problems in education aside from teacher salaries. However, management's behavior can't be merely a paternal behavior or a take it or leave it kind of attitude towards the demands of teachers. A healthy relationship built on respect and trust is needed.

BHC: Will you continue to function as a change agent in education? I'm wondering if the Quabbin experience with change has dampened your enthusiasm?

Supt.: No. I don't thing it has dampened my enthusiasm. I guess it's sharpened my focus of sensitivity to change process. I think more important than that, it's confirmed a lot I believed in from the beginning. I never felt otherwise that anything that is worth calling change or innovation has to get somehow into the spirit or heart of the people involved. This is not just verbalization. Yet, wasn't this one of the predominant guidelines in whatever I promoted? I think it was, but didn't it come out that way. I don't know if I'll ever know why things didn't work. The only thing I question is what were the temporary or immediate
The question is what is a mistake or what isn't a mistake? These are the damnable things we're hooked onto. There's nothing changed as far as a basic strategy that I would use to deal with change or innovation. The most significant challenge in my own thinking is the approach, the strategy for change. Is it important whether or not to deal openly in a comprehensive way with the whole concept of change or openly and directly with what I would call the discrepancy between where you think you are and where you think you ought to be with the people involved? Is it better to deal with a select group that is supposed to comprehend the whole thing? Department heads and teachers do their own little things, and somehow they don't see the whole. They see clearly their little part. To me, the concept of a professional person is one with the ability to see the whole as well as his part. I've been criticized, questioned and examined by myself and others. I think you've raised the question too, as to whether or not it's too frustrating to demand someone to recognize the whole. It's a very honest question as far as I'm concerned. I think it's a question that has to be dealt with in the whole change process.

BHC: It's also part of systems management, too.

Supt.: Yes. If I could draw a painting of what ought to be, and most of us conceive that we can, should I be the one to draw the painting in the first place?

BHC: There did seem to be a great cry from the LC's
and staff to see the master plan. Somehow a model would have represented something tangible and, perhaps, terminal. It seemed that people were fed partial constructs which would hopefully result in a whole at some point in time. This generated much frustration in terms of security because one construct called for the elimination of staff. Could this happen again? Well, I guess the answer was felt to be yes!

One thing that Quabbin didn't taste and maybe it should have and that was any instance of "pilot" testing. It seemed that all innovations blanketed in a horizontal fashion. By that I mean any one innovation touched the entire school. There was no vertical implementation which would constitute something similar to pilot or trial involvement. Differentiated was the innovation, and it contained a number of additional innovations within its structure. This entire concept of DS was initiated throughout the total school without the careful analysis of the consequences of such a move.

Supt.: I understand exactly what you're saying. Whole scale innovating may present a conflict, but I think it's a kind of conflict that a guy like Dwight Allen could face when he says, "If you're going to undertake change, you might as well take a lot of it." You can consume a considerable amount of energy and time in the model approach, assuming that the model approach is going to lead into the kind of domino effect. You don't know if it's really going to promote a confidence and spirit of commitment to change in
other ways. I'm not in a position to refute this either, but very clearly I would accept the premise that the model approach would take some risk out of change.

BHC: Who learned and what from the Quabbin change experience?

Supt.: I could evade that question by sharing with you the thought: who learns what out of any experience? This is a big question. When do you realize that the experience you had is really part of learning? I'm not evading the issue, but expressing the fundamental belief I have that applies with what we've done, as well as what our kids are doing in the classroom. If learning isn't experientially based, there probably isn't any learning taking place. What we did was to involve a lot of people in an important experience. If it was more negative than positive, I don't think we know that as yet.

BHC: What do you feel you personally learned from this experience with change?

Supt.: I think the thing that I personally have learned which I think, is an asset to our educational system is that worthwhile change somehow has to be conceived to be a long range patient and, yet, a systematic process using management by objectives. Anyone who deals with change must be careful not to be guilty of setting unrealistic targets. Most of the targets that I set had a short time limit, but they were comprehensive and deep in their implications. This caused problems which I'm feeling right now. What I'm
saying is that if I don't have a view toward change which is long range and patient, and if I had that view four years ago, would things have been different? I'm really not sure?

BHC: What do you think the faculty has learned from this?

Supt.: There are quite a few people who I think honestly say that they'll never be the same. I think they mean this in a positive rather than negative sense. I would conclude that that we haven't damaged, closed, or restricted any enthusiasm for continuing inquiry, for looking for alternatives. I think I'm probably in a position to be sensitive to that, listening to other superintendents complain about their systems and their problems. I don't think it's rationalization; I really think we have a spirit generally amongst our staff of desire and mission to improve and seek alternatives through a process of openness and receptivity.

Yet, I guess, on the other hand, I say it would not be healthy to go about jumping on any old bandwagon that comes along just to change. If the Quabbin system is involved in change, it's going to have to be legitimate. It's also going to have to be real, and above all it's going to have to be accepted within the system.

BHC: Do you think the Quabbin faculty is more aware of scientific management as a process to facilitate change and the implications of it?

Supt.: I would have to conclude, "Yes." This would be particularly true at the leadership level. But, again,
I don't feel that anyone is very hot about verbalizing about it. I would suspect that when you get down into the essence of management by objectives they are knowledgeable in a superficial way. They are years ahead of most because they have lived with this process, and yet, if you were to call it management by objectives, they might not be able to identify it as such.

BHC: If you were to implement an important but, perhaps, controversial innovation at this time, how might you do it?

Supt.: I'm assuming that we're talking about an innovation that would involve the total faculty, and not an alternative approach to education that may not involve them?

BHC: I'm talking about something which would affect them personally such as a vast organizational change.

Supt.: For me, there'd be no question but what the objective of the change must be dealt with initially along with the goals and the purpose of the change.

BHC: How would you involve faculty in this?

Supt.: I'd have to start with the people within the system and deal with that kind of question with them. The strategy to develop involvement in change, as far as I'm concerned, would have to be part of the responsibility of the people involved. I hope this doesn't sound like a contradiction. They must help develop the ground rules and the ground work or you're facing trouble before you begin.

BHC: How do you deal with the diverse personalities and styles that exist within a staff like ours? There are
resistors, exciters, the blase, restraining forces, driving forces, etc. It all seems rather complex, and, I must say, frightening.

Supt.: A careful analysis of staff is critical. I felt from the beginning that I knew the Quabbin staff. I still feel the same way. It is difficult for me to conceive of a professional educator who wouldn't want to be a part of change if he had some say in it. The key, then, is to promote involvement. I am presently embarking on a major innovation in career education.

BHC: Beyond involvement, what other components are essential to aid the implementation of an innovation?

Supt.: I believe that an activity matrix or plan is necessary which not only describes what target you're shooting at but also what you've got for ammunition and who's going to be shooting the gun. But I must also say that I don't know that there is any global strategy. I would have to look specifically at what are we talking about. Are we thinking about a change that involves learning activities for kids, or are we seeking a change that is fundamentally organizational and demands behavioral changes in the faculty?

BHC: Let's say, for instance, we're going to move to an open concept on the high school level. This would be drastic and controversial?

Supt.: I feel that the strategy to employ would depend on the nature of the innovation, and the initial reaction I get from the staff when confronted with it. You see, here
It becomes evident that if innovations grow out of accepted needs, the chances for success will undoubtedly be better.

BHC: I would like to deal with another component in the change process. What part did outside consultants play?

Supt.: I think there was a rather irregular pattern for outside consultants. Fundamentally, they were used in various spots as a catalyst, to generate heat. In no sense were there any outside consultants who were brought in as recognized resource people. These people had no commitment to us over a long period of time. They had no responsibility from beginning to end. When consultants came in they were crisis oriented. This is not the way, in my opinion, you should use resource people if they're going to be a help to you.

BHC: Should you have maintained consultants throughout the total process?

Supt.: Yes. They could have provided some objectivity and, certainly, needed advise. But there were problems here because the idea of bringing someone in from the outside can be distasteful to some. There were questions raised about outsiders with limited knowledge of our system trying to help us. It seemed that some felt that we invited consultants here to seek their fortunes.

Yet, we could have used some long-term consultation because we weren't prepared to meet the challenge of change alone. I think that we should have had someone like Ken Blanchard and Bill Walsh with us all the way through our
implementation phase. Their presence would have insured our ability to solve problems. Once again we find ourselves dealing with an old notion that the superintendent or the principal has all the answers. This just isn't so! I'm trying to work from the premise that says that administrators today must seek help in all stages of the change process unless we are dealing with the ideal system that welcomes all and every change. Does such a place exist?

Both Bill Wolf and Ken Blanchard worked with us, but this was on a very limited basis. This system made its biggest mistake when it didn't retain Dr. Blanchard through the real conflict when he set the ground work for problem resolution at the retreat, designed for the purpose by him; at the hunting lodge in New Hampshire, Tinker Doodle.

This is a problem caught up in the consultant situation and this concern consultant. Who does he identify with? Does he identify with the superintendent; is he a consultant for the superintendent? Does he identify himself with the problem? Is he really an independent part of whatever we're doing? I would prefer the latter. We ought to have someone that can take an objective point of view and be free to offer constructive criticism no matter what? I believe that this type of help goes beyond participative observation because it is outside expertise familiar with change and the human dynamics that go along with it.

BRC: Can you possibly evaluate the change experience at Quabbin in terms of its total impact on the system?
Supt.: It's very difficult for me to conceive of it as a failure. Maybe it's an optimism in me, but I think many feel there have been failures. Somehow, I choose to call them disappointments. There were not very many as far as I'm personally concerned. The whole change experience has to be viewed as a focus on where we're going, rather than where we've been. Yet people remind me, in very candid statements, that you've got to take your history with you, and where you've been is also part of where you are.

I think that what is important is that we've got most of the same resources we started with and these resources are talents that have grown. I think the potential for the Quabbin system is great, and this is reinforced by the enthusiasm we still get from the community. What have we lost besides a heck of a lot of work and frustration on the part of management primarily? Some would like to believe that we're back where we started in 1967. This may appear to be the situation as seen in our present organizational structure, but this is deceiving. We have changed and are still changing. I think there's a spirit now which is a kind of a rebirth, if you want to conceive it as such, in which kids are optimistic, parents and teachers are optimistic toward the educational climate in Quabbin. So, what have we lost? I know some people have been hurt, but these are not permanent injuries.

Am I rationalizing when I say that most people have gained? The people that have left the system, as I under-
stand it, feel more comfortable. This would also, be true of the people that remained. I guess the ultimate question should be, "What is education in business for." The answer is: "It's in business to help kids grow in a healthy and desirable way." Our system is oriented in this direction, I think we're focusing upon people, upon the kids in particular, and I don't think we have to take the focus off teachers in order to focus on kids because they are one. It seems to me that what we aspire too can't help but lead to the objective that set the value system for our school. Education is a community enterprise not a school enterprise. I think we're well on the way to making it this, but we have a long way to go. I think, though, that the change experience at Quabbin has given the direction that we needed. I guess the question remains, and I don't feel I can objectively answer it, "Where would we be if we hadn't attempted change at Quabbin?"
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QRTA President: She is currently the reading supervisor at Quabbin. She is a tenacious lady committed to fair play and good education who gained a leadership role in the teachers' association through commitment and concern for what she felt to be detrimental results from shaky innovations. In the Barre community she commanded the respect and admiration for her honesty and endeavor to help others. She came to Quabbin in its first year.

Like many of the teachers, who came out of the old system, she had received an intensive evaluation before being accepted as a member of the Quabbin faculty. There was also an initial dispute concerning her degree status which influenced her position on the salary scale. It would be fair to say that instances like hers bred a certain amount of malcontent before Quabbin ever opened its doors.

BHC: There are numerous places that we could begin, but I imagine that the best would be to begin with your role as a teacher within the Quabbin system during the period of change and innovation.

QRTA Pres.: I was a teacher who came to Quabbin Regional under a dark cloud as did all former Barre teachers. I had taught 7 yours locally and had good rapport with parents and former students. Because of a forced situation in that cur
principal felt to be loyal we could not talk about school things outside. I was a teacher who was powerless to change anything in Quabbin, but a teacher who felt that students were not receiving the education which parents had expected this school to provide for them. I was also a teacher who as a taxpayer resented the fact that my tax money and that of other taxpayers was being spent by educators who "knew" (and KNEW is in quotes) what the community wanted without allowing parents or taxpayers to enter the building: This is an expression: enter the building. In other words, they did not want them involved: they did not want them asking questions, or making suggestions about educational policy or the education climate of the school.

BHC: It is, then, your opinion that the administration at Quabbin ran a rather closed system?

QRTA Pres.: Absolutely: The principal, in particular, resented parents asking any questions, coming in to check on anything, or going to school committee meetings to raise any question about their children, or general school policy.

BHC: Was this a general feeling of all administrators as well as school committee people?

QRTA Pres.: It was more the principal who felt this way. The superintendent and school committee listened but did very little about any complaints or suggestions.

BHC: Would you discuss your involvement with the QRTA and perhaps talk about your role as an officer and how that organization began to take a stand with regard to issues at
Quabbin?

QRTA Pres.: I think that the QRTA's stand is one question that we can touch on later. As far as being elected QRTA President, I was brought on at the end of the school year in which our troubles started. There weren't many around who really wanted the job, and I felt obligated to get involved.

I was elected for various reasons. First I think I was elected because the members of the QRTA felt they could trust me since I had no designs on an administrative position. Many of the members were afraid that if they become presidents they might be blackballed by the administration, and they didn't feel they could afford to be put in that position since they had to earn a living to support a family. There were not many at that time who were on tenure, who were not in an administrative position, so I think that I was elected, as I have said, because I had no ambition to an administrative position. I could not be blackmailed as I did not have to work for a living. I could have taken an early retirement if things got too tough. For these reasons I feel I was elected. The members didn't know exactly what I could or could not do, but I did serve notice on the administration and all concerned that I was a mouthpiece for the QRTA, but I was not the QRTA by myself. I would defend teachers rights, but I also would express what they wanted expressed.

BHC: What was the faculty's or should I say QRTA
feeling about educational change and innovation?

QRTA Pres.: I think teachers are constantly seeking and promoting educational change and innovation to meet the need of students and the expectations of our society. They resist change and innovation when it seems to have no logical basis or if they don't understand the reason for the change or if they feel the changes won't be wise or beneficial to students. I think they put the students ahead of their own personal well being as far as innovations and changes are concerned.

BHC: Were any changes and innovations at Quabbin teacher-initiated?

QRTA Pres.: Not really. The LC structure and guidance plan were certainly not teacher-initiated.

BHC: Differentiated staffing was a global innovation. Was that teacher-initiated?

QRTA Pres.: No!

BHC: Who or what was responsible for the changes that came?

QRTA Pres.: I would say the superintendent.

BHC: How was he perceived by the staff?

QRTA Pres.: He was seen as the person directly responsible for changes at Quabbin.

BHC: Were there other changes or innovations going on in the school?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, I would say there were and many of them were for the good of the students. For instance, in
the English department they had gone to semester elective courses, social studies were writing objectives, course outlines, and new courses were being included which would meet the needs of students and state requirements. Every department seemed to be happy and innovative for the good of the students without this overall change, differentiated staffing, which came from the top.

BHC: Did the faculty play any part in determining what changes were to be implemented?

QRTA Pres.: No!

BHC: What you are saying, then, is that the faculty was involved with instructional innovation while the superintendent was responsible for organizational changes?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, with the blessing of the school committee, which, at that time functioned as a rubber stamp.

BHC: Being a long-standing member of the community in good repute, did you feel that the changes being promoted were in fact in line with your perception of what the community wanted and needed for its school?

QRTA Pres.: No, I did not. I had the feeling that the superintendent had been reading of new educational concepts and was trying to implement these here without notifying the public to the extent that it could understand and conceive what was to be developed. I felt he wanted to try an experiment here.

BHC: Was it your opinion that Quabbin students were guinea pigs?
QRTA Pres.: Yes, it was.

BHC: What did the community have for expectations for Quabbin, keeping in mind that the regional high school was a long time in coming?

QRTA Pres.: The people of the community were concerned about the education of their students, and their students being able to compete with students from other communities both in schooling, if they went on to school, or in getting jobs. Through the school they wanted to provide the best possible education so that their children could go out and compete on even terms with those of other communities in every respect.

BHC: The superintendent was brought into Quabbin because he was regarded as an innovative individual and was seen as a change agent who could bring good, contemporary educational practices into the system. Do you think that this was the reason he was hired?

QRTA Pres.: It may well have been as I learned myself within the past year, but this was not known in the community. Also, it was not known to the faculty. The changes that he made seemed to be on his own.

BHC: Evidently, the school committee supported this behavior.

QRTA Pres.: As I said before, school committee members more or less rubber stamped decisions or recommendations of the superintendent without really knowing what it would involve.
BHC: Was this behavior on the part of the school committee typical? What I mean to say, is it possible for the school committee to appear any way but a rubber stamp?

QRTA Pres.: Well, it’s been my personal feeling that many of the members were not familiar with education and knew nothing about innovative, educational concepts. They did not want to lose face by admitting they did not know. Also, it may be that the superintendent presented things in such a way that his ideas sounded very good. I’m sure the school committee didn’t rubber stamp things with the intent of doing any harm either to the taxpayer or the students at the school.

BHC: How did the faculty respond to the change atmosphere?

QRTA Pres.: Rumors of change and release of teachers had a very demoralizing affect on the faculty. It made them feel uncertain as to their own security. Also, the learning coordinator set up created a feeling that there had been a double-cross and resentment resulted. There was the feeling that only former buddies or brown-noses of the administration could advance and that those so-called buddies and brown-noses rose over the bodies of their former faculty peers. These people were strong administrative backers, and, then, for awhile some of them sought faculty favor since they were smart enough to see that without faculty backing nothing would happen. Some learning coordinators waivered back and forth between backing the administration and then backing
the faculty which created even more chaos and mistrust. It reached a point where no one trusted anyone else, students and community sensed the faculty chaos, mistrust and resentment, and, in turn, this upset them. Many teachers and some LC's left, and, I feel, that the final result was that educational standards dropped drastically.

The guidance counselors, for instances were teachers who were appointed to the role of teacher/counselors, and they felt untrained to meet the need of students in guidance. Their teaching suffered as a result of the time and effort they put into guidance. Study hall supervision was added in addition to guidance duties. At this point it became just too much. When the school committee and the QRTA could not negotiate sufficiently to secure a new contract, the teachers felt that the time had come for them to air their grievances to the public and to express their concern and worries to the parents of the students who attend this school.

BHC: Would you say that the teacher/counselor and the learning coordinator concepts fell under the blanket of "differentiated staffing"?

QRTA Pres.: I feel that the original concept of differentiated staffing has been in the superintendent's mind from the very beginning of his term of office here. In his opening speech to teachers on the day he welcomed us, the first day we saw him, differentiated staffing was mentioned. When the training money was lost or I should say when the govern-
ment project was not accepted for funding, he tried to innovate through force.

As a result, he more or less played it by ear, depending on the reaction he was getting from the community and from the faculty and perhaps from some of the administrators, too, so that nothing was consistent. DS would start in one direction, and then it would go off in another, and then in another, so that there was no apparent planned course of action that the superintendent followed. This approach created even more problems.

BHC: How would you describe this kind of change? Was it perceived as chaos?

QRTA Pres.: No.

BHC: What, then?

QRTA Pres.: I would have to say, change for the sake of change.

BHC: Is it a general feeling that adequate funding could have helped to avoid the conflict that ensued?

QRTA Pres.: Perhaps in a way it would have helped had a training period been provided and release time for teachers to have extra time for these things. Also, it's possible, too, that with the adequate training teachers might not have been quite so disturbed about taking on guidance and study hall responsibilities. But, I don't think all of the problems would have been solved. I think the method by which LC's were selected and the selection of the particular teachers to be released, created a very bad situation as
far as morale was concerned with the teachers.

BHC: This might be an appropriate time for me to ask what important characteristics should planned change have from your perspective?

QRTA Pres.: I believe, for one thing, that there should be a definite need which is very apparent for change. Also, I believe because we are a series of small communities that make up this region, we cannot afford to experiment too much. We should first see what in the line of change is desired and where it may have worked somewhere else.

BHC: Were the innovations at Quabbin an outgrowth of need?

QRTA Pres.: To my knowledge, and, I have asked repeatedly if there was a needs assessment, and the only one that I have been told was that the superintendent became aware of the fact that the budget was too high. I feel that he decided how the budget should be cut rather than involving the community or parents in determining the priorities that they may have preferred and the elimination of those which they did not consider priorities. He set his own priorities, and in asking him what needs assessment that he took, he has never told me. He may have sent out a questionnaire and received half a dozen answers and considered this the needs assessment.

BHC: Is there more that you would care to add to this question?

QRTA Pres.: Again, I feel that there should be a
search made to find similar concepts that have been tried somewhere before we get involved, or at least a pilot program should be the limit of innovation. A major organizational change is frightening, confusing, and threatening.

BHC: Are you saying that you should go out and search for programs that meet the needs that have been set?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. Perhaps you may also find them being used in the same type of community.

BHC: Where does the development of a model come into play in change? It seemed to me that there was a great concern at Quabbin for someone to come forth with the master plan.

QRTA Pres.: There were no models; there wasn't a master plan that I knew about.

BHC: Is it your opinion that model building or simulating are important either for direction or information about change?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, I do.

BHC: Was there anything particularly disturbing about the change process?

QRTA Pres.: Well, in particular, it seemed that when a problem arose with a change that had been initiated, another change was initiated to throw people off balance and to keep them from questioning. It seemed that there was always something new added to take up attention or withdraw teachers' focus from the original point problem.

BHC: Could this situation be the result of a poor
communication system?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. There was a great deal of talking going on, but I'm not sure anyone did any listening.

BHC: Did you have much interaction with the superintendent?

QRTA Pres.: He constantly asked for feedback from the faculty, and for a long while he constantly received feedback, but he completely ignored it. This seemed to be his way of pacifying the frustrations of teachers over things that weren't going well. He looked for suggestions and recommendations on how things might be improved, but none of our recommendations or suggestions were accepted or implemented. It just seemed as though we would talk, and he would act as if we never communicated. All decisions were top down.

BHC: Would you discuss the superintendent's style of management as a change excitor or change agent?

QRTA Pres.: At first he gave the impression that he was warm, concerned, and a good listener. He wanted to give this appearance, and he constantly talked with teachers and ask for committee reports. Also, he met long hours with teachers, and, for awhile, they were convinced that something would come of all these meetings and hours of work and research. However, the information they presented to the superintendent was never used, so after awhile, teachers lost interest in even meeting with him.

BHC: Would you elaborate a bit more on the initial
impression the teachers had of the superintendent?

QRTA Pres.: Well, he sounded very idealistic; he was a very hard worker; he made a very good impression; and he seemed very concerned about the happiness of each individual teacher and with helping him advance in his teaching. Also, he promoted positive thinking about advancement in salary and position. I would have to say that he seemed to be a very dedicated educator. But as time went on, I think most people liked him as they met him. He was a very easy person to talk with, but after a time most lost faith in what he said.

BHC: Why?

QRTA Pres.: Because he did not carry through with anything that he seemed to say he was going to do.

BHC: He was a good listener but that's as far as it went?

QRTA Pres: Yes, and a smooth talker. He used a lot of language, educational lingo, which after awhile was even beyond most of us who considered ourselves educators, too.

BHC: The superintendent did, initially, spend quite some and energy preparing materials and articles to be purused by the staff for a number of reasons. These were documents that addressed themselves to new approaches to education such as differentiated staffing. What was the response to this move on his part?

QRTA Pres.: Well, people got fed up with the mounds of paper that came down. All the ditto and photostatic copies
of things were ignored for the most part.

BHC: Do you think that this was one way for him to communicate to the faculty what he wanted to bring forth in terms of changes or was he setting up alternatives to be considered as innovations?

QRTA Pres.: To teachers this move became so ridiculous. They did not have time to read the reams of things that he did. Besides, the subject varied, it might be on one subject one day, and another subject another day. I have talked with him at length, when things were going better than they did for a couple of years, and supposedly his idea in sending this down was to keep teachers up to date with things. He felt that, perhaps, through reading this material they would become innovative. But it reached a point of being ridiculous after awhile when the stuff was just thrown out, and the language was such that by the time you read through it you weren’t sure of what it said.

BHC: What was the behavior of principal during this change period?

QRTA Pres.: The principal was always a very reserved individual, although he seemed very uneasy at all times, certainly not a relaxed. He seemed dedicated, worked hard, and seemed to be very concerned about the school functioning well. But he had very poor relationship with the faculty in that he could not talk with many individual faculty members or the faculty as a group. He was suspicious of people, and he was non-cooperative as far as QRTA meetings
were concerned. He could make no exception if someone had an emergency, and he questioned at great length before he allowed you to go, or leave early. This made you feel at all times as though he were checking on you, not trusting you. Somehow he was not able to create a feeling of good rapport with the faculty.

BHC: Did the principal have the same inclination for change that the superintendent exhibited?

QRTA Pres.: Not in the set-up that we had here at Quabbin.

BHC: Why? What do you mean when you say the set-up we had here?

QRTA Pres: With the particular superintendent that we had, the principal was constantly put in the background. The more pleasing personality of the superintendent overpowered his image. I feel sometimes that he was not in sympathy with the concepts that were being implemented by the superintendent or that he was not being asked to play an important role in the implementation of innovations at the school.

BHC: Did there appear to be a conflict between the role of the principal and that of the superintendent?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, the superintendent did not let the principal run the school. He constantly interfered. They had two very different personalities and, perhaps, philosophies of education. There was a constant conflict between the philosophies of the two men. But the principal was always
in the shade of the superintendent.

BHC: What action was contemplated by the QRTA to meet the situation before it?

QRTA Pres.: When teachers returned in the fall of '71 and found that they had no choice in that they were going to be teacher/counselors and would have to take on study halls in addition to larger classes, they were shocked. This was especially true because they left in the spring with the result of a previous grievance on guidance, it was there opinion that the school committee would no longer allow the issue to be forced. To come back in the fall to find there was no alternative and that we were going to do it or we would be up for insubordination and possibly fired, was too much. At that time the teachers felt that they had to take a stand. It took awhile, but as time went on, a month or so, they became more and more convinced that things could not go on as before. We were being forced to do things which we felt were wrong because the school committee, principal, and superintendent told us we had no contract which said we had no say in the matter.

BHC: What do you mean when you say things were wrong?

QRTA Pres.: We were having to be teacher/counselors which was assuming that every teacher could be a counselor. I know that not every teacher is able to counsel because most are inadequately trained to do this job.

BHC: What were some of the problems that developed to convince teachers that they were not up to take on the
counselor role, also?

QRTA Pres. One was that each teacher had approximately 25 counselees who had different free or study periods than the teacher. If counseling was desired, quite often students had to be called out of class. Teachers were expected to see every one of their counselees each marking period. Also, the teachers with upper classmen were expected to help them with their future plans. Many teachers had little or no acquaintance with scholarship information and college placement. Colleges were not very cooperative in some instances because they were getting calls from numerous teachers about students entering when normally these calls go through one person, or one department which is the guidance department.

Teachers were not that familiar with parents and many families did not live in the Barre community. Parents were not cooperative in coming in to see teachers. It took so much time to do the paper work which we were told we had to do. To make matters worse the superintendent said that we could be liable for suit for information or notation which we put down on student forms. We were told by the principal we had to do it, or it would be reflected in our evaluation.

So the whole set-up just seemed wrong to teachers. We felt that guidance was a part of teaching and when one area, or one concept of teaching is segregated out from the numerous concepts covered under the word "teaching" and emphasized, it would seem as though the other concepts of the art of teaching were being relegated to the background.
BHC: Who was in charge of the guidance program during this period?

QRTA Pres.: During this period the guidance counselors having been dismissed at the end of the previous school year, the principal was supposed to function as the head of the teacher/counselor system. This seemed to be the only innovation that he personally backed.

BHC: So grievances were filed?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, they were filed on the basis that teachers were being compelled to perform a function which was in direct violation of our former contract.

BHC: At this time you were not working under any contract at all?

QRTA Pres.: No.

BHC: Was it the feeling that the conditions of the old contract were still in force?

QRTA Pres.: It worked two ways. We were told by the administration that if they wished us to do something that was covered by the previous contract we had to do it. For instance, if they wanted us to come to a night meeting, the previous contract stipulated two night meetings a year, the administration felt it could call a meeting because previous practice becomes present practice without a contract. However, when teachers and the QRTA protested additional duties of those things for which they were not qualified, they were told they did not have any grounds to complain because there was no contract. Therefore, with the lack of confidence
in the administration, the LC concept, and having to become teacher/counselors when we were not prepared. the QRTA felt that the superintendent was the initiator of these changes, and they gave him a unanimous "no confidence" vote as an educator because of the policies that he was promoting and the ways in which he was implementing those policies.

From here the QRTA filed many grievances after grievances. We went to the labor board to ask for a hearing, and we, also, went to the press. We felt that the educational climate had deteriorated to such an extent here in this school that we owed it to the parents and the students to notify them of the conditions as they existed.

BHC: Was the "no confidence" vote and the use of the press effective in your desire to better the educational climate?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, because we tried not to do a character assassination. We were honest in our concern for the students and we needed to communicate with parents who seemed to feel that the teachers were interested only in salary. Through our press releases the public came to realize the truth of our concerns. It was not salary; it was the conditions that existed and concepts that were being promoted which caused a deteriorating educational climate which was very harmful to the student.

As a result there was a parent group formed. Three members from that parents' group were elected to the school committee and from that point on things did begin to change
in that the school committee wished to talk with members of the QRTA to find out what problems they felt should be corrected. They did listen; they didn’t just hear us and forget it. They investigated and found that some of the problems we were concerned about were in fact problems which they themselves were concerned about, and they did try to work with us as we did with them.

BHC: Did the public have any data beyond the teachers’ feelings as they were vented in the press?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, the parents’ group did do a great deal of work. They came in the school and talked with students. Also, they ran surveys in the communities to substantiate the things they had heard. As a result of this it was found that the concept of teachers/counselor was one of the things which everybody objected to. It was also discovered there was a great deal of mistrust and lack of communication between the administrators, the faculty, and the students. It seemed that the entire educational climate at Quabbin was in a deteriorated state.

BHC: Was there a feeling by some that the QRTA was using the classroom to poison the minds of the students against the administration and many of the innovations that had been implemented?

QRTA Pres.: I have never felt that teachers as a whole did this. I think that students talked with perhaps youngsters of school committee people and with children of teachers. Most of the information that students did gain came not from
teachers but through other sources. It did seem, unfortunately, that children of school committee members talked freely about what went on at school committee meetings, and I would assume that teachers in talking with their families might have discussed their concerns and their problems at school and why they were upset. Their children didn't realize they shouldn't talk about these things to their playmates.

I will not say that no teacher talked in their classrooms, but I do feel that the majority of the classroom teachers would never talk about such things in their classrooms.

BHC: Did the student body react in any way to the state of affairs in the school as you describe them?

QRTA Pres.: There was a strike which seemed at first to be against the cafeteria. Students felt that they should have, perhaps, a more varied menu, more, and larger servings. It turned out to be, according to later information from student notices, that the boycott of the cafeteria was to gain attention and concern for the educational climate and the guidance situation. Also, students felt that teachers were not teaching as well as they could and should because they were upset over the conditions that existed here.

BHC: Was there any alternative other than open conflict with the superintendent and the school committee?

QRTA Pres.: No, because for a year and a half neither the superintendent or school committee would listen to
teacher concerns and grievances.

BHC: Why wouldn't they listen?

QRTA Pres.: We were told one time at a negotiating session that if we didn't like it we could get out. In other words, you did what you were told with no questions asked or got out. This seemed to be the idea that we were to do what we were told and we had no right to question.

BHC: What was the school committee's reaction to the QRTA?

QRTA Pres.: At one time there was a very healthy relationship. That was before the innovations. When we hit the negotiating table to work on a new contract we were told that the committee could take away all our sick leave, our insurance coverage. They expressed the feeling that they could stop all benefits causing us to earn only our salaries and we would work the hours they prescribed.

BHC: What was that negotiating experience like in terms of the feeling and actions that evolved out of it?

QRTA Pres.: From the sessions teachers felt that the superintendent was against them, and he frankly admitted that he was. It bothered him that they did not want to supervise study halls, become teacher/counselors, and that they did want more money. Actually our salary scale was much below the average around here. Then the pressure from the superintendent and school committee became real. They were going to use us in any way they desired.

BHC: Did the superintendent negotiate with the teachers
on behalf of the school committee?

QRTA Pres.: He talked, and he did negotiate. Also, he called the caucuses. The school committee at times would seem to be amenable to certain conditions, and he would call for a caucus. They would return to the table and renege on what they had said previously.

We approached the school committee and the superintendent in the spring because we felt that the LC concept had violated the intent of the original intent of our contract. We felt that we should negotiate for the LC's.

BHC: Was it the intent of the superintendent to dictate his own contract? Did he listen to the complaints of the QRTA?

QRTA Pres.: Listened, but ignored them. He listened faithfully, but nothing ever came of it. Many teachers felt that he had lied to them. I know for a fact he did to me. I can give you an example. After the grievance had been settled on guidance in the spring, the school committee said we would not have to do guidance. On our individual salary contract was a statement that teachers would do guidance only if they chose to do it. I asked him about this, and he told me he meant that if a teacher did not want to do guidance he would not have to. In the fall at a meeting he requested with the executive committee, I asked him about this, and he told me he didn't like people putting words in his mouth. I told him I didn't like being accused of being a liar either.
BHC: This hurt relationships?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. I cannot quote the examples now, but others told me they had specific facts to prove that he had lied to them. When the superintendent sat at the negotiating table he did not make teachers dislike or mistrust, the harm had already been done before negotiations had begun.

BHC: Did most teachers share in this opinion of the superintendent that he was basically "anti-teacher"?

QRTA Pres.: I would say that the majority did. There are always those within an association who would not come out and say it. But I think the majority felt this way except those who were out to butter their own bread.

BHC: When the vote of no confidence was taken, was there a majority of the QRTA in attendance?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. There were forty some odd members present, and the vote was unanimous.

BHC: How large was the QRTA membership at this time?

QRTA Pres.: I would say about 52 or 54. Some of the staff were not members at the time; they had come on later in the year.

BHC: Were there LC's at this meeting who shared in the vote of no confidence?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. I guess I would have to say there were some LC's there who surprised me very much in that they voted for the no confidence. I did not expect it to be unanimous.

BHC: At the point of the vote of no confidence for
the superintendent, what was the environment like both inside and outside of the school?

QRTA Pres.: At that time the parents' group had not been formed. In fact, if anything, we seemed to be fighting a loosing battle. I did feel that even those LC's who were backing the administration were not sold on its innovations. They were benefiting from them, but they were not sold on them, or the method by which they were being implemented.

BHC: Was there anything positive associated with the changes that went on?

QRTA Pres.: I feel they did do something positive. They made us all consider our own philosophy of teaching, and I think they made us more aware of being able to help students than we were before, not to the extent of being a guidance person, but rather along the lines of becoming more sensitive to student needs. Many teachers grew in this respect. Also, the struggle brought teachers closer together.

BHC: Is it your opinion that teachers learned anything about change and change process from this experience?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. When teachers think of doing something different in the classroom, at least those of us who went through this, are a little more aware of talking things over with students, getting their ideas, working with them, and getting their cooperation before we do undertake change.

BHC: What was the more destructive blow dealt Quabbin from this experience in your opinion?
QRTA Pres.: I would say that students' education suffered drastically. I think, too, the community, students and the teachers will long be suspicious of changes being implemented at Quabbin. I think this is a condition which any administration at Quabbin is going to have to work under for a long time to come.

BHC: What did the change process lack that made it so ineffectual? I know you have touched on many points related to this already, but maybe you can summarize.

QRTA Pres.: I think in the first place, the parents had no say. Administrators felt they knew what should be done without consulting parents whose children they were responsible for. I think the entire change without any master plan which parents could see or talk about. Parents were just not consulted or encouraged to enquire. The change was something that was implemented, and it just had to go through that way. It couldn't be changed at all, in process. There were many good points about some of the things that were tried, but if one part of it didn't work, if you questioned it, you were against it. You couldn't suggest that certain parts be changed. It was so inflexible.

BHC: It would appear, then, that complete adoption without adaptation was the manner implementation?

QRTA Pres.: No. It seemed as though each problem brought on a new change. There was a constant series of changes with no evaluation of the previous one. It seemed to most of us, who didn't have any say, that new changes
followed old problems, and we were told to behave differently without knowing why. This was now the case; forget yesterday. We never knew why we were to forget because we had no evaluation of what had gone wrong.

BHC: There were changes that had hand positive elements, but the positive elements were killed because of the unwillingness of the administration to modify the changes to make them better?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. If there had been an evaluation, the good may have been salvaged, and, then, perhaps adding on to the good, we might have come out with very good results, rather than the results which we did end up with.

BHC: How might these changes have been evaluated?

QRTA Pres.: Well, student achievement could have been tested quite easily. Even the effectiveness of teacher/counselors could have been assessed if somebody had wanted to do it. I think teacher feelings and perceptions is pretty valid for information.

I think if we had surveys of parents, students, faculty, and honest, heart-to-heart talks with each other, good give and take rather than the feeling that it was wrong to question, things might have been different. Communication was very bad here. In fact it reached a point where teachers would sometimes agree to something because of fear of their job, but go to a QRTA meeting and come out with an exactly opposite opinion behind the safety of the QRTA.

BHC: If Quabbin were to experience the effect of a new
change agent, how should that person work within the system? What words of wisdom would you give that individual?

QRTA Pres.: I think, first, he would have to come to know the communities, realize their hopes, fears, and expectations of the parents. This is not an easy job, but I think this is the first thing any person, if they're from the outside, must do because you cannot implement change unless you know what the community expects. Then I would say, that working with parents and getting down to everyday language, explaining how you proposed to implement a change and the reasons for it, would have to be dealt with. Also, what are the results that could be hoped for to come out of the change, and how would you evaluate, again, using the parents, students, faculty, and perhaps, tests to see whether or not the results had been accomplished. This approach would be much more successful in implementing change.

BHC: What personal characteristics should the agent have?

QRTA Pres.: I think he has to be a good manager. He has to be someone who can listen and who can analyze what is said to him. Also, he must be very sensitive to the community climate and who will be able to say if something is wrong that it didn't work. At that point, try something else rather than keep going on something that isn't good, or to make changes without being honest and open as to why the new changes are being made. It is important for this person have confidence in himself and his ability to be
able to change his behavior and ideas when need be.

BHC: How did you respond to outside consultants? More than one was brought in on a limited basis to help at certain points in the change process.

QRTA Pres.: Well, the first few who came was good and we enjoyed him. But nobody knew why they were here. They were just interesting people to listen to. Then, when we heard they cost several thousands of dollars, I think most teachers felt they could have used that money more effectively in the classroom. We didn't need to have an outsider from California to tell us what to do. It reached a point where teachers felt that outsiders were brought in to try to push through reform. We had one instance where a man was to come in to listen to teachers and decisions would be made based on what he found out from teachers. Well, he found out, and he agreed with us. But the administration didn't listen to his recommendation. He came to help with the guidance problem, but only teachers worked with him. He left and that was that.

BHC: What about the Timber Doodle retreat? Was this move to bring the faculty, administration, and school committee together under the direction of disinterested, third party of any value?

QRTA Pres.: Well, I went to Timber Doodle by accident because at the time the plans were made I was not president of the QRTA, and it had been decided that the president of the QRTA was going because an LC happened to be holding the
presidency. It could be said that the teachers were represented through the president of the QRTA, but in the meantime, from the point when the plans were originally made until the weekend at Timber Doodle, there was a change in the presidency. I didn’t know how to get out of it, so I went, and, I think, because I went the female member of the school committee went also. In addition, once the tide got started for women to go, we were allowed another representative. I think this was at the suggestion of Dr. Blanchard. He made the suggestion that we invite teacher representatives. So we did have teachers go.

I honestly felt that they wanted the truth about exactly how we felt. I was very candid and I did a great deal of soul-searching there. I honestly expressed what I felt within myself with the feeling that it would be taken in that spirit. We were asked at the end for some recommendations. I suggested that we go back to the department structure. I found out later I was practically blackballed for that. It was not a recommendation, it was more or less idle thinking, and it was to the effect that the last peace we had had at Quabbin was under this structure. While so much water had gone under the dam from that time to the point of Timber Doodle that we could never fully go back, would it be worth considering? I brought this out to the group for their consideration, not that I was promoting it, but merely as a suggestion. Later, I learned that the IJ’s felt I was threatening their position by this suggestion.
BHC: Yet, it was not long after that the system did go back to the departmentalization.

QRTA Pres.: I know that, but it was just a suggestion for their consideration. I didn’t even know if it was the right thing or not. I felt that it was not something that I had to decide, but a group should consider it, and we were considering other people’s suggestions. I felt as though I had been landed on by a ton of bricks.

BHC: It was a hot session, I remember it well.

QRTA Pres.: You know, it really took my feet right out from under me because I did not mean it as a threat, but merely as a suggestion for consideration.

BHC: Did you think there was any value in the counter-session at Timber Doodle? Also, would it have been more effective if Dr. Blanchard had been given the opportunity to follow this session up with other meetings?

QRTA Pres.: Yes. I think the situation here would have been resolved much more rapidly had he been able to come in. Again, there was never any follow-up to anything. Timber Doodle was a start.

BHC: I raise this question because it is unfortunate and unfair to bring in a consultant and give him limited access.

QRTA Pres.: It was my understanding that he was to come back and talk with each of us to see if we felt this had done any good. We left in good faith. At the end, when we all said we were going to do something positive
when we got back, we really felt whatever we said at that time we would do. But the farther we got away from Timber Doodle, the more each of us realized that what we experienced there was not going to carry over. The nearer we got to Quabbin, the more we knew things would not change.

Perhaps the most important aspect of a change process or innovation trial is having someone on the staff who has the credibility to monitor the going on. What I mean is a person who not only reveals trouble spots and good things, but a person who can effect change himself. That person cannot be the superintendent. You came close to this part, but nobody listened. There are quite a few people on our staff who could do this.

BHC: The role your talking about is what has been termed a "participant observer." This person could function as a member of the organization while also monitoring its behavior. Hopefully, he could allow for "in-flight" corrections, one of the things that disturbed you, in particular, about the Quabbin change process.

QRTA Pres.: I think we had a small number of "participant observers," but they were merely tolerated.

BHC: From my point of view, this is a function that the superintendent allowed me to play to a limited extent, and that was the problem; I was only allowed to function in this way.

QRTA Pres.: We had problems that we could have corrected ourselves without all the conflict, but without involvement,
and, in particular, communication this will not happen. You know, in a way a "participant observer" could do a great deal for a system if he or she is the right person or maybe persons. We should have given this idea more thought before.

BHC: What did happen after the retreat?

QRTA Pres.: Things get hotter. All of us, I did and I think others did too, laid their souls there about how they felt. I think some people learned how others truly felt, they used that as a weapon.

BHC: Do you think Quabbin has grown from this experience?

QRTA Pres.: Yes, I do. I feel, and I have felt from the very beginning, that the set-up as Quabbin opened, the philosophy of the people here within the faculty and administration, was such that there had to be a breakdown and a build up again. I do not blame the individuals who were here. I think they came in, through no fault of their own, with false understanding of what the community expected. I do not blame them; I feel sorry for the things that happened to many people who came here with high expectations. I think they were allowed to develop these expectations because they were given information by people who did not know the community and the expectations of it.

BHC: Do you think that the administration after having undergone this conflict is going to function differently than it has before?

QRTA Pres.: Well, it did last year. But the further
you get away from the conflict and the longer the people are in administration, the less they will remember when they were teachers, and how teachers feel. This is bound to happen. We do forget the same as when we grow up. We forget exactly how we felt as youngsters, and we seldom take the time to think how you felt when you were 14 or when you first fell in love. We do not stop and think because the day-to-day demands don't give us time to think. Administrators, in particular, and I don't mean this in a snide way, forget too quickly as they get farther and farther away from an old conflict, the reasons for it, and how the everyday teachers feel. I think this is bound to happen.

BHC: Let's hope that it doesn't.

QRTA Pres.: I hope it doesn't, either, but I think it's almost inevitable.
APPENDIX C

TAPED INTERVIEW WITH A QUABBIN REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMITTEEMAN
Taped Interview with a Quabbin Regional School District Committee Member

School Committee Member: He is a member of both the Quabbin Regional School Committee, Barre School Committee, and Supervisory Union 63 School Committee. He is an educator in his own right possessing teaching credentials and a Masters degree in educational administration. In the Barre community, he is an insurance man of long-standing respect. He has children in the Quabbin system and values their education dearly. Also, he represents the parent group in that he rose to the school committee from their ranks. Barre which has always been his home is the focal point of his public service interest. It is here that he served on the Budget and Finance Committee when Quabbin was conceived. He was actively involved at the public meetings in which the area towns were initiated to the regional school concept.

BHC: As a parent of students within the Quabbin Regional School District, businessman in the community, and school committeeman, please attempt to relate those things you deem necessary to capture the nature of the Quabbin Regional High School involvement over the past few years. I feel that your personal exposure to this situation is quite unique.

School Comm. Member: There are numerous issues to be considered here. It is difficult to know where to begin. Let's take the Quabbin Parents' Association first. It was
a group of concerned people, from the Quabbin district, who realized that there was a state of turmoil in the school. They felt this condition was the result of some attempted changes that were unacceptable to the teaching staff. They also felt the turmoil was damaging the students' education. The group felt that the changes had not taken direction after several years of attempted implementation and that they were actually stopping the educational process. They deduced that this halt was not the intent of the changes themselves, but that this dilemma was not clearly seen by the school committee. So, the group decided to organize and bring its thoughts to the attention of the school committee. The group was made up of housewives, businessmen, lawyers, doctors, and working people who had met regularly in business or social functions and had discussed the Quabbin. They organized, formally, and wrote some objectives which were to attempt to get at the basis for the trouble and find out if there was justification for the Quabbin staff's opposition to the changes that were floundering, and if, in reality, these changes would have been beneficial, if they were made successfully. From that point the group planned to go to the school committee with the information they had gathered and request them to act on this information in a rational manner.

To get this information the group surveyed students and teachers; they surveyed parents and taxpayers outside the parent group itself. They asked questions about the
school as to what the expectations of these people were from the school. The survey revealed that everyone felt that the academic areas at the school had not deteriorated from the attempted changes, but it was felt that the conflict had brought the academics to a standstill. It showed that the students were aware of a conflict between teachers and administrators and they further felt that it was encroaching on their desires and expectations from the school.

The parents' group brought these facts before the school committee. The school committee agreed to further investigation such as an examination of the financial structure of the district by the University of Massachusetts Department of Business Administration, a further probing of the community's educational desires, and they indicated that they had seen the conflict only as one of more money demanded by the staff based upon their negotiation experiences with the staff. At this stage of the struggle, two other members of the parent group and myself ran for and succeeded in getting a seat on the school committee. Obviously, from this point on, change was viewed differently by the governing body.

What had happened at Quabbin became clear to the committee. There had been a blockage of communication between the innovators (the superintendent and committee) and the lower echelon at the school, and it was causing grass-roots panic.

BHC: Are there significant historical factors that need to be examined concerning the communities perspective and the conflict that was initiated in the building of the
Quabbin as a regional high school to replace the old?

School Comm. Member: Yes, very definitely. Before the construction of the regional school was consummated, I was serving a membership on the town Budget and Finance Committee, and I was actively interested in the idea of a regional school. So was the existing school committee. The rest of the community was simply passive about the whole idea. But the Center School which had been serving as a middle school between Ruggles Lane and Barre High burned, and it had become necessary to run double sessions at the high school. This situation was not at all desirable, and it made the regional concept more desirable. It brought the issue before the people of Barre with much more vigor than it would have had the Center School not burned. The people were very unhappy with the double sessions, Sputnik was understood as the kick-off to a science education game, and Barre began to look like losers. Its people were warming to a regional concept.

There remained long standing opposition to the regional idea, however, in Hardwick membership had been voted down by a solid majority several times. The region would need them in order to become a practical financial reality. Finally, they did vote to join, but the core of dissenters were still vocal and actively trying to sabotage the idea after the construction of the school had begun. These anti-regionalists felt that the issue had been railroaded through because the vote was won on a night that they could
not get to the polls to vote, and they insisted that the situation was deliberately contrived by the minority who favored the regional school. Hardwick had always been a rival town to Barre and these two towns were going to take the lion's share of the financial burden of building and running the new school. At this point the regionalization simply drew a more distinct battle ground for the two rivals.

Hubbardston, on the other hand, had always had a good relationship with Barre and was passive toward Hardwick. This third town had been maintaining its own elementary school and was sending its high school students out to Gardner, a nearly city, on a tuition basis. They were leary about their small town kids going to a city school, and they were afraid that their students were going to be refused there because of the over-crowding in the Gardner schools. The incentive for Hubbardston to join the regional was there and it showed at the polls. They approved their own membership with ease.

Oakham was in much the same situation as Hubbardston, only on a smaller basis, as they were the smallest town of the four. They had sent their students to Barre High on a tuition basis before the Center School fire, but after that they were forced to turn to North Brookfield for their student's secondary schooling. This was done on a flimsy agreement because North Brookfield was already overcrowded. The regional school looked like the best alternative to them, especially since they had to send the one or two overflow
students from the North Brookfield system to the Waschusett Regional in Holden. The experience had been favorable with that regional, and there was no reason for them not to expect the same from Quabbin.

The promise of funding from both state and federal monies were viewed as desirable by all the communities and allowed Hardwick and Barre to put aside some of their old rivalries, and Barre passed the monies to join and form the Quabbin Regional Junior/Senior School. There was, in general, a good feeling, I think, that everyone had gotten something he needed.

They had some reservations as you might expect, such as the bigness of it all and the less familiarity with the people who would be staffing it. After all, they used to know the principals of their own schools well enough to know whether he smoked a pipe or a cigar and what kind of tobacco he used. They knew all his strengths and weaknesses. They also felt free to call him on the phone and either tell him off, in the vernacular, or to congratulate him, also in the vernacular. The communities all started into the regional concept with these minor reservations.

To show how minor the resistance was at this point, I would like to tell you my vivid remembrance of the town meeting at which the regionalization of Barre was passed. There were two factions present at the meeting where the Monachusett Technical High School and Quabbin were both on the warrant. One of the factions was in favor of having a
street light installed in their neighborhood and the other was deadly opposed to the light. It was a sixty dollar decision. The two fought continuously for two and one half hours finally passing the expenditure for the light. The two and one half million dollar Quabbin building was next on the agenda, and the exhausted light-fighters passed the Quabbin unanimously without a word of discussion. The moderator called, pleaded, and begged for just one question, but his cries fell upon deaf ears.

The regional school committee was elected and it consisted of people who were then, and still are, friends of mine. They were of the same frame of mind that I have been and that is, that education could no longer be what it had been in old Barre High. They wanted an innovative school with forward, confident people staffing it. They wanted educators who had heard of the education race that Sputnik had started and had some ideas on how to put our kids into their rightful place in the future.

So the committee let their faithful, conservative superintendent go, and they hired an interim super-superintendent, who had master-minded the Wachusett Regional in nearby Holden, and put him in full charge of the birth of the Quabbin. This interim superintendent hired a young energetic staff that was filled with idealism and let most of the old Barre High teachers find jobs elsewhere. This last move left some very bitter and disappointed teacher-citizens grumbling to their friends and neighbors in the
The fuze to a potentially explosive situation had been lighted. It was moving in such a direction that it dazzled the rural people of the Quabbin region. The building that had turned out to be someplace the people got lost in when they tried to look it over began to take on the symbolism of a fearful monster that was feeding itself on their hard earned tax dollars. The coldness of the monolithic masonry building reflected on the personality of the principal, and the people avoided the place. They lost interest in trying to understand the regional school system as a positive thing and saw it, instead, as an enemy. The Quabbin community has in general remained as outsiders to the school in spite of the six years that their children have come together as friends there. They feel the building on the hill to be a monster waiting to pounce upon them with its tax armored claws.

EHC: What was it that drew you personally into the Quabbin midst of this conflict within the school, in particular?

School Comm. Member: I was personally drawn into the conflict because I was interested in the process of education through a personal philosophy that says the future can be determined by man in certain areas and education is one of them. Of course, a strong incentive existed in the fact that my own children were attending the Quabbin during the conflict, and I didn't want to see them or any other child
hurt. I felt that because I held a masters degree in educational administration, I was duty bound to use some of that education in public service. I was also acquainted with many of the members of the Quabbin staff who had explained the problems as they saw them within the school. It was their opinion that they were victims of top down management.

DHC: Would you say that most people were reluctant to get involved? I think it would also be interesting to gain your perspective on the kinds of communications that were going on within the communities. Also, what about the perspective the community had on what appeared to be a tremendous conflict between teachers, administration, and school committee at the regional school?

School Comm. Member: When you approached the members of the communities about the conflict at the school, they seemed to glory in it because of their fear of the school, and they saw the conflict as a confirmation of their fears. They saw the feared monster was wounded because its own internal organs were fighting each other. They would say that the administrators had set up a plush environment with very well paid jobs for themselves. They would say that the teachers were fighting for more money and that, for the most part, they were a greedy bunch of lazy creatures that wanted the community to support them while they hid in the building. They saw the educational jargon that appeared before them to explain the changes that were being attempted as a smoke
screen put out to hide the fact that the administrators were putting some foul deed over on the community. In short there was no realistic communication between the school and the community. They never understood the changes and only saw conflict.

Then the realization that, if what they believed was going on was true, the school that their hard earned tax dollars were paying for had become a farce. They saw only in-fighting where teachers were allowed to carry their money grabbing interests into their childrens lives. They were saying that they were threatened by teachers and that they suspected the administrators were going along with it. When they did communicate with the school, they heard only terminology that was meaningless to them like pupil personnel service, PPBS, and M.E.O. From the teachers they heard fears that they could not do their jobs because they did not have the ability to be counselors.

They met this rhetoric with suspicion, and interpreted it as a sneaky means to hide their expensive school because it was a sinking ship. They repeated the old cliche: all educators hang together, and they trusted no one who was an educator. They demanded that administrators drop PPBS budgeting approach when they explained the budget and use the old line item. They said that putting an educator's pay in several different categories was simply a means of covering up how much the person really made.

BOC: I think the next question deals with a couple
of factors that need explanation. First of all, the Quabbin community is quite conservative and certainly traditional, with this in mind, please discuss its perspective on outsiders coming into the community and let's look upon the superintendent as an outsider. Was he accepted? What kind of an individual did they see him as?

School Comm. Member: Well, this is New England and outsiders are fully accepted at the point in time when the "locals" can no longer remember when there wasn't someone around that had the same last name as the outsider. Two or three generations will usually do the trick. The superintendent was viewed as a vacationing, education salesman being paid to stay around awhile. He had been hired by the interim superintendent, who had no social ties here and who had no credibility in the community. The people considered the two educators as, "cut from the same bolt of cloth."

They felt that the interim superintendent had set up a school that was beyond their financial tastes. They considered the present superintendent another high-priced item who had been forced upon them, and they suspected that he held neither love or mercy for them. This feeling of distrust brought the citizenry to circulate a rumor that said that the present superintendent had to pay a kick back to the interim superintendent, who was living in Florida.

This thinking grew from the fact that the present superintendent's pay was much higher than they had ever paid any public administrator before and that it was high because
he had to meet his alleged payola. Obviously, there was a thick aura of distrust in the eyes of the community and it was fortified by the jargon, they did not understand, which seemed to issue constantly from the superintendent's office.

BHC: To go along with this you've mentioned that the principal himself cast a cold image. I would like you to elaborate on some of the conflicts that the principal had when he first came into the community and talk a little but about his behavior toward the community.

School Comm. Member: The principal seemed removed from everyone in the community. He was in a large, complicated building in which the citizen who entered to see him would have to make an appointment with a secretary and then wait to see him when he was ready to be seen. This situation was a shock to people who had been used to approaching their old high school principals on the street anytime they saw fit and expecting the man to handle their problems right off the top of his head. Then, too, this man had never really mixed socially with the community in a way that they would accept him.

He built a house and fought court battles with the local contractors whom he had hired. They made it a point to talk about their fights with the principal. They said some very unkind things about him. These contractors were local people of high standing in the community and considered trustworthy. This situation cast a distasteful light on the principal in the community. It made him suspect of hiding.
facts as the image transferred from his personal business to that of the principal of Quabbin. Rumor circulated that he was not interested in putting down the turmoil in the school and that he wished only to hide in his little back room and watch T.V.

His attendance was requested at public meetings, and he was questioned abusively. He answered these questions with the same infamous jargon the people had rejected from the superintendent. The people felt that he was not reachable in the same way they felt a principal should be and rejected him as a cold individual.

BHC: You have a couple of youngsters who are students at the school. It may be somewhat unfair, but it may be interesting to have you relate perhaps their perspective of the principal.

School Comm. Member: Well, of course the students at the school in general felt that the principal was a cold, withdrawn, unreachable person that they seldom, if ever, saw. And they thought that they could never address him because of his being shut up in his office all the time. The student body had rumored that the man watched T.V. all day. They even told of witnesses who had seen him in his office with Captain Kangaroo on. All this imagery came from the fact that the principal was not available to the students so they made him into a character product of their own imaginations. Their mental pictures were, of course, influenced by the atmosphere in the school building at the time.
BHC: What educational issues were of particular interest or importance to the community?

School Comm. Member: The issues were polarized around the fact that the grads were not going to college in the great numbers that they were expected to by the community at large. You see, the school never made any commitment to the community as to what it did plan to do, so the community just assumed it was going to make a larger number of students eligible for college than the old school and this would be in proportion to the added tax dollars they spent on education. For example, they felt that 30% of Quabbin's graduates going on to further education was only double the percent the old high schools sent to higher education, but the cost of Quabbin was four to five times greater than that of the old schools. So, they deduced that they were not getting their educational dollars worth.

In order to capture the logic of the citizenry, you must realize they were seeing their school in the wake of Sputnik. In this frame of mind the people felt that the conflict at school had stopped progress. They felt that the teachers were busy unionizing for their own end and not doing their jobs. The citizens could understand conflict in terms of money because they could identify with teachers in that they both got pay checks from a boss and knew that additional work called for resistance unless it was accompanied with additional pay. They saw administrators as bosses and felt that they were trying to keep more of the
pie for themselves by letting the guidance department go and forcing teachers to pick up the guidance work at the expense of their children's class time.

**BHC:** Along with this question I would like to raise a couple of issues that need more elaboration. I think that you've already pointed out that the guidance situation was considered to be deplorable by some members of the community and also the fact that part of the innovation going on under the heading of differentiated staffing had reduced the staff, forced guidance responsibilities on the teachers and made the classes larger.

Perhaps, the personal interaction that would go on between the teachers and pupils was bound to be affected. I guess what I am concerned about is did you as a parent, and someone concerned with education, really feel that the educational atmosphere was deteriorating as a result of the innovations taking place in the school?

**School Comm. Member:** Yes! I did feel that the failure of the innovations to take hold were a definite erosion on the quality of teaching and learning in the school. The teacher-administrator conflict had reached the student body and it began to foster a careless attitude toward education on their part. I feel that such conflict could not generate a learning atmosphere especially when teachers were not busy with their students and were avoiding their unaccepted guidance role.

The teachers were without a contract, they were not
attending inservice courses, and were not asking for other self improvements sources that staff who have accepted their own situation would have. They were falling back upon the working conditions of their expired contract before they would make the slightest move. They were operating on a minimum standard.

Even though the Quabbin had had a difficult birth, the community didn't expect a miscarriage. They had high expectations for their two and one half million dollar baby and they didn't accept its regression under the carelessness of the highly paid strangers who were wasting their time fighting while the school vegetated. Here were teachers with expensive training who could not learn guidance but could spend their training fighting while students sat by and watched as their futures wasted away. A feeling that a different move had to be made dominated the attitude of everyone.

BHC: You've talked about your role as a member of the parent group. What I would like to do is to have you elaborate on the effectiveness of the parent group as a change agency to put Quabbin back on an even keel.

School Comm. Member: Of course, the parent group was a change agency in that it formed a communication link between the staff, the community and the school committee. If you were to set them against a model for effective change, the group would be a feedback loop for the committee and the superintendent from the community. They
communicated to the committee that the changes that had been initiated had no grass-roots support. Their primary concern was, however, measuring what was happening to their children as the result of the changes and innovations.

BHC: What was the perspective that the parent group had of the change process being worked at Quabbin?

School Comm. Member: Scientific change is something that few, if any, outside of some educators and a few governmental agencies are aware of. The parent group might have benefited if they had been aware that such an intentional process was available and demonstratable in a model.

I was attending courses at the University of Massachusetts at the time I was a member of the parent group, but it wasn't until I got on the school committee that I got into scientific approach to change and management. It was at that point, however, that I saw the flaws in the attempted changes. The process had had a very serious communication breakdown between administrators and staff. The teachers were communicating their feeling about the whole process through protest. They saw that teacher-guidance as the weak link in the change chain and they were using to smashing other innovations. The chain was too weak to sustain such intense pressure. All the innovations seemed so locked in and inflexible that it seemed the inevitable result would have to be conflict and possible rejection of the good with the bad.

BHC: Is it your opinion that the administration was
very inflexible in terms of being able to change years to deal with the conflict that had erupted?

School Comm. Member: Yes! I would say that the parent group was looking at one administrator, in particular, as a stumbling block in the process of change. The suspicions that were initially aimed toward the superintendent were as members of the school committee became aware, somewhat misdirected. The superintendent seemed to be very inflexible and to be imposing a dead issue through the staff.

In actuality the principal was not communicating the seriousness of the situation with his staff to the superintendent and was completely committed to the teacher/counselor idea no matter what. The situation was that the superintendent could not back off with greater conflict with his principal.

BHC: What were the pressures that the parent group brought to bear on the school committee?

School Comm. Member: Well, the first thing they did was to try to become recognized as a group of local citizens that were honestly concerned about the process of education in the community. They got this recognition when they attended the committee meetings and were seen to be local professionals, businessmen, and respected housewives. Then they presented the results of the survey, I mentioned before. The survey brought with it the opinion of 15% per cent of the community as further pressure to the committee. Members would talk to school committee people outside of meetings.
about the dangers of the course they were pursuing by not doing something to settle the conflict in the system.

Meanwhile, the general public had had it with no action from the committee on the conflict at the school. They began to telephone committee members and harass them. Finally, several members of the committee refused to seek re-election. The places were filled with members of the parent group and together with the residual membership stopped the change process to seek resolution to the great conflict that was at its peak.

BHC: Was the parent group itself aware of the fact that the original change in question had been contingent on government funding that had been refused by the United States Department of Education?

School Comm. Member: There was no knowledge of this fact in the community or the parent group. The mechanics of project financing are readily available only to school committee members, and I think that the memory of these things tend to die off as the members that handled the original issue leave their seats. At least neither the administration or the committee men ever mentioned this aspect. Consequently, everyone saw the attempted change as a means of saving money by eliminating the guidance department and teachers.

BHC: Also, many of these school committee members at this time were not on the committee when this proposal was drawn up.
School Comm. Member: This is a fact. The school committee is always in a state of membership flux, and it probably had no idea of the original plans for this change. There were a few members that were on the committee that sanctioned the change in the first place, but they may not have attended the meeting at which the change had been ratified, or they could have voted against it. There are any number of possibilities for the behavior of the committee.

I think that many of the members were honestly searching and trying to find a way out of the dilemma they were supposed to be overseeing. But, they were only able to search within their own membership, and their own executive (the superintendent). They had no effective communication pipeline to the teachers or students.

I doubt that any of the members had either the time or the energy to search through the volumes of materials that had been handed out in the past. By volumes I mean that I got five large cardboard cartons full of papers handed to me when I came on the school committee. Others got the same amount of information as I did. So there probably was no time or incentive for members to research and find out the details of this change situation.

BHC: What was there about the school committee that accepted the initial change that prompted them to be so sure that it was needed and would work?

School Comm. Member: I have to qualify the type of school committee Quabbin had at that time. It was a committee
elected by people who felt that they had over extended themselves financially with their schools and they wanted a minimum cost school. The community had elected people known to be budget slashers to committee seats. These people were essentially conservative, anti-change, unless it was to save money, and not educators or even slightly concerned with the mechanics of educational issues, only the plant costs and salaries etc. Consequently, they did rubber stamp many of the educational issues especially if it looked as if it were economical. Naturally, the elimination of the guidance department and reduction of the teaching staff did save money.

BHC: How about the educators themselves, by educators I mean faculty members and department heads, did they, in any way, contribute to the community understanding of the changes that were being implemented at the high school?

School Comm. Member: The staff related their dissatisfaction and fears with the changes without ever explaining what they were, and I think that the staff probably didn't understand the changes themselves. That is, they didn't see a process of ordered change. They did see themselves threatened by the mechanics of a process. They seemed to fear that they were asked to go beyond the limits of their training. They were on unfamiliar ground and scared.

I doubt, also, that they could communicate the ideas to the community even if they fully understood them. After all they were not a socially integrated group in the
community. Many lived out of the Quabbin community and had no contact with the citizens in the community. When they did socialize, they attended teacher parties where they might as well have been at a union meeting. Their only communication with the community was through some one-way newspaper articles that the QRTA had published to explain their position of not accepting the changes. The community assumed that the newspaper article meant that the teachers would soon be asking for more money.

BHC: Would you discuss the political moves that were made via the parent group to bring about positive action in dealing with the Quabbin conflict?

School Comm. Member: I have already hit on the fact that the parents’ group approached the school committee and eventually took seats on it. The members that were urged to go on the school committee were people who were educators themselves, only one was practicing, and he had no trouble interpreting the jargon. Several were businessmen and the combination, it was felt, would insure a minimum of error or bad planning.

BHC: About how many members did you have in the parent group?

School Comm. Member: We had about thirty, twenty of which were the active ones. We held bi-weekly meetings on Friday nights. This membership constituted the aggressively interested persons in education in the Quabbin district. Only a relatively small number are actually disinterested
in what is happening in Quabbin. Although, a few would take pleasure in seeing the doors boarded up.

BHC: What was the structure of the group?

School Comm. Member: The group consisted of a lawyer, an owner of a local manufacturing plant, local businessmen and tradesmen, and housewives. All these people are astute, influential persons with a reputation for conscientiousness and honesty. The communities were well represented among them with equal numbers from Barre, Hubbardston, Hardwick, and Oakham. These people had enough concern for the school to make up for the thousand that didn't have the time to join the group.

BHC: When the election to the school committee was held how many seats were occupied by new members from the parent group?

School Comm. Member: The Barre committee got four members out of its total five membership, two went to the three man committee in Hubbardston, and Hardwick got one inactive member. After these individual towns sent their allotment to the Quabbin committee there were seven parent group members in seats on the eleven-man committee.

BHC: Could you describe the steps that were taken by the school committee, and I guess we are looking at your role now as a school committee man, to bring Quabbin back on an even keel? At the same time it would be important to point out how this committee was different from any other school committee.
School Comm. Member: This school committee was different from others is that most of its members were encouraged by the parent group to become school committeemen because the group had assessed educational needs in Quabbin and now wanted these needs to be met.

Specifically, these people were the largest taxpayers in the community, and they were genuinely interested in quality education. One of them is an owner of a local manufacturing plant that supports that portion of the tax base that six or seven hundred individuals would. So, it is obvious that money poorly spent is certainly a concern of this committee. Aside from financial concern you must know that such an individual could not be the type that avoids responsibility or that would be unaware of the need of progressive, benefical change.

This individual replaced a member of the former committee who believed that formal education, especially beyond high school, was a wasted effort and an unnecessary expense. He believed that the law had corrupted the schools because it did not allow teachers to beat kids into submission. If you contrast the two will get some idea of the contrast in general between the new committee and the old.

A division manager from a large modern industry in Worcester had joined the ranks recently. He comes from a plant that has had M.B.O. effectively working for some five or six years now. He is aware of the value of education to the modern world and he is committed to trying to make
education as effective as possible. There is also a teacher of ten years experience in the Wachusett system to share in the policy making of this committee. He has offered much contrast and comparison of strengths and weaknesses of ideas from a teacher's point of view. Also, the committee has gained a teacher of teachers from Worcester State College who is, out of necessity, aware of the pitfalls and the direction educators must avoid or take. He is very generous and shares this information with us readily. In my own case I am a business man, but I have been trained as an educator and have within the last year completed a masters degree in educational administration.

All and all the existing committee today is very strong and capable of working with the administration, faculty and student body in determining the appropriate goals of our school. We are not frightened unless that change be for the hell of it. Change can be necessary and worthwhile.

BHC: What were some of the positive steps taken by this committee to end the conflict at the high school and at the negotiations table?

School Comm. Member: The conflict had, as I've mentioned before, brought about a breach of contract in the eyes of the teachers, and an aggressive hate campaign between the teachers and the administration reached its acme in a no-confidence vote for the superintendent. It was anything but a healthy situation.

The present committee dropped their professional
negotiator, who had become a symbol of distrust to the teachers, and met face to face with them. They came away with a contract and an a change in attitude that would get them back together into the common goal of educating children.

The committee then removed the sore spot and reestablished the guidance department. They accepted the resignation of the principal and restored the superintendent's confidence with the committee, at least. They replaced the principal with a former Quabbin department head. Next they set to work backing the administration all the way with the intent of creating a strong working relationship between staff and administrators. It will take several years to dispell old fears, but this committee is committed to bring staff, students and if possible community into future decision-making.

BHC: Do you think that the present school committee or parent group gleaned anything from being involved in this conflict?

School Comm. Member: I'll start with what I learned from this experience. I learned that scientific management is a process that no longer can be ignored. The absence of feedback from all echelons because of a communication block in the Quabbin system caused the expensive failure of innovations that someday might have saved the careers of the very people who misinterpreted them and opposed them. It has taught me, also, that change must be ordered and not left to trial and error through experimentation. It also
left me with the belief that pilot programs should be used whenever possible and, above all else, that no change should ever be attempted without first establishing an operative feedback mechanism.

As far as the present committee goes, they have learned about feedback. Proof of this is in the question that is always asked whenever anything comes up that involves either staff, students, or teachers, and that is: "What do the people who this will affect say about it." Also, they are very gun shy of any, all, or none changes and won't pass an idea unless it has been tossed around outside the committee first. They see all changes as a pin ball that must roll down the board bouncing off obstruction, changing direction, and attempting the impassable.

The community's role remaining somewhat unchanged. It has yet to realize that it must become part of the planning and work on as a feedback agent on all changes or innovations. It is the social critic. This, of course, is an educational process that the system must sell to the people of the community, and it is a long way from closing the sale. The battle to open the school and make the public welcome and comfortable in it has just begun, but the kids school spirit is building up and going home. The new principal is there using every opportunity he can find to communicate honestly with them.

BHC: Has Quabbin gone back to what it was in 1967, or has it grown substantially in terms of putting itself
into the 20th Century although it has undergone a fairly long period of turmoil?

School Comm. Member: It has not gone back to 1967, definitely not! Quabbin is not now what it was in 1967. It now has the ability to go with change, the know how that is. There is a flowing together of the separate towns among the students. Now you never see Barre cliques or Hardwick cliques, only Quabbin students. School spirit is up to the point where some kids will defend the school rather than just agree with the critics. This attitude is important in that students feel the school is trying to do something for them.

The staff is slowly viewing, not completely trusting, their own situation as better than it ever was— at least more fruitful in terms of their teaching conditions and considerations. They are not as negative about the future of the school. If they are confronted as to the condition of the school and their place in it, they will honestly tell you that working and learning conditions are better than they ever were before at Quabbin. They will now point, with much pride, to some specific student accomplishment or some class or teacher's accomplishment and go on about it with enthusiasm, so that you know that they are beginning to enjoy their work. It is somewhat different from the days of conflict when it was difficult to find enthusiasm, only predictions of downfall and constant gripes. They are fast to single out an administrator, who are now always available
to them, and give them their honest opinion about anything they feel is not up to expectations.

Today, there is a student advisory council sitting at all school committee meetings as is the faculty advisory council. Each is allowed to report at each meeting, and each has a part in the decision-making process at Quabbin. This has made our school more receptive to change because numerous innovations are presently taking place at all levels within the school.

BHC: How might you evaluate the impact of the changes that have taken place on the total environment?

School Comm. Member: This is difficult to answer. It was certainly not all success nor was it all failure. One thing is sure, we really learned a great deal about ourselves through this ordeal. Some good people have left, but so have some bad. But I tend to feel that maybe this experience opened up some volatile issues that would have surfaced even if this particular experience had not taken place. I am not quick to blame our problems on rapid change because all of the innovations appeared reasonable on paper.

In particular, role conflicts and misunderstandings about management practices cleared up during the conflict. We have grown, hopefully matured. All the wounds are not healed, but, perhaps, in time they will be.
APPENDIX D

A PROPOSAL
A NEW MODEL

OF

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR

SCHOOL PRACTITIONERS

A BETTER SYSTEM
Authorize the administration to follow through with the development of "A New Model of In-Service Education for School Practitioners" with the intent of seeking support from the Federal Government that would finance two-thirds of the costs for a three year program. It shall be understood that such a proposal will include consideration for all expenses and efforts now supported from category #2100—Curriculum Improvement. The maximum total Curriculum Improvement (2100) Budget shall not exceed $15,000 annually and will be subject to specific endorsement each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quabbin Regional</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Support</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elementary and secondary schools of Union #53 and Quabbin Regional School District like other educational systems in this country must deal with the following realities and trends:

- **COSTS**: rapid increases in educational costs caused by the salaries of staff.
- **SHORTAGES**: increasing shortage of well qualified teachers.
- **TURN-OVER**: increasing mobility of teaching personnel.
- **RESEARCH**: considerable focus on innovation and research in learning.
- **STRUCTURE OF KNOWLEDGE**: revolutionary restructuring of learning that stresses concept development, learning as inquiry, and use of knowledge in the thinking process, rather than simple knowledge accumulation and simple instruction. (focus from content to process)
- **LEARNING THEORY**: marked focus and new knowledge dealing with biological, physiological, sociological, and personal components that affect the pace and degree of learning for individuals. (Theories of learning)
significant increase in the application of technology to the learning industry. Technology that replaces, reinforces, and amplifies the efforts of teachers.

new institutional patterns that promote better utilization of staff talents, better sequence of learning, more attention to individual problems and needs, and better utilization of technology. (team teaching, ungraded, individualized instruction, independent study, large group instruction, small group seminars, differentiated staffing, etc.)

a demand from students and public for relevancy in schools.

demands from organized staff for working conditions as well as salary increases.

A systems approach that involves staff (practitioners) in an ongoing study and concern for the above problems with a clear voice and involvement in changes that are promoted in our educational program. To a lesser degree, a system that promotes and involves the public who support education and the students who are engaged in the process.

1. Organize and express precisely what we expect students to obtain from our schools.

2. Recognize and clarify priorities for education and changes

3. Combining in-service education with curriculum study and improvement. (Personal growth in solving system problems)

4. Consider alternatives to instructional supervision and evaluation. (Self-evaluation systems, interaction analysis)

5. Get off the single salary schedule and recognize both different staff functions and different levels of performance.

6. Develop a "feedback" system that better informs staff, students, and parents of the strengths and weaknesses of individuals and system.
DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING PROPOSAL
A BRIEF...INCOMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF A BRIEF PROPOSAL
CREATED AT "NORTHFIELD CONFERENCE" OCT. 29-31

B. Crowder...P. Allen...K. Bailey...C. Trask...W. Wolf

QUABBIN REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL -- BARR, MASSACHUSETTS

"Training Master Practitioners for a Differentiated Staff"
In September 1970 the Quabbin Regional High School will implement a d/s pattern based upon the following premises:

1. Behaviorally stated outcomes for learners in a sequence of learning will be clearly written for all aspects of the instructional program.

2. Instructional tasks will be clearly delineated for all employed personnel involved in the promotion of the above objectives (outcomes).

3. A team of educational leaders and decision makers will be trained in skills necessary to implement, manage, and evaluate their design.

4. A "year round" trimester pattern for programing will be scrutinized as an alternative to the present structure.

5. Integrated with staff differentiation will be the utilization of instructional materials and technology with instructional media.

6. All d/s will be on a differentiated salary schedule of which the maximum of "B" will be twice the maximum of "A".

7. Main goals will swing toward individual value growth.

8. Staff differentiation will promote more adult/student contact.

9. The role of the teacher will be shifted from dispenser of knowledge to coordinators of learning experiences.

10. To generate a habit of considering alternatives in education.

11. Outside evaluation sources will constitute an integral part of aid and evaluation.

Much work has transpired with the Quabbin Regional School District -- at local expense for the most part, over the past several years pertaining to alternatives to current district staffing practices. Short term in-service opportunities, faculty planning groups, and consultation sessions with specialists have resulted in 3 constructive moves:
a. First, an in-service training program was offered to selected district teachers by trainers from the Eagle Hill School, trainers specializing in diagnostic and pedagogical techniques.

b. Second, the district used EPDA fiscal resources to train and employ 20 paraprofessionals for school service.

c. Third, the district arranged for an extensive pre-service internship program in collaboration with the University of Mass.

Hence, steps have been taken to incorporate paraprofessionals, unique pre-service interns, and some diagnostic aid within the staff structure.

Since the weakest element of the long-range staffing plan, at present, is the development of master practitioners, the prospectus submitted focused on strategies for training ten such individuals, who will then guide the process of staff differentiation while taking into account accompanying curriculum and personnel concerns.

Consequently, training will be supplied by University of Mass. specialists. Once the ten master practitioners have acquired sufficient competence, they will become responsible for coordinating the process of differentiating Quabbin's school staff. Allied with the staff changes will be changes in instructional tasks, pre-service and in-service training, curriculum opportunities, human interaction patterns, and physical space arrangements.

CONSULTANT COMMENTS: Leadership Training Reaction

Woodbury: Perhaps a "12" premise: "Staff differentiation will be accompanied by other structural changes, such as the flexible use of time and space, which contribute to a better learning environment."

13. "Measures will be taken to institutionalize a process of rational change.

14. "The concept of student as teacher will be implemented wherever possible." Is the idea expressed by No. 9 too narrow a focus?

15. "Maximum use will be made of part-time professionals (housewives with BA degrees, for example) and other community resource people with special expertise.

The project obviously is headed in the right direction.
TO: DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN...GUABBIN REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL
FROM: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

SUBJECT: SUPPORT...INVOLVEMENT...LONG RANGE COMMITMENT TO:

A SYSTEM OF INSERVICE EDUCATION AND STAFF TALENT UTILIZATION
THAT EXERCISES THE WISDOM AND PROBLEM SOLVING TALENTS OF A
TEAM OF LOCAL EDUCATORS IN DEALING WITH: (AS A CONTINUOUS
PROCESS)

A. CURRICULUM PRIORITIES & RELEVANCY
B. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES
C. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

IN BRIEF: A LOCAL SYSTEM DESIGNED TO DEAL WITH CHANGE.
Creating Change...if it is desired.
Resisting Change...if it is not desired.
Evaluating Change...to expose its strengths
and weaknesses

Our youth involved in public school education and training will
gain significantly from the above system that links together the
classroom practitioners and the problems of intelligent distrib-
ution and application of limited financial support for education.

A crisis exists locally as well as nationally in the matters of
rapidly rising costs for education caused in great part by the
deserved salary increases of professional teachers...but the
present pressures for simultaneously adding more services to our
school systems and meeting the needs of more individuals (who need
real help) by increasing existing staff, reducing class sizes, and
adding on more courses, causes us to respect the need for seeking
with vision alternatives to existing "add-on" curriculum structure;
"outside" decision making; "rigid" organizational patterns; "goal-
blind" educational promotions; "short-sight" planning; "hit-or-miss"
inservice education; "credit/years of experience" basis for talent
payments; etc.

BELIEF

GIVEN: A. A limited amount of financial support from local
sources for education.
B. A significant number of talented and aspiring pro-
fessional staff members presently employed.
C. A leadership at the School Committee level willing
to promote alternatives to existing patterns.

TO FIND: A means of engaging the talents and interest of a
significant number of existing staff members in the training and
decision making process that will result in present and long range
practices in the Quabbin Regional School District that attract,
hold, and exercise a high level of talent in key leadership roles.
ENDORSEMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAM TO IMPLEMENT CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION-
TIONAL STRATEGIES, AND ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS THAT SEEK ABOVE GOALS.
A PROPOSAL

A TRAINING PROGRAM DESIGNED TO IMPLEMENT
A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO CHANGE:
INCLUDING DIFFERENTIATING
A SCHOOL DISTRICT'S
STAFF

Corridon F. Trask, Superintendent
Quabbin Regional School District
Barre, Massachusetts

March, 1970
IMPLEMENTING A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL CHANGE...INCLUDING DIFFERENTIATING STAFF

Local educational leaders to be known as "LEARNING COORDINATORS" will apply their knowledge, decision making talents, sensitivity skills, and leadership skills to establish and exercise a systematic process for dealing with changes in curriculum structure, organizational patterns, and staffing utilization that keeps clearly in focus the desire for quality education supported by a limited financial resource.

Contrary to the view that changes and improvements in education must require even greater financial inputs, the Quabbin Regional School System seeks systematic change based upon the belief that significant improvements in education programs can and must be made without greater overall educational costs.

Worthwhile improvements in public education must recognize that a local staff involved in the implementation of changes must possess both the spirit and the understanding behind conceived changes, as well as the skills required to exercise new strategies. A spirit of inquiry, thirst for continuous learning, and an enthusiasm for change should be the habit of the majority of professional staff.
The Quabbin Regional School District, now in its third year of operation, has made the decision to attack with vigor several related and serious problems threatening the educational climate of the community. First, unrealized student aspirations; second, shackled staff potential; and third, rising educational costs exceeding the local ability to pay — primarily in the form of staff salaries and benefits.

Student aspirations presently are a direct result of family financial status, and in an area that is economically and culturally deficient such a base leaves much to be desired. Fortunately, the initial formation of this new Regional School attracted a significantly large number of talented and sensitive staff members who are ready to tackle alternative curriculum structures and instructional strategies geared to overcoming the unrealized student potential, and creation of a learning system that places priorities on the process of learning, and the sensitivity to individual human beings. Unfortunately, the present organizational patterns for staffing and programming view teachers as if they were all interchangeable parts; each responsible for the total educational cycle within his structured course; rewarded on the basis of time spent in district and credits accumulated; and no matter what their talent differences and performance level might be, they all contact comparable numbers of students in a traditionally rigid schedule. Industrious teachers, pressured by economic necessities, are seeking administrative positions within and outside of the system which in effect removes them from daily contact with students.

The communities in the Quabbin Regional School District have experienced critical strains on their taxable resources and find their competitive status related to teaching salaries markedly deteriorating. The ability to attract and hold quality leadership in the educational system is at a crisis point. Since staff salaries account for most of the cost increases, and since changes in
educational programs have tended to "add-on" staff and supportive costs, more effective models of curriculum structure and staff utilization -- given the finite amount of taxable assessment -- must be explored. School and community leaders have confronted these problems, and they are taking steps to rectify them.

During the past eighteen months, a considerable amount of momentum has been generated to change conventional practices. Through a variety of short-term in-service opportunities, faculty planning groups, consultation sessions with specialists, and systemwide focus on curriculum exploration and planning (all financed with local resources), the stage has been set for exciting pedagogical inquiry. Steps already taken to differentiate the entire staff are as follows: (1) Total staff involvement with "behaviorally stated objectives" as a frame of reference for curriculum organization and evaluation; (2) EPDA grant to train 20 paraprofessionals for service in the region. The training took place during the summer of 1969 and involved training personnel from the University of Massachusetts and local school system. The trained paraprofessionals are presently employed by the District. (3) Arrangements for extensive pre-service internship program in collaboration with the University of Massachusetts. Many U-Mass interns are situated within the District during the 1969-70 school year, and the program undoubtedly will seek continued growth in numbers involved and particularly in the changes in pre-service experiences arranged for interns; (4) Inquiry into the concepts and practices of "Individually Prescribed Instruction" as fostered by the Research For Better Schools, Inc., and the PRIMES Regional Center at Greensburg, Pennsylvania; (5) Introduction of concept of student-student instruction as a basis for effective learning -- implemented through a "Conservation Corps" and "Student-tutors" who become meaningfully involved as student-instructors in our school programs.

In summary, arrangements have been made for three new roles within the Quabbin staff structure -- paraprofessionals, unique pre-service interns and
student-instructors. Some critics would charge that the District is moving too fast, without anticipating the serious changes that must take place in the behavioral life of the traditional classroom teacher. However, if officials are sensitive to the weakest element of the work completed thus far -- that work relating to the training and development of a new breed of educator who would be called "Learning Coordinators". Leadership that is necessary to meet the District's educational needs requires training and re-orientation of a magnitude beyond the means of the district. Hence, this proposal is addressed to the development of a group of "Learning Coordinators" who will be responsible (1) for leading the District from a conventional curriculum and staff pattern to a flexible and relevant curriculum involving a differentiated staff pattern, (2) making decisions about organizational structures, instructional strategies, and curriculum priorities necessary to make the new scheme work, and (3) for offering pre- and in-service training necessary and/or desired to make the new scheme effective over time. They will remake the basic ingredients of the learning climate -- i.e., human interaction, space, time, feedback, organizational patterns, etc. -- as needed.

2. OBJECTIVES

Generally speaking, this proposal is designed to establish a leadership team capable of leading a low-income, rural non-farm regional school district complex from a conventional staff and curriculum pattern to a differentiated staff and flexible curriculum pattern and then maintain (with flexibility) the pattern over time.

Specifically, intentions include:

a. Evolving a training experience for fifteen individuals, who desire to assume leadership and decision making positions within a differentiated school complex, which is designed to provide both insight into the reality of change-over and competence to implement an effective differentiated staff model.
b. Preparing these individuals, beginning September 1, 1970 to become the architects of a viable differentiated staff model for the Quabbin district, a model which accounts for job specifications, salary schedules, staff selection and retention, new configurations of human interaction and resource utilization, and pre- and in-service training.

c. Devising an evaluation scheme which ascertains the human benefits, instructional advantages and cost benefit of the differentiated staff plan to be put into effect.

3. PROGRAM DESIGN

This account is ambitious, as realistic as possible, and most likely to be accomplished.

THE PLAN

Funds requested offer the level needed to complete a differentiated staffing model during 1970-71 and initiate it during September, 1971. These funds will be used to train an in-house leadership team that will be charged with changing the District's staff utilization structure and with the sustenance of the new, differentiated structure. Efforts of the "change agent team" concept will be carefully studied to ascertain its efficacy; hence, the need for a meaningful evaluation scheme.

Salient elements of the differentiated staff model envisioned for adoption during September 1970, are explained in the following paragraphs. The following commentary represents the best effort and intent of District personnel at this time. It is not unreasonable to believe intensive study between September 1970 and September 1971 will result in refinements and improvements upon current thought.
ROLE SPECIFICATIONS

Superintendent: Coordinator of overall planning, fiscal and community
dimensions of the Quabbin Regional District operation.
His responsibilities include general educational leadership
for the four elementary systems that feed pupils into
the Quabbin Regional High School. Salary: $20,500

Principal: Coordinator of the Quabbin Regional High School overall
program including instructional staffing, utilization of
facilities and organizational management. His role is
central to the cooperative decision making, systems
planning and management, and effective evaluation
strategies. Within the concept of a change agency,
his role is that of key agent responsible for promoting
the enthusiasm and spirited involvement of staff.

Eleven months Salary: $13,000

Learning Coordinators: Thirteen full-time certified personnel who command
varied unique competencies in addition to teaching know-how for students and staff. They are employed on a ten
month contract plus two weeks of curriculum planning and
evaluation work during the summer recess. The positions
demand in-service leadership, systems planning, and
cooperative decision making on a regular basis in addition
to teaching and supervision of instruction.

Ten months Salary Range: $10,000--$16,000

Senior Teachers: Full-time certified personnel who command at least one
unique competency in addition to teaching know-how.
These positions have yet to be worked out through
negotiations procedures, but it is planned to deal with
this matter in the immediate future as negotiations get
Teachers: Full-time certified personnel who prefer or best function with instructional responsibilities. Some part-time certified personnel may be employed in this category. Contracts are arranged for ten months period with 165 days of teaching and service scheduled.

Salary Range: $8000 to $12,000

Note: This category, like the Senior Teacher category, is still subject to negotiations procedures.

In addition to these roles, student personnel will be utilized in varied ways within the team, and community personnel possessing unique and useful talents will be used within the staff structure.

ROLE FUNCTIONS

Superintendent: It is his responsibility to maintain the overall aspects of the District operation; for portraying the system to the Committee and public; and for effective management of all contracted and legal requirements of the system. He is also a chief advisor for the negotiations committee of the School Committee.

Principal: He will be assigned to "hands-on" instruction and counseling of students with approximately twenty percent (20%) of his time devoted to such activities. He will be responsible for the management of systems planning and designs being implemented. His leadership is exercised primarily in the instructional area with focus on the curriculum organizational
aspects. He coordinates the supervision of teachers and other staff involved with the learning climate. He will have immediate priorities for the evaluation of the newly created positions called "Learning Coordinators" to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the role definitions as well as the performances of the individuals within each role. He will have the added responsibility of presenting monthly progress report and curriculum information reports to the School Committee. Keeping lines of communications open and exercised with be another leadership role for the principal. Educational leadership rather than school management will be his priority.

**Learning Coordinators:** Each of the thirteen coordinators has an individual job description as described in the following sections. Each has his individual assignments, but each is also a member of several "task Forces" created to work on school-wide problems and programs. The Learning Coordinators as a group meet regularly as a type of Learning Council to translate to each other the activities of each Learning Unit (See Appendix) and to exercise sensitivity to strengths and weaknesses of any and all aspects of the life and learning climate of the school. Individually and collectively the coordinators are expected to accelerate the involvement of all staff in improved guidance services through teacher involvement. In-service leadership is also expected to come from within this group with immediate priority devoted to (a) educational accountability through the organization of LEARNING UNITS based upon measurable outcomes. (b) more
effective learning through attention to individualized instruction, increased use of technology and multi-media, increased utilization of paraprofessionals and interns. (c) diagnosis and improvement of reading weaknesses.

The individual job descriptions are:

1. **JHS LEARNING MANAGER**
   - Coordination of overall development of new JHS organization
   - Coordination of guidance in JHS
   - Daily management of JHS activities
   - JHS Discipline
   - Teaching 8-10 periods per week
   - Teacher supervision
   - Coordination of JHS activities (planning)
   - In-service training of teachers

2. **SHS ENGLISH-HUMANITIES COORDINATOR**
   - Teaching 12-15 periods per week
   - Curriculum organization and planning (including writing)
   - In-service training of teachers (in and out of department)
   - Teacher supervision
   - Program coordination and management
   - Guidance coordination
   - Cooperative budget planning and management with SOCIAL STUDIES-HUMANITIES
   - Coordination of intern and teacher aide programs
   - Overall school planning and evaluation linking JHS and SHS

3. **SHS SOCIAL STUDIES-HUMANITIES**
   - Same as above but with emphasis in Social Studies. The two positions are seen presently as dual or linked leadership responsibilities with heavy emphasis next year on strong curriculum organization involving the development of LEARNING UNITS that integrate guidance into curriculum and draft written units that identify measurable outcomes expected of learners.

4. **HUMANITIES-PUBLIC RELATIONS-PROJECT WRITING**
   - Teaching 15 periods per week in Social Studies & Humanities
   - Curriculum organization and planning (including writing)
   - Development and implementation of schoolwide public relations program
   - Organization and dissemination of in-house curriculum activities
   - Coordination of planning and development of Federal Projects (writer)
   - Organizing and keeping thorough records of Steering Committee, I/C Council, and Special Task Force activities.
   - Working closely with SYSTEMS SPECIALISTS
5. SYSTEMS SPECIALIST-NJROTC DIRECTOR

A. Teaching 15 periods per week in NJROTC
B. Establishing, maintaining a system for plotting, controlling, evaluating
time and energy distributions of all staff. Using PPBS, PERT and/or
other systems visualize all significant changes proposed and implemented.
Interpret such a systematic approach to staff, administration, and
Committee. Include application of such a systems approach to curriculum
development and program implementation.
C. Research coordination and dissemination

6. JHS CURRICULUM SPECIALIST

A. Teaching 15 periods per week
B. In-service leadership and coordination of JHS curriculum planning
C. In-service leadership in teaching methods and materials usage
D. Curriculum materials selection
E. Curriculum writing
F. Evaluation of program and activity effectiveness
G. Leadership in implementing guidance and reading into curriculum
H. Leadership in overall understanding and implementation of JHS objectives
I. Involvement of parents and students in understanding JHS
J. Linking elementary and JHS curriculum
K. Linking JHS and SHS curriculum
L. Leadership in a general staff inquiry into alternatives for improving
   JHS learning
M. Leadership in in-service work dealing with learning theory and childhood
development as it applies to JHS group

7. JHS CURRICULUM SPECIALIST

Same as above with subject area speciality in Social Studies.

8. JHS DIAGNOSTIC-READING SPECIALIST

A. Teaching 15-20 periods per week (including group testing, diagnosis)
B. In-service training of staff in reading development
C. In-service training of staff in screening for learning problems
D. Supervision of teaching of reading
E. Planning and implementing strong AUDITING PROGRAM together with
   other JHS Curriculum specialists resulting in PROFILE of LEARNING
   STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES for each JHS child.
F. Curriculum planning & development including reading as integral
   part of subject field instruction
G. Analysis of instructional materials from readability focus
H. Training of aides to assist in reading program
I. Leadership in overall planning and evaluation

9. VOCATIONAL-CAREER-INDUSTRIAL CURRICULUM SPECIALIST

A. Leadership and coordination of all programs designed to lead learners
   into occupational-career fields generally associated with work entry
   immediately following high school. Existing programs in Business Ed;
   Industrial Arts; Home Ec. and Basic Studies will be linked and expanded
   into Work-Study on the job training; industrial and vocational guidance,
etc.
B. Teaching 15-20 periods per week (including group guidance and counseling)
C. Curriculum development and planning linked to other fields
D. In-service training and pre-service training of teachers and learning aids
E. Overall budget and systems management—coordinated with Principal and SYSTEMS SPECIALIST

10. SCIENCE-MATH COORDINATORS JHS

A. Teaching 15 periods per week
B. In-service training of teachers with curriculum organization
C. Curriculum organization & planning incorporating principles of "guidance based curriculum", "reading based curriculum", "moving toward individually prescribed instruction", "flexible grouping", "independent learning", "linking math and science", "integrating environmental education", etc.
D. Leadership in overall program planning and evaluation with specialization in research and evaluation

11. ATHLETICS-ACTIVITIES-GUIDANCE

A. Teaching 15 periods per week. (including group guidance & counseling)
B. Coordination of total athletic & activity programs JHS & SHS
C. Cooperative planning, implementation, and evaluation of Guidance activities including general school programs such as assemblies, career days, college admissions information programs, guidance films, guidance centers and resources, etc.
D. Public relations and publications coordination in above fields, Handbooks, bulletins, etc. linked with PUBLIC RELATIONS

12. INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA-RESOURCE CENTERS

A. Teaching 10 periods per week.
B. In-service leadership (formal & informal) of staff with effective use an application of varieties of instructional media & technology
C. Supervision of instructional media center(s)
D. Training of aides in management of audiovisual services & equipment
E. Evaluation of various new media in field
F. Coordination of scheduling and use of film rentals, etc.
G. Training and supervision of Student Media Service Corp.
H. Cooperative leadership in overall planning for changes that involve more technology and development of media centers throughout the school.

13. ASSISTANT SHS PRINCIPAL

A. Daily school management activities dealing with staff and student personnel management.
B. Concentrated trouble shooting in matters of discipline, school attendance, plant usage, cafeteria practices, etc.
C. Coordinating Intern Program
D. Working as guidance counselor with difficult adjustment cases
E. Acting principal in absence of principal
**Senior Teachers:** They assume prime responsibility for the operation and implementation of the instructional program. Each has interests and skills in providing counseling and guidance instruction to pupils in large and small groups. Senior Teachers have a thorough knowledge of curriculum organizational strategies that include "behaviorally stated objectives" and "individually prescribed instruction". These teachers are able to translate or prescribe learning activities for utilization of "learning aides" and "student learning aides" as well as "independent learning". They are capable of selecting and using a variety of learning media in order to promote a set of prescribed objectives. They are likewise able to administer and interpret a variety of measuring or evaluating activities and translate results to learners. A priority for the time and talent of Senior Teachers is that invested in modifying the learner's behavior. This is accomplished via constant study of needs, program efficacy, and staff performance. Team leadership will be exercised by such teachers. Self-evaluation skills should be mastered and applied.

**Teachers:** They invest nearly all of their time facilitating instruction in behalf of the learner. Teachers execute the instructional program set forth, they serve as a resource for learners engaged in independent inquiry, they arrange and utilize multi-media resources, and so forth.

**Non-certificated Personnel:** Pre-service interns are absorbed by the instructional setting as expeditiously as possible. Personal capabilities dictate the time schedule for extent and depth of involvement. Paraprofessionals work with individuals
and small groups to follow-up instruction and to offer advice, they assume responsibility for maintaining varied school records, they help teachers plan and execute instructional plans, and they assist in assessing pupil progress. Technicians serve specific functions needed to maintain the differentiated staff scheme.

Teams, made up of individuals from each staff category, meet regularly to plan, to implement, and to reflect upon programs aimed at the learner. Underlying this new scheme is the belief that the learner will derive more benefits from it than from existing conventional schemes.

THE "MODUS OPERANDI"

The project will be housed within the Quabbin Regional School District. Corridon F. Trask, the Superintendent, and Kent F. Bailey, Principal, will assume prime responsibility for the overall undertaking. Professors of Education at U-Mass will be responsible for the training dimensions. Two stages are planned within the context of this Phase One proposal:

1. September 1, 1970 - June 15, 1971: During this period, management plans will be set forth, part-time specialized in-service training will be initiated, a "state of the art" study of present staff utilization practices in the District will be undertaken, and the needed evaluation scheme will be devised.

2. Summer, 1970: An intensive six week institute will be offered to expand leadership skills of the Superintendent, Principal, and thirteen learning coordinators.

Each of these stages is amplified in the following paragraphs.
Initially, training activities need to be worked out with University of Massachusetts' officials so that selected "learning coordinators" can begin to prepare for the change to take place during the following year.

These fifteen individuals will work with members of the U-Mass School of Education's evaluation center, research center, and center for the study of educational innovation. Plans for managing and evaluating the process of change will be evolved, plans for an assessment of the current state of staff utilization in the District will be set forth, and plans will be made to meet training needs of the fifteen immediately and during a six week summer institute.

Initial training opportunities will include the following:

(1) Exposure to "areas of competence" (such as learning theory, curriculum revision, evaluation, human relations, the process of change, diagnostic and prescriptive techniques, cost-benefit analytic techniques and PPBS, and psychometrics, to mention salient examples) which need to be built into the repertoire of the instructional coordinators will be the first order of training. A frame of reference, behaviorally-stated objectives, and an implementation plan, will be offered for the Fellow's enlightenment. Based upon this exposure, the Fellows will design and follow-up their own initial training schedule in collaboration with the U-Mass trainers.

(2) A series of short workshops aimed at orienting the entire Quabbin staff to the theory and practice of staff differentiation will be offered by members of the U-Mass Center for the Study of Educational Innovation. These workshops will focus upon anticipated changes in the school operation which will call for considerable behavioral modification on their part.

The management plans evolved will be subjected to external evaluation prior to the summer institute; the "state of the art" survey will be completed by June of 1971; and plans for the summer training program will be solidified.
by May of 1971 at the latest.

2. **Summer, 1971 (Dates to be arranged)**

Only intent can be offered at this time for the six week institute. The institute will be designed to serve the needs of the "Learning Coordinators" and, it will provide a setting for refining plans for differentiating the staff in September 1971.

The previously-mentioned "state of the art" survey of personnel utilization practices in the District offers a point of departure for the trainees to set forth needs and then arrange experiences to meet these needs. They will have a unique opportunity to plan their own educational experience for the summer, with the District's best interest providing a frame of reference.

Once plans have been solidified, every effort will be made to obtain appropriate training staff to expedite the plans. The University of Massachusetts' School of Education offers a rich source of such talent which can be utilized as needed. Temple City, California is another recognized source of potential training talent.

Steps will be taken during the six week institute to personalize the inquiry process. Performance criteria will be employed, alternate modes of inquiry will be encouraged, and individual initiative will be stimulated.

An important outcome of the institute will be clarification of details to be put into effect when the differentiated staff plan is implemented at the end of the summer. The institute will also provide the important human relations and interaction skills and habits of the team of leadership that will be living with and molding alternatives it has decided to implement in the school system.

**4. EVALUATION**

This proposal seeks to institutionalize change in order to provide the flexible programming needed to keep pace with social and technological changes. Such an institutionalized change design requires continuous
decision making throughout the planning and operation of the program. These decisions provide a structure through which the project can be shaped to better meet the identified needs stated in the program, to modify the objectives designed to meet these needs, and to up-date the up-grade program components in the light of generated empirical evidence. Without data upon which to base these decisions, there exists only faint hope that the new model to be created will contain more social relevance than do current existing programs of the 19th century model.

Too often evaluation has been viewed only as a source of validity substantiation rather than being viewed as an essential source of feedback placed in an active role in program design and operation. In the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, and Product) model, evaluation is conceived of as a source of feedback for administrative and operational decision-making. Both an overall evaluation seeking to provide evidence of the outcomes of the enterprise and a component operation designed to monitor each part of the program for operational flaws and for component inadequacies are planned.

The design of the overall evaluation of the plan set forth must begin with an analysis of the expected outcomes projected by the program objectives. The proposed outcomes suggest four types of final products, namely: (1) training increments for educational personnel at elementary, secondary and higher educational levels, (2) increased student education benefits through added efficiency of instructional programs (hence, increased achievement, better attitudes, more appropriate social adjustment, etc.), (3) innovative models of instruction and of personnel utilization including the development of appropriate instructional materials and administrative structures for transition and implementation; and (4) cooperative efforts between educational agencies at both the planning and operational stages of school programming. This general internal evaluation must be designed to include attempts to verify the presence of the four types of outcomes and to demonstrate that
these outcomes are a product of the program.

Once specific elements of the developmental themes are operationalized, plans can be made to obtain data about the four above-mentioned outcomes. Since operational decisions are incomplete at this time, it is difficult to treat evaluation intentions meaningfully. Precise evaluation plans cannot yet be related to proposed plans, because specific short, mid-term, and long-term goals are not spelled out. Once these goals are clearly set forth, a scheme can be described for evaluating this enterprise. Details of the scheme will be evolved during the 1970-71 school year.

5. BUDGET

Funds are sought to provide for the specialized training set forth, for the "state of the art" study mentioned, and for the evaluation scheme needed. Costs are projected, then pooled, for each of these categories. The District will offer its best effort to fulfill work commitments indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Specialized Training (Academic Year and Summer)</th>
<th>19,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trainers....................................</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expenses.....................................</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning Coordinator's Sustenance..............</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. &quot;State of the Art&quot; Survey</th>
<th>2,300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Date gathering and analysis..................</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written copy preparation and reproduction..</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Evaluation Planning</th>
<th>3,750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consultation..................................</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expenses.....................................</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COST $25,550
APPENDIX E

NEWS RELEASES
BARRE — The Quabbin Regional School District Committee will hold a special session at 7:45 p.m. Nov. 2 in the school auditorium to explain Quabbin's guidance program.

Mrs. Marcia Johnson, committee chairman, said the meeting is the result of requests from several residents.

The School Committee and school administration will explain existing and planned guidance services at the school as well as the ‘current problems and issues associated with changes being made in the Quabbin system.”

To make the meeting more relevant to those who attend, the committee has asked that anyone wishing a particular topic or issue to be examined or explained to register such interest in writing with the school superintendent before Nov. 1.

The questions will be made a part of the program presentation, according to the school board.

The scheduled program will begin at 7:45 with Super. Corridon F. Trask’s assessment of the needs and structure of the school’s guidance program.

Residents will then have an opportunity to respond to Trask’s remarks addressing their questions to the committee, school Principal Kent F. Bailey and Trask.

The session will close with small-group discussions and a large-group feedback session.
Group Interactions: 10:00 - 10:15 a.m., Feedback and Large Group Interaction.

Follow-up: 10:15 - 11:00 a.m., Follow-up Group Interaction.

Parent-Teacher Conferences: 10:15 - 11:00 a.m., and 11:00 - 12:00 p.m., followed by a Parent-Teacher Conference.

School Committee: 10:15 - 11:00 a.m., School Committee Meeting.

Guidance Needs Assessment:
- Grade 6-8: Guidance Needs Assessment.
- Grade 9-12: Guidance Needs Assessment,

School Committee: 10:15 - 11:00 a.m., School Committee Meeting.

Guidance Needs Assessment:
- Grade 6-8: Guidance Needs Assessment.
- Grade 9-12: Guidance Needs Assessment,

School Committee: 10:15 - 11:00 a.m., School Committee Meeting.

Guidance Needs Assessment:
- Grade 6-8: Guidance Needs Assessment.
- Grade 9-12: Guidance Needs Assessment,

School Committee: 10:15 - 11:00 a.m., School Committee Meeting.

Guidance Needs Assessment:
- Grade 6-8: Guidance Needs Assessment.
- Grade 9-12: Guidance Needs Assessment,
Special Meeting Called
On Quabbin Guidance Unit

BARRE — The Quabbin Regional High School’s guidance program will be explained at a special session of the district school committee at 7:45 p.m. Tuesday in the school auditorium.

The special session is the result of several requests from “local citizens,” according to Mrs. Marcia Johnson, regional committee chairman.

The School Committee and administration will explain the existing and anticipated guidance services at the school as well as the “current problems and issues associated with changes being made in the Quabbin system.”

The committee has asked that anyone wishing a particular topic or issue to be examined or sized publicly by both students explained to write to the superintendent of schools before Monday. Questions received by that date will be made a part of the program presentation, according to the school board.

The program is scheduled to begin at 7:45 with School Supt. Coridon F. Trask giving his assessment of the needs and structure of the guidance program.

Residents will then have the opportunity of responding to Trask’s remarks, addressing their questions to the committee, School Principal Kent F. Bailey and Trask.

The session will end with a small-group “discussion” and a large-group “feedback session.”

The school’s guidance program has recently been criticized publicly by both students and teachers.
Teachers Drop Raise Bid, Ask Bosses to Take Pay Cut

By JOYCE R. ELIAN

Telegram Spencer Bureau

Administrative pay cuts are: Ashwick, Hubbardston and

BARRE — The Quabbin Region teachers Association has asked to keep
their raises. The salary schedule which

(Quabbin) voted Tuesday that it in their 1971-72 salaries and that for the next two school years
would not seek a pay raise for these amounts comprise their base scales of $7,000 to $11,500 in
next year and that it would ask 1972-73 salaries...

Highly Paid

The association also unani-

The association noted that for a bachelor's plus 15 credits,
mously gave School Supt. Corri-
don P. Trask Jr., a vote of "no been "clearly among the high-
Quabbin administrators have $7,200 to $11,858 in 12 steps from
minimum for a master's de-
confidence" in his leadership paid in the state for...degree, $7,600 to $11,858 in 12 steps
and in policies he is implement-
ing at the regional junior-senior
high school.

The teachers said their "no $12,156 in 12 steps from min-
against seeking a pay raise for taken after considerable delib-
nation that it was showing conflict concerning what the teachers and School Com-
exists "genuine concern for local ORTA regards as deteriorating...committee agreed to that schedule
in light of the present educational conditions at the ju-
for the 1971-72 contract last
high school." February, but have not been

The teachers noted that they...The association listed the..."are refusing to seek salary increase in a press release agreement since. Their last com-
base increases, even though last...saying they give raise expired June 30.
year (they) worked under a...evidence of the teachers' concern. The two sides are bargaining
salary schedule based on one...minimum in the region of the education offered have not determined which year
state, and have not yet received at Quabbin Regional high School or years it will cover.
the increases provided for by and their sincere concern for Negotiation sessions, open to
the salary agreement of last the taxpayers of the communities public, are held from 7:30 to
February because of the Pensions which they serve."

11 a.m. Mondays in the high
dent's wage freeze." The communities are Barre, school library.
Teachers Reject Raise; Score Superintendent

BARRE — The Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association (QRTA) has voted to seek no pay raise for next year and to suggest administrators take a 10 per cent cut in their 1971-72 salaries and should maintain that pay level for the 1972-73 school year.

The association said Quabbin administrators have been "clearly among the highest paid in the state" for comparable school districts.

The salary schedule which teachers have agreed to keep for the next two years has scales of $7,000 to $9,800 in eight steps from minimum for a bachelor's degree, $7,200 to $10,656 in 12 steps from minimum for a master's degree plus 15 credits. $7,400 to $11,514 in 12 steps from minimum for a master's degree plus 15 credits and $7,600 to $12,163 in 12 steps from minimum for a master's plus 30 credits.

That schedule was adopted last February for a 1971-72 contract, but teachers and school board have not been able to reach full contract agreement since then.

Their last contact was June 30, and they are hoping gaining for a new contract.

Trask OKs Pay Cut; Responds to Charge

BARRE — Corridon F. Trask, Jr., superintendent of Quabbin Regional Junior-Senior High School, said this morning that if the school's teachers will accept a general 10 per cent cut in salaries throughout the system, he will be the first to submit to the cut.

"If the teachers are really serious about the local tax problem," Trask said, "they would offer to take a salary cut along with the recommendation that the administration do so."

Trask said such a cut in administration salaries amounts to very little compared with what a similar cut in teachers' salaries would save the taxpayers.

"I find it very difficult to respond intelligently to such a generalization," Trask said.

"I would hope that when the association takes a position like that, it would be specific," Trask said.

Trask said it is unclear whether the lack of confidence in him, the programs the administration and school board are implementing, or a part of these programs.

"When you get outside the association, I think you find that teachers recognize that at least some of the programs have merit," Trask said.

Trask said it is up to the school board and the community to determine whether improvements and competence are lacking.

"The association can certainly exercise its point of view, but does not make the decisions," Trask said.
SPEAKERS at annual meeting of Massachusetts Division of American Cancer Society were Francis W. Hatch (left), president of Castine Community Hospital, Castine, Me., and Samuel Seegal, vice president of the Massachusetts Division. Five Massachusetts cancer researchers received grants worth up to $10,000.

Tax-Conscious Teachers Vote Down Raise Request

BARRE (AP) — A regional teachers association in western Massachusetts has voted not to seek a pay increase "in the light of present economic conditions."

At the same time, a spokesman said yesterday, the Union Regional Teachers Assn. voted to ask administration to take a 10 per cent pay cut. The spokesman said the union administration is looking into one of the lowest minimums in the state for school districts of comparable size and characteristics."

The association said the decision not to seek a pay raise was made "in the light of present economic conditions."

The teachers said they arrived at the decision after last year's salary schedule was voted to be one of the lowest minimums in the state. They added that the raising of teachers' minimums would have an impact on the region's economy.

The teachers' raise was proposed by the students' union, but has not yet reached the hands of the administration.

The agreement provided a pay scale of $7,000 for a teacher with a bachelor's degree, $7,500 if a master's degree and $8,000 for a teacher with a master's plus 30 credits.
Quabbin Supt. Will Cut Pay
If Teachers Will Cut Theirs

BARRE — School Supt Corrigan understanding the parallel drawn to the situation at the
Regional Junior-Senior High Trask took exception to the school administrator's suggestion that they would seek a pay raise this year,Teachers also will accept a general decrease in salary, which guarantees a normal step
The Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association (QRTA) voted Trask said the administration Tuesday to seek no pay raises has no such schedule and he
for next year and to suggest all salary increases in the school administrators take a 10 per cent cut have declined.
year and lasting through the school year.
The teachers passed resolutions that were recommended "at the town meeting" to increase their concern for taxpayers in the four years of cutting school costs, but
the school serves, a he questioned such a proposal.
The QRTA release said Wednesday, coming from the teachers' association.
The towns are Barre, Hardwick, Hubbardston and Oakham.
"If the teachers are really serious about the local tax problem," Trask said yesterday, "they would offer to take a
salary cut along with the recommendation that the administrator do so."

"No-Confidence" Vote
"The QRTA, in addition to passing the salary recommendations, gave Trask a vote of "no confidence" in his leadership and programs he is implementing at the school.
Trask said it is difficult for him to comment on that vote, but it is clear that the move was a "general"
to very little compared with Trask's actions appear to be what a similar cut in teachers salaries would save the taxpayers.
Trask said he has trouble under-
Students Boycotting Cafeteria
To Express Protest at Quabbin

BARRE — A student protest spokesman and one of those involved in its fourth day at Quabbin who started the protest, said Principal Bailey said this is probably not unusual at the start of a school year, and that problems are likely to be corrected as the year progresses.

The main element of the protest is a boycott of the school cafeteria. It was initiated Friday by a group of students who is a means of protest against the administration's handling of the issues is unbounded.

Displeased by 'Situation'

Nicholas Borelli said the lunch boycott is in the right direction. "The administration feels most day at the school. With an effort to improve the cafeteria menu involves lunch groups. He feels the school, but that it also involves.

Principal Kent F. Bailey said the lunch hall is a costly one to run. "We've been sick of the way everything's been handled," he said. Bailey said the cafeteria is "in the right direction." School officials have served about 300 students this week.

A spokesman said the concerns of the union are the "union" is protesting what it feels is a turnover rate of teachers. Bailey said the teachers who have left the system "have, individually, good reasons for doing so."

Several Complaints

Other complaints of the union are:

- No trained guidance counselors.
- Bailey said this is not a fact. He said there is a year-old change in the system whereby teachers become involved as "student advisors." But that doesn't necessarily mean "certified" substitute teachers, and he feels this is fairly well achieved.
- No certified librarian.
- Bailey said this is true, but it seems to be about the library program is some teachers have also complained about the guidance student body. Bailey said this is true, but it seems to be about the library program is some teachers have also complained about the guidance student body.

"The teachers council, the official voice of the students, it is headed by a teacher with advanced degrees, who could teach..."
The teachers are on a strike as of today.

President of the Teachers Association, Mr. John Smith, stated that the teachers are on strike because their demands for a better salary and benefits are not being met. The teachers have been protesting for several weeks, and the administration has not responded to their demands.

The Teachers Association has also stated that they will not return to work until their demands are met. They have stated that they will not return until the administration agrees to a new contract that includes higher salaries and better benefits.

In response to the strike, the administration has stated that they are willing to negotiate, but they are not willing to meet the teachers' demands. They have stated that they will only negotiate if the teachers return to work.

The strike has caused a lot of disruption in the school system, and parents and students are concerned about the future of education in the district.

The Teachers Association has also stated that they will not return to work until the administration agrees to a new contract that includes higher salaries and better benefits.

In response to the strike, the administration has stated that they are willing to negotiate, but they are not willing to meet the teachers' demands. They have stated that they will only negotiate if the teachers return to work.

The strike has caused a lot of disruption in the school system, and parents and students are concerned about the future of education in the district.
Quabbin board urges citizen involvement

BARRE—The 1972 Quabbin Regional District budget will be presented as a first draft proposal at the Quabbin Regional committee meeting tomorrow, October 21. Program additions and program changes being proposed by the Quabbin staff and/or administration will likewise be presented and explained to the committee.

Supt. of Schools, Corridon Trask Jr. stated that the Quabbin committee has sent invitations to selectmen and finance committee members of the four-member towns of the Quabbin Regional to attend meetings scheduled for the express purpose of analyzing budget proposals and making 1972 budget decisions. He also expresses on behalf of the committee, the urgency and importance of active involvement of citizens of the four towns. This is the right time for parents, taxpayers, and interested citizens, along with students and teachers, to make their concerns known to the committee and to become better informed about the problems being faced in light of overburdened taxpayers, poor local economic conditions, teacher negotiations strategies, and administrative proposals that promote changes in programs and staffing patterns.

In light of the recent registration of concerns about several elements of the Quabbin program by students and by the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association, it is even more critical that all parties concerned about educational conditions and alternatives that seem reasonable for committee consideration make such proposals directly to the committee as part of the decision-making requirements facing it during the next two months.

The third Thursday of each month will be used specifically for budget study.
The success of the parent teacher association in winning teachers' support for the school's financial campaign was due to the formation of the parent-teacher association. In the fall of 1973, the association met to discuss the need for increased funding for the school. The meeting was attended by a large number of parents, who expressed their support for the campaign. As a result of this meeting, the association was able to raise the necessary funds to support the school.

The focus of the campaign was on increasing the school's budget for the following year. The association worked with the school administration to develop a budget that would support the school's needs for the coming year. The association also worked with local businesses to secure additional funding for the school.

In the end, the campaign was successful, and the school was able to secure the necessary funds to support its programs. The parent-teacher association played a key role in this success, and its efforts were recognized by the school administration.

The success of the parent-teacher association's campaign was a testament to the importance of parent involvement in the education of their children. It showed that when parents work together, they can achieve great things for their children's education.
BARRE — The Quabbin Regional School District Committee and teachers' association have resumed bargaining for a new contract, but have not determined which year it will cover.

The committee and teachers started a review of the 1969-71 contract last night to see how points of that document could be retained or changed. The contract expired June 30.

The teachers, in rejecting a school board proposal to work on a contract draft resulting from bargaining last spring, indicated they might file an unfair labor practice charge against the committee because of that draft.

The teachers said that contract proposal was presented by the School Committee as the final draft of a 1971-72 contract which the two sides agreed on the compilation of a "working" draft of a 1971-72 contract.

Eugene Caille, a representative of the Massachusetts Teachers Association who is negotiating for the teachers, said the school board draft was not an accurate representation of the bargaining.

"Inflated" Proposals

"We feel some of the proposals have been inflated," Caille said. He said teachers feel they have been "steamrolled" by the school board and would "not be amused" into accepting a contract so the committee can meet its deadline.

Caille said in drawing up its contract draft, the school board "unilaterally changed" some of the proposals. He said the board made other unilateral policy changes in the past.

Matthew McCann of Worcester, an attorney representing the school board, said the committee felt its draft was a bilateral effort.

The committee and teachers had not settled issues of guidance duties for teachers, extracurricular positions for learning coordinators or hiring ancillary personnel, but had agreed on the rest of the contract, McCann said.

"You say quite casually that these (contract proposals) don't represent bargaining, but the School Committee says categorically that this is not true," McCann said.

McCann asked that the teachers accept the contract draft as a base for new bargaining since negotiations from last spring would not be wasted.

"Just because a lot of work was done doesn't mean it was done right," Caille said. He said teachers accepted a salary schedule "on good faith" before other contract items and "things suddenly changed" in their bargaining with the school board for fringe benefits.

"The teachers have gone on good faith about as far as they're going to go," Caille said.

The two sides have agreed to meet from 7:30 to 11 p.m. Mondays for negotiations. The sessions are open to the public. Until last night's meeting, they were closed.
Quabbin Committee, Teachers Begin Contract Talks Again

BARRE — The Quabbin Regional School Committee and the Quabbin Teachers Association agreed on the rest of the contract, McCann said.

"You say quite casually that these (contract proposals) don't represent bargaining. But the School Committee says categorically that this is not true," McCann told the teachers.

Wasted Effort

McCann asked that the teachers accept the contract draft as a base for new bargaining so the negotiations from last spring would not be a wasted effort. "Just because a lot of work has been done does not mean it was done right," Caille said.

He said the teachers accepted the salary schedule "in good faith" before other contract items and "things suddenly started changing" in their bargaining with the school board for fringe benefits.

The teachers have gone on a new scout without agreement on a new contract.

The Quabbin Teachers Association representative negotiating with the board are reviewing the 1970-71 teachers, said the school board contract, which expired June 30. Draft was not an accurate representation of the bargaining agreement they will retain or last spring.

The two sides have been negotiating for more than a year without agreeing on a new contract. They have agreed on a 1971-72 salary schedule.

Caille said that in drawing up a new draft that the contract draft, the school teachers rejected a committee board "unilaterally" changed proposal to work from a contract teacher's salary hours, paid other salary changes in the past.

The teachers also indicated that they might bring an unfair labor practice charge against the school board, said the contract they're going to go," Caille said.

The committee felt its draft was a bias effort.

The committee and teachers meet from 7:30 to 11 p.m. Monday.

The teachers said that the had not settled issues of prorated days in the high school library contract proposal was presented during the teachers' extra duty negotiations. The sessions by the School Committee as the teachers' positions for learning are open to the public. Until a final draft of a 1971-72 contract coordinators or hiring of an attitude's meeting, they were when the two sides had agreed collectively personal, but had closed.
BARRE — The state Labor Relations Commission has dismissed an unfair labor practice suit filed by the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association (QRTA) against the Quabbin Regional School Committee.

The petition was dismissed on the state's General Laws.

Dec. 12, after teachers and their School Committee had presented information on their dispute School Committee interfered with the commission examiner and, with "the formation, existence before the petition reached the school board's administration" of the stage of a formal commission hearing.

The QRTA filed the petition Oct. 12. Teachers met Oct. 22, and the school board Oct. 22, moved from the bargaining unit with an examiner for the Labor positions and employees whose existence and compensation was included in a collective bargaining agreement ratified in February of 1971.

The commission dismissed Dec. 19 and the school board denied yesterday the charges.

In light of the commission's action, the school board has suspended contract negotiations, according to a release yesterday. The school board denied all the charges.
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Menegoni Resigns
From School Units

BARRE — Anthony J. Menegoni has resigned from the School Committee, and in effect, the Quabbin Regional High School Committee, effective immediately.

Menegoni submitted his resignation yesterday to Mrs. Frances F. Sullivan, town clerk. He is the second school board member in as many weeks to resign.

Last week Albert J. Regienus, also a selectman, resigned from both boards.

Menegoni gave no reason in the letter of resignation for his action.

Regienus said last week his resignation was because of lack of time to devote to the post and because he disagrees with the cost of programs recommended by the school administration.

The Barre school board automatically serves as this town’s representatives to the Quabbin committee.

Menegoni was re-elected in March to his second three-year term. He was appointed in August, 1967, to fill a vacancy on the board and was elected to a full term in March, 1963.

Menegoni was unavailable for comment today.
Resolved by March

Task Wynn Guidance

LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

We’ve heard from the students. We’ve heard from the teachers. When will we hear from the school committee and administration concerning the problems at the Ouabbin Regional High School. It’s my guess that we won’t. Perhaps the committee feels that if it lets the issues blow over people will forget. The committee seriously misjudges the legitimate concerns of responsible citizens if it thinks the community doesn’t care about its children’s education. Already there is serious talk about forming a parents’ action group to impress upon the committee the need for concrete answers and concrete programs to redress the problem at the high school. It’s a shame the committee is too emotionally involved in its past decision to act on its own.

One need not even judge the merits of the teachers’ students and parents position. The hard practical fact is the teachers do not believe in the kind of activities they are required to do. It may be a surprise to administration, but the days of authoritarian rule have gone. When a group of adults, be they teachers, assembly line workers or doctors are asked to think and behave differently there had better be at hand the kind of inspired leadership which can cause an act of will to be made. Our teachers evidently have no faith in the leadership here or these unorthodox programs would succeed.

The solution to this problem is obvious. The committee and administration must be made aware by phone call or personal contact that we as the taxpayers District care enough to demand some answers to the unfortunate situation in our school. Furthermore these answers must guarantee more than a vague defense of the status quo.

They must contain solutions as well.

Glen A. Hersey
Open Letter to residents of the Quabbin Regional School District

We, the members of the Quabbin Teachers' Association, feel a moral obligation to communicate to the public our position with regard to the rumored deteriorating conditions at Quabbin Regional High School.

The association by its very nature functions as a monitoring agency for administration policies, seeking to assess the impact of those decisions on the total educational program of the school. As professional educators in the community, we bear an obligation to see that the needs of students, parents, and taxpayers are well served.

Teachers at Quabbin Regional High School find that the quality of their classroom teaching has been impaired by changing conditions at the school. In the first years of the school's operation, teachers taught five classes a day, spent one period in preparation and one period in giving academic counseling to their students. Faculty members were available to give extra help to students experiencing difficulty in their studies, supervise the make-up work of those who had been absent, and suggest advanced independent study for those with a special interest in the subject.

Now, the time formerly given to academic counseling has been abolished and in its place teachers have been assigned to study halls and/or guidance-like duties, which were formerly handled by certified guidance personnel. Those additional duties demand a considerable expenditure of teacher time, talent, and energy on non-teaching tasks. Faculty, however, continue to provide academic counseling, but at the expense of their preparation time. Students suffer either from a lack of extra help or from less carefully prepared lessons.

The size of the faculty has been reduced while the student population has increased. As a result, class sizes have grown and students cannot receive the individual attention which the teachers feel is necessary.

Educational innovations at Quabbin have floundered without adequate direction or evaluation of previously existing programs. The student body and staff have been used in guinea pig fashion for any educational whim of the school committee and its executive officer. This has caused severe confusion in the school. At this point, the instability of the educational situation at Quabbin makes it impossible for teachers to refine and revise curriculum or develop meaningful long-range plans.

The frustration felt by teachers is reflected in the high staff turnover of the last year, particularly among highly qualified and experienced staff members. The extra demands on teacher time and energy that have been added to beyond a full teaching load have necessarily resulted in dilution and mishandling of the teacher's classroom performance, and thus have created frustration and poor morale among the faculty.

It has been the policy of the teachers' association to attempt to work with the superintendent and school committee to ameliorate the deteriorating educational climate at Quabbin. The committee and its executive officer, however, have refused to act on the teachers' association's suggestions and grievances. Consequently, the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association feels a moral obligation not only to inform the public of its feelings but also to take legal action against the superintendent and the Quabbin Regional School Committee.
The past four years clearly
proved that the key to
educating the students
within our community
was the establishment
of a new, effective
teaching program.

This program
consisted of a series of
workshops and
seminars that
were designed to
improve the
educational
standards within
our schools.

The teachers
were trained in
new teaching
methods and
techniques, and
the students
benefited from
the increased
knowledge and
understanding
they gained.

As a result,
our students
achieved
impressive
grades, and our
community
became more
knowledgeable
and informed.

We are proud
of what we
have accomplished,
and we
continue to
work hard to
improve the
quality of
education in our
schools.

I hope you will
consider supporting
our efforts,
and I look
forward to
sharing
further
progress
with you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Budget request up $74,000

Quabbin Area Survey
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I didn't want to consult the teacher for help.
BARRE — The unfair labor practice suit filed by the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association (QRTA) against the Quabbin Regional School Committee has been dismissed by the state Labor Relations Commission.

Teachers and the school board had presented information on their negotiations dispute to a commission examiner, but the petition had not reached the stage of a formal commission hearing.

The QRTA filed the petition Oct. 12, and teachers met Oct. 28 and the school board Oct. 29 with an examiner for the Labor Relations Commission.

The commission dismissed the case Dec. 12, and the school board learned of the action Dec. 17, according to a release yesterday.

In light of the commission's action, the school board has asked the QRTA to resume contract negotiations.

Teachers and the school board suspended bargaining Nov. 22 pending the outcome of the unfair labor practice suit.

The QRTA charged in the suit the school board "interfered with, restrained and coerced . . . its employees in the exercise of their rights . . . " provided in the section on collective bargaining in the state's general laws.

Teachers also said the School Committee interfered with "the formation, existence and administration" of the teachers' association; failed to bargain in good faith, and "unilaterally and unlawfully removed from the bargaining unit positions and employees whose existence and compensation was included in a collective bargaining agreement jointly ratified in February of 1971 . . . ." The school board denied all the charges.

The school board and teachers have reached contract agreement only on salaries for this school year. Their last contract ended June 30, 1971.
Trask is Defended
By His Colleagues

BARRÉ — Coridon F. Trask Jr., Superintendent of Quabbin Regional Junior-Senior High School, has received the support of the school’s three other administrators in the wake of an attack on Trask by the school’s Teachers Association.

Defending Trask against last week’s vote of “no confidence” by the association are Kent F. Bailey, principal; Donald R. Finley, assistant principal; and Paul F. Alien, junior high school learning manager.

A release Friday by the three said:

“Every coin has two sides and the administrators of the Quabbin Regional School District, wish to make known to Mr. Coridon F. Trask Jr., that they extend their unanimous vote of confidence in him as an individual and as superintendent.”

“The citizens, students, and staff of the Quabbin district are fortunate beyond realization to have the benefit of Mr. Trask’s sincere and unselfish dedication toward the improvement of the total educational program.”

Trask has previously termed the association’s action a “generalization” and said it is “very difficult to respond intelligently” to it.

The association, which has formerly scored the administration and school practices at two other times recently, also said teachers would not seek a salary increase in the next contract and suggested that the administrators take a 10 per cent cut in pay.

Trask responded that he would take the cut if the teachers will. He said a cut in the administrators’ salaries amounts to very little compared to what a teachers’ cut would mean.

Bailey said Friday he had “no comment” on this part of the issue.
QUICKEN SURVEY TO BE DISCUSSED

FOUR-TOWN EVALUATION
 Quarshim Contract Plans Due

3-Year Pact Suggested by Board

In the planning committee which recently approved the three-year

plan, it was recommended that Quadrant be considered as an

option for the construction of a new school.

The school board has expressed interest in exploring

the possibility of a Quadrant plan, which would allow

for greater flexibility in the design and layout of the

school buildings.

The various districts within the county have

been consulted regarding their preferences for

the new school, and it is anticipated that a final

decision will be made soon.

The construction of the new school is expected to

begin within the next few months, with completion

scheduled for the start of the 2024-2025 academic year.
ment in connection with this pro-
posed plan.
ounced a survey would have to be
and the results were to be used in
endorsing the proposed plan.
Quabbin Board, Teachers Meet For Preliminary Contract Talk

BARRE - The Quabbin proposals to work with the next district School Committee and bargaining session, set for 7:30 p.m. on Nov. 15 in the high school, were reviewed by the School Committee. A three-year contract was suggested for a new contract. The two sides reached an agreement which would cover the salary schedule to be reconsidered each year. The teachers have not yet determined which years the contract will cover. Their last contract, agreed to bring written proposals to the School Committee, has expired June 30.

Matthew McCann, an attorney bargaining for the School Committee, suggested a three-year contract. The two sides also discussed procedures for negotiations, grievances, the school calendar, teacher assignments and teaching hours a workload.

Eugene Caille, a Massachusetts Teachers Association representative negotiating for the teachers, said that if they agreed to a three-year contract, other items such as sick leave, working hours and insurance benefits also should be negotiated on a yearly basis.

The two sides also discussed procedures for negotiations, grievances, the school calendar, teacher assignments and teaching hours a workload.

Caille asked to hold that part of the contract that says teachers must attend school for 180 days a school year, because the state law which sets that minimum does not stipulate that teachers be present. The law says only that school must be open. Caille said:

Object to Guidance Duty

He said the teachers might propose a 50-day work year, with the other 50 days spent getting training to qualify for guidance work.

Quabbin teachers have been assigned guidance duties the past two years and have protested, saying they are not qualified.

Discussion on teaching hours was limited because Caille said the School Committee had broken its contract in that respect.
Discussion of Guidance Problem
At Quabbin Brings No Easy Answer

BARRE — About 50 persons, including teachers, administrators, and students, attended a special meeting in the auditorium of the High School to discuss the guidance program. The gathering was called by the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association to discuss the guidance program and its implementation.

The guidance program has been under criticism lately from a group of students asking help from the administration to deal with ongoing problems. The teachers' association charged that the program is not implemented properly, and that the staff is not adequately trained.

In reply to questions asked by the parents' association, Trask said the state recommendations for guidance programs are not followed. The program is now undergoing changes, and some teaching personnel are among the non-certified personnel involved in guidance counseling.

The State Board of Education is now reviewing the program, and a teacher turnover of 15% has been reported. More students are being certified because the state is in the process of certifying the guidance staff.

The guidance program, under the present program, is considered as a positive one. The guidance program is now being reviewed, and a new program is being developed.

The teachers' training as said the program changed because of the District Parents' Association experience and training as a fact and the School Committee had been told to keep the program.

A recently-formed Quabbin counselors committee on its own cause the old one was not satisfied with its work. The counselors have been asked to make decisions regarding guidance.

The guidance program is now being reviewed, and a new program is being developed.

The guidance program is now being reviewed, and a new program is being developed.

The guidance program is now being reviewed, and a new program is being developed.

The guidance program is now being reviewed, and a new program is being developed.
November 29 at 7:30 A.M.

Propriate schools.

...
Quabbin Unit

OK’s Study "in" Of 4 Towns

BARRE — The Quabbin Regional District School Committee has "endorsed and encouraged" an economic investigation of the four district towns by a team of University of Massachusetts business administration students. The towns are Barre, Hubbardston, Hardwick and Oakham.

School Supt. Corriden F. Trask presented committee members with a 1972 preliminary budget amounting to $1,372,327. The proposed budget, showing a $74,000 increase over last year's figure, was not discussed, however.

The remainder of the meeting was held in closed session with the committee discussing "an emergency transportation problem in the town of Hubbardston affecting service to the regional as well as the elementary school."
Quahog Teachers' Hi Program

Teachers Rap Voluntary Assignments

By Joyce A. Elton
Quabbin Teachers, Board
Break Off New Contract Talks

BARRE — The Quabbin Re-staffing and guidance, as they'll The QRTA statement conditional. Teachers' Association are being implemented, are cost-est. "If teachers were to accept (QRTA) and the Quabbin Re-staffing, a duplication of effort in the contract working provisions regional School Committee in many areas, subjects teachers as the School Committee has might mutually broke off one to questionable salary and both presenting them, we would track negotiations after reaching greatly workers the instruction fact by using a means for an impasse on working conditions process."

Furthering and extending the

In a statement, the QRTA said the matter is "pending outcome of prohibit labor prac. The guidance program has hidden under areas such as in- include against the School. Committee by the QRTA, or a decision from the state Board of Arbitration and Conciliation."

The statement continued, "The QRTA's position is that program to the Quabbin area par., rather to non-instructional or the programs of differentiated.
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JASKOVIAK and because the duties take them away from instructional tasks.

The teachers said the problem is being addressed by the Quabbin planning. The program of innovative staffing and counseling, as they are being implemented in the school, is costly, but it will help in the educational inefficiency structure that is a result of such a separation. Task Force for special education programs has a group of students and students should experience a well-structured program of guidance counseling services need a network of resources in the school and also in the community.

Trask said in his statement that "Much of the controversy is based in the fundamental belief that every student needs career counseling. The new program is the 14-year-old school counseling program, which takes in the broader picture of the community."

He said it does not eliminate the need for "specialized services," but it can help in the counseling of the community. He added that classroom teachers have a hard time keeping up with all the responsibilities of two professional counselors out from the staff in the teachers the spring of 1970.

The report, which was presented to the teachers at the meeting, said that the program would be better if it could improve their service by using more specialists. The report calls on students to provide help.

Trask said, however, that assistance and counselors can work with and "decisions" that the counselors can make with the teachers. The students face are within the school, but they have little prospect of making a decision that "any well-trained counselor" can handle in the classroom. The student body, the help is needed, the National School Public Relations Bureau and the National School Public Relations Association, correct if that teachers would be expected to be "counselors," it means "specialized counseling."

But, he said, "Good teachers have always been good counselors" in matters of normal decision-making procedures and have willingly devoted time and energy into helping students..."
Teachers or Counsellors?

Guidance counselling, a relatively new service in public school education, appears to be the main obstacle in contract talks between the Quabbin Regional School Committee and the Quabbin Regional Teachers’ Association. Unfortunately, the obstacle has reached such proportions the talks have been temporarily broken off.

The committee has set up a plan in which teachers would take over guidance work. There would be no guidance counsellors especially trained for the work and exclusively assigned to it.

The teachers have some strong arguments in their favor in this matter.

Guidance with any real hope for a successful program cannot be a band-hazard effort. The young people who need and seek guidance must face futures on the line with them ask advice and expect to follow it. An understanding of a pupil’s qualifications and needs could prove instruction that might adversely affect an entire lifetime. At the least, faulty counselling threatens a detour costly in time and personal development.

There was a time, when guidance work was in its initial stages, when teachers — often unsuccessful teachers — were shunted into the field. Since then, counselling has become highly professional. It is of crucial importance to high school graduates.

Most persons who have admired Quabbin Regional — and there are many — tend to worry about the teacher-guidance counsellor arrangement.

If the school committee lacks faith in guidance, or feels it is costly beyond its worth, perhaps it should be abandoned — although that would fly in the face of most modern educational precepts which move toward more guidance not less. But poor guidance is worse than none.

If the committee believes that guidance is worthwhile, its members must also believe it should be done well. In that case, trained, full-time counsellors ought to be assigned to so vital a facet of modern education.
Key for Improving Guidance Services

School Superintendent explains
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Good Guidance Services

School Super-explains
Quabbin Board Directs Trask To Seek Accord With Teachers

BARRE — The Quabbin Recler-advisor functions,” recommend the department to drop a major- regional School Committee has directed School Supt. Corridon F. Trask to meet with faculty representatives in an attempt to reach a consensus on a guidance program recommendation. That request followed an hour-long exchange between Trask and the teachers at Thursday’s board meeting after which one board member likened himself to an observer in a war zone.

Representatives of the Quabbin Regional Teachers’ Association (QRTA) and a spokesman for the school’s Learning Coordi- nator Council told board members the superintendent had misrepresented their recommendations for Pupil Personnel Services (PPS). At Quabbin, guidance is included within the PPS program.

Trask submitted a proposal that would have a pupil personnel program that would allow students, particularly those working with specialists and staff in the ten schools, to meet self-sufficiency in the classroom. The recommendation was based primarily on cost.

Bruce Clouden, a Quabbin English teacher explained to the two-day Oming Club trip for teachers that many teachers need vacation. The Oming Club presently carries full insurance and planned a hiking trip along scenic roads and that staff costs, a portion of the long trail in whose backs have forced the English, Vermont.

A statement presented the committee by the QRTA said, “The Quabbin Regional Teachers’ Association has been consistently rejected the concept of a teacher-advisor or guidance role designation for two and a half years” — that being the reason for no settlement of a 1974-75 teachers contract.

The teachers called for an immediate moratorium on “teacher-
By Guided Proposal

Quabbin Teachers Assn.

A statement presented to the committee

Teach's plan - alternative for
The teachers feel that under

By Bradford L. Miner

recommendation

A sample of a guidance program

in an attempt to reach a con-

Teach's plan - alternative for
The teachers feel that under

a result of the hard

near zone

in a reactor in a

Sinkers, N.Y.

턴 - a letter-home

1929
Quabbin Revamps Guidance Program

By HAROLD A. GUSKUE
The Evening Gazette
Spencer Bureau

BARRE — Quabbin Regional-School Committee has approved major changes in its guidance program by authorizing hiring two school counselors by Aug. 1.

The committee also voted to eliminate for the 1972-73 school year the positions known as teachers-advisers.

The teacher-advisor positions have been criticized by the Quabbin Regional Teachers Association which stated earlier this month the positions are "the main reason for no contract settlement for 1971-72."

The guidance program at the school has been criticized by teachers, parents and students.

The regional board also voted last night to establish a position of head counselor and maintain the existing position of school psychologist.

The recommendations were made by Supt. Corinna E. Trask Jr., and included suggested salary schedules for the psychologist, head counselor and school counselors. The committee decided the proposed pay schedule should be discussed behind closed doors. The proposal was for 15 per cent extra pay for the head counselor, 12 per cent more for the psychologist and 10 per cent more for the counselors.

The committee also voted to establish a guidance advisory council comprised of parents, staff, students, residents and school board members. The council was recommended by Trask.

Closed-Door Sessions

The board held five closed door sessions last night.

A nine-minute closed door session was with Mrs. Lois Mortell, president of Quabbin District Parents' Association. She presented results of teachers' response to a survey conducted by the parents. Student and parent responses to the survey of the school have already been made public.

Mrs. Mortell said the parents group will meet tonight to discuss the results.

Another closed-door session, for 42 minutes, was held to discuss an appeal of the suspension of a student.

A third closed-door session of 17 minutes was held to discuss a candidate for the possible position of Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps assistant.

A fourth closed-door session for eight minutes was to discuss a student request.

A fifth of five minutes was to discuss staff and special graduation conditions.

No reports were made available on any of the closed-door sessions.

Student Requests

The committee denied two Student Council requests, but approved a third.

A request for a smoking area at the school was denied.

Mrs. Marcia Johnson moved it be denied because the committee earlier authorized the counselors students smoking on school property.

The committee also denied a request to allow seniors to report to school for second period class if first period was a study that would allow students to leave school early if the last class was a study and would allow a student to leave a study hall at any time as long as he reported to his next class on time.

Committee members said the proposal needs a more detailed presentation.

The committee granted a Student Council request that seniors be allowed to drive cars to school. The committee granted the request on a trial basis for the rest of the school year.

Permits would be first granted to seniors who were after school. Seniors would supervise the privilege and violations would be reported to the Student Council which would recommend to the administration action to be taken.

Kent F. Earley, principal, recommended there first by a meeting with parents of seniors before the privilege takes effect.

The committee will meet at 7:20 p.m. Thursday to discuss a leadership proposal presented by Trask. The proposal would eliminate the learning coordinator positions and establish 12 department head positions, among other items.
Quabbin Cuts Posts, To Hire Counselors

BARRE — The Quabbin Regional School Committee has recently more for the counselors, authorized hiring two school counselors by Aug. 1 and to eliminate for the 1972-73 school year, the various recommendations regarding the positions of teacher-advisors were taken item by item.

As recommended by Mr. Trask, the committee voted to establish a guidance counselor position. It would be comprised of three counselors, one for each of the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association, parents, and students.

The school board held five closed-door sessions.

The regional committee-a nine-minute closed-door session was held with Mrs. Lois Martell, president of the Quabbin Regional Teachers' Association. She presented the results of the survey conducted by the parents and included suggested salary schedules. The committee decided the proposed pay schedule should be discussed behind closed doors.

The proposal was for 15 per cent extra pay for the head counselor, 12 per cent more pay for a third.

A third closed-door session of 17 minutes was held to discuss a candidate for the possible position of Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps assistant.

A fourth closed-door session of eight minutes was held to discuss a request by a student and parents.

A fifth closed-door session of five minutes was held to discuss staff and special graduation conditions.

No results of any of the closed-door sessions were made available.

The committee denied two student-council requests but approved a third.

Requests Denied

A request for a smoking area at the school was denied, as was a request which would allow seniors to report to school for second period class if first period was a study. That would allow students to leave early if last class was a study, and would allow a student to leave a study half at any time as long as he reported to his next class on time.

The committee granted a Student Council request that seniors be allowed to drive cars to school. The privilege will go on a trial basis for the remainder of the year.

Principal Kent F. Bailey recommended first there be a meeting with parents of seniors before the privilege takes effect.

The committee scheduled another meeting for 7:30 p.m. Thursday to discuss a leadership proposal by Trask. The proposal would establish 12 department head positions, among other things.
Quabbin Teachers

Administration Gets

Low Survey Rating

BARRE — Teachers have given low marks to the administration at Quabbin Regional Junior-Senior High School in response to a questionnaire by the Quabbin District Parents' Association.

In response to 52 questionnaires sent out, 49 were returned with the teachers' answers to 13 questions. Teachers were given a choice of six replies, ranging from "excellent" to "failure" and to "don't know" or "no answer."

The survey results, along with eight pages of comment, were presented Thursday night to the regional School Committee.

Rated low by teacher was communication between the administration and teachers. But teachers were almost evenly divided on their opinion of assistance from department heads.

In reply to a question of how effectively "in-school administration" assists with discipline, 10 junior high teachers rated it either "excellent" or "good."

However, 29 senior high teachers considered assist with discipline from "average" to "failure." The average rating was checked by 12 teachers, while 22 considered it poor, and five labeled it as a failure.

Two teachers rated as "good" evaluation of teachers by the principal. Five teachers considered the evaluation average, while 11 said it was poor, and 12 thought it a failure. Only one teacher checked the "don't know or no answer" category.

The teacher aide program received overwhelming positive support as 13 teachers considered it excellent and 17 rated it good. Nine teachers said the program was average and only three rated it poor.

The parents' group noted many comments "had to do with low morale among teachers and the lack of trust between the teachers and the administration."

Previous replies to questionnaires answered by students and parents have been made public by the parents' association.
Teachers also rated as low! One teacher commented that, and provided to new teachers at the time. There was only one one student will be expected and response each for the "very another put it to the teachers" and "good" categories. Some offense directed at four, considered it "aver-age," while four considered it "average." However, 21 teachers said. The parents' group noted the aid was "poor," and 17 rated many comments, tried to get the "don't know or no answer.

Teachers were almost perfectly divided on their opinion. Previous responses to these questions by students and parents, however, have been made on the basis of total of 10 teachers rated this assistance as "excellent." The principal's office as a spokesman for faculty to higher administration was rated as "good."
something in excess of 50 night meetings a year and otherwise has no free time for personal or community life."

He said his resignation does not necessarily involve the controversy which has surrounded the school and the administration of late — this controversy most recently fanned by a poll of teachers by a new parents group. The poll showed teachers' dissatisfaction with the administration.

Trask said he has asked the committee for the freedom to look for a new position in the next year and a half and to accept one without feeling that he is violating the contract.

Trask said he has to be concerned with his personal life as well as that of the Quabbin community.

Trask said last night's executive session involved "free-handed discussion" and "air clearing."
Trask Resignation
Submitted in Barre

BARRE — Supt. Coridon F. Trask Jr. has submitted his resignation, effective August 1973, as superintendent of Quabbin Regional Junior-Senior High School and the four-town School Union 63. He has also asked in the letter of resignation that he be free, to pursue other employment during the next year and a half and accept such employment if it presents itself.

The Quabbin Regional District School Committee has, in effect, recently fanned the embers of an epidemic that has been smoldering in the 'closed-door' meetings. The poll showed dissatisfaction of the teachers with the administration and the resignation date because the contract expires.

'Asked Permission'

Trask said he "asked" the committee for permission to pursue other employment in the meantime because he does not want to violate the contract. He said these conditions were not necessarily involved in the controversy which had surrounded the school and the administration of late — this controversy was not connected with the resignation of Trask in the first place.

The resignation was discussed between Trask and the school board in an hour and a half executive session Thursday night. That discussion and the resignation were not revealed by the committee or Trask that night. However, Trask did reveal the fact of the resignation in answer to a direct question yesterday morning. He did not discuss the closed-door meeting other than to say it involved "free-handed discussion and air clearing."

Trask said his decision came after some "realistic appraisal" within the last two weeks. He said it became evident to him that "there was little chance" of his remaining at the post longer than next year he.
BARRE -- The Quabbin Regional School Board, acting in executive session, elected 10 department heads for the school at Thursday's meeting.

The position of department head takes the place of the learning coordinator in the school's structure.

Elected were Bruce Crowder, English; Glenn Stratton, social studies; Roberta Grandone, foreign languages; Barbara Fiorrello, art; John Hansen, music; Maurice Leroux, mathematics; Richard Lyons, science; Donald Raffier, business education; Mary Lawlor, home economics; and Carleton Perry, health and physical education.

4 Coordinators

Crowder, Stratton, Raffier and Perry were learning coordinators at the regional junior-senior high school this year.

School Supt. Corriddon F. Trask said the change reflects a return by the School Committee to the structure in effect when the school opened five years ago. Trask said the move is designed to provide better service for the teachers in each department.

Trask presented the committee with a proposed driver education policy and a list of the regulations governing the program which has been an extension of the school's curriculum since the school opened.

Policy 'Understood'

Kent F. Bailey, principal, explained that the policy has been "understood" to date and that the regulations have been "in effect" without being in written form.

Rental fee on the Henry Woods Building, shared by the Quabbin Regional Union 63 school districts will be increased from five to six thousand dollars. That approval came on a 5 to 4 vote.

The committee authorized the transfer of retired teachers insurance from the local to the state level.

The board voted unanimously to discuss several items on the agenda including the election of department heads, a discussion of seniors in danger of not graduating and an evaluation of the superintendent in executive session.

Policy 'Understood'
A Voyage of the Lowe's Schools

Experienced Teachers Enjoy

Regional Report
BARRE -- In executive session Thursday the Quabbin Regional School Committee elected 10 department heads for the 1972-73 school year.

The position of department head replaces that of "learning coordinator."

Elected were Bruce Crowder, English; Glenn Stratton, social studies; Roberta Grandone, foreign languages; Barbara Floreito, art; John Hansen, music; Maurice LeTourneau, mathematics; Richard Lyons, science; Donald Raffier, business education; Mary Lawler, home economics; and Carleton Perry, health and physical education.

Crowder, Stratton, Raffier and Perry were learning coordinators.

School Supt. Corridon F. Trask said the change reflects a return to the structure in effect when the school opened five years ago. Trask said the move is designed to provide better service for teachers.

Trask presented the committee with a proposed driver education policy and a list of 10 regulations governing the program.

Kent F. Bailey, principal, said the policy has been "understood" to date and that the regulations have been "in effect" without being in an approved written form.

It was incorrectly reported in Friday's Evening Gazette that insurance on the Henry Woods building had been increased from five to six thousand dollars. It was the rental fee on the building that was increased by $1000 by a five to four vote of the board.

The board voted unanimously to discuss several items on the agenda, including the election of department heads, a discussion of seniors in danger of not graduating, and an evaluation of the superintendent in executive session.
BARRE — A major reorganization of the administration at Quabbin Regional High School is underway, calling for the post of superintendent-principal and three assistant principals.

The program was approved by a 5-3 vote of the Quabbin Regional School Committee Wednesday night.

School Supt. Coridon F. Trask said the reorganization calls for a "team management" concept. Trask said he will assume duties of superintendent-principal, with a possibility he might teach on a substitute basis or possibly one class per day.

Trask said the assistant principals will be Bruce Crowder, head of the English department, Donald Raffier, head of business education, and Paul Allen, junior high school principal. Each will receive $10,000 a year total salary, which includes their teaching salary and administrative pay for an 11-month period, Trask said.

He said the additional pay beyond the normal teaching salaries will come from the $19,000 paid to Principal Kent F. Bailey, who resigned to become principal of Uxbridge High School effective Aug. 1.

Trask said there are no plans to replace Bailey for at least one year, which is the trial period for the new program. Trask said not all of the $19,000 will be used.

Trask said the total number of people remains the same. Under the old system was a superintendent, principal, and two assistant principals.

Trask said the new structure will probably mean a change in his duties as Union 63 superintendent, with the elementary principals probably assuming greater responsibility. Union 63 includes Barre, Hardwick, Oakham, and Hubbardston.

Trask said the idea of the reorganization is to have the administration directly involved with the classroom and students.

Additional details on the change may be presented at an Aug. 3 meeting of the school board.
Quabbin School Change
Is OK'd by Split Vote

By HAROLD A. GUSHUE JR.
Telegram Spencer Bureau

BARRE — A major reorganization of the administration at Quabbin Regional High School has been approved by a 5-3 vote of the Regional School Committee.

Supt. Corriden F. Trask said which was paid to Kent F. Ball the reorganization approved by principal, who resigned to Wednesday night calls for a become principal of Uxbridge said the counselor would be in familiar with student problems in the classroom.

Trask said the superintendent would be the trial period for the will act as superintendent principal, with the possibility in which may become permanent.

Advisory Role

Trask said there will be some people who are not in the administration who have the administration become involved with the classroom and the students.

Funds Available

Trask said there will be three assistant principals under the assistant principal, under the new "team management" concept, and two assistant principals. Trask said and the school staff.

They are Bruce Crowder, and the total number of administrative principal, the English department; the junior high school assistant will be a change in Trask's school and the Quabbin community.

Each will receive duties as Union 63 superintendent.
BARRE — Supt. Corridon F. len and Donald Raffier were The committee accepted the resignation of Carlton A. Perry. Perry will remain at Quabbin Regional Junior-Senior High School and act in a supportive capacity to the reorganization of the "team management" concept of administration.

At Thursday's meeting, the regional committee voted unanimously to ask Trask to withdraw his resignation which was submitted in April 1972. Despite the title change, the duties of all will remain basically unchanged from their present jobs. The title change is effective immediately. Salaries have not yet to be determined for the resignation under study and d.d.principal and associate principals act on it again until Thursday.

As part of the reorganization, his resignation to become effective this August when his contract expires. At that time, he cited the "work load" involved as head of the regional school which encompasses towns of Barre, Hardwick, Hubbardston and Oakham.

Trask Will Remain At Quabbin School
Trask to Stay at Quabbin As Head of New Program

HAROLD A. GUSHJE
Program Spencer Bureau

RE - Sept. Gordon P. Trask, Jr. will remain at Quabbin Regional Junior-Senior High School and in a supervisory capacity in the school system as "team management" head of administration.

At Thursday's meeting, the school's administrative board unanimously voted to accept Trask as head of administration, effective immediately.

The new position, created through a restructuring of the school's administration, will involve Trask in the day-to-day management of the school and its programs.

"Team" Concept

The "team management" concept was put forth by Trask and the town's school committee as a means of improving the educational experience for students.

Trask will work closely with the town's superintendent and other administrators to ensure that the school's goals and objectives are met.

Rutland Undergraduate

The administrative team is to include Trask, the town's superintendents, and other administrators.

The new arrangement is expected to improve the school's governance and decision-making processes.

As of the time of this report, Trask has submitted his resignation as head of the school's physical education department.