STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this professional paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Administration at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this professional paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this professional paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Norman W. DeVore

Date August 8, 1973

ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION: A SURVEY

BY

NORMAN WAYNE DeVOE

A professional paper submitted to the Graduate Faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

with concentration in

Administration

Approved:

Robert J. Theisen
Head, Major Department

Robert Van Voast
Chairman, Examining Committee

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher wishes to thank the College of Education at Montana State University, and Dr. Robert Van Woert and his staff in particular, for their assistance and encouragement in the completion of a difficult task. He also wishes to thank all of his fellow graduate students for their support and encouragement over six long summers. And, finally he wishes to voice his appreciation to his long suffering wife, Gladys, for her many sacrifices in the interests of his educational program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Historical Highlights	1
The Problem and Purpose of Study	5
Definition of Terms	7
Summary	8
II. THE LITERATURE	9
The Need for Accountability	9
Suggested Approaches	17
Alternative Considerations	35
Summary	38
III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
Summary	39
Conclusions	41
Recommendations	44
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDIX A: A SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	52
APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
APPENDIX C: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ERIC SOURCES	65

ABSTRACT

The Problem. In Montana, as well as the rest of the nation, the topic of accountability in education is one vital to educators and school board members. The study is a presentation of a history of accountability in education, tracing its origins, identifying it in the present, and relating it to the future in a context that would be helpful to educators presently embroiled in the accountability process or those facing it in the near future. The research was prompted by the fact that educators and school board members are being required by the public to account for results of their educational programs in the public schools, while at the same time expectations of the public are changing due to changing moral values, increasing costs of education, and the rapid growth of large urban schools.

Literature was reviewed which yielded varied attitudes, opinions, and programs for the solution to the accountability problem. Material reviewed was primarily periodicals, reports and speeches from which the researcher has extracted information and re-organized it into a historical format with comments and evaluations by the researcher.

Results. It was found that accountability in education is a continuing problem for all educators, particularly administrators and school board members. Many varied solutions to the problem are being tried. Management systems adapted from the business world and government operations are the most popular. No system has furnished all the answers to the accountability problem. In light of present research, no one system is likely to furnish methods for complete accounting to our public schools. It is plain, that businessmen have convinced the majority of educators that PPBES or similar management systems have a definite place in the solution of education's accountability problem.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

"Upon the Education of the People of this country the fate of the country depends."--Disraeli

Accountability in Education has been an increasingly important topic today. This interest has been generated, in the main, by three things: the increasing cost of education, the deterioration of moral training in the home and the church, and the growth of large urban schools. These three factors are putting more and more pressures on taxpayers and educators, with the taxpayer asking what am I getting for my money, and the educator asking what am I obligated to teach and how much? The educator is also receiving pressure from business, civic groups, private interest groups, and the courts.

Historical Highlights

The term accountability, with reference to education, did not appear in the Education Index until June, 1970;[1] however, the idea of accountability in education was evident as far back as the days of Socrates when the penalty for displeasing the local "school board" of Athens was a deadly dose of hemlock--that was accountability "with a vengeance". It is hoped that today's push for accountability in

---

[1]The Education Index, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: H.W. Wilson Co., July 1969-June1970), Vol. 21.

education will not result in any such measures. Quite obviously, in Socrates' case there were factors outside education at work in the accountability process--in this case, politics. There are also factors outside education at work in the accountability process today.

Mosely feels that accountability has been drastically hampered by factors outside the direct control of educators. According to him, political elements have taken over the running of our schools, putting out propaganda to misinform the public about schools' aims, responsibilities and accomplishments. He claimed that educators have accepted criticism too readily, and by their laxity in discipline and standards, have encouraged disruptions and bad behavior in the schools. He also feels that teacher organizations have reduced the image of the teacher through bickering negotiations. According to Mosely, the courts have intruded into schools on discipline, encouraging student disruptions through political activity, and made it seem that behavior of students is no longer a function of the school. As a result, the teaching of character and morals in the school have been dropped as a school responsibility.[2]

These views were supported by articles written in 1915, by prominent educators of that time. Lawson stated that students were lacking power to rightly use unrestricted liberty and because of the

---

[2]Francis S. Mosely, "The Urban Secondary School: Too Late for Mere Change," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1972, p. 558.

deterioration of the home and the church, the school is the only hope for the true development of our youth.[3] Randall felt that college should expect more disciplined behavior from students and that character building should be an important part of the educational plan.[4] Sills backed up this contention by stating that character is a necessity for success in college and that the school cannot develop character without the support of the community.[5]

Going back to 1899, Johnson suggested that there is a fundamental trinity in the operation of the public schools: the school board, administration and teachers; the parents; and the students--and that this trinity must function in harmony at all times for schools to be successful.[6]

In 1972, Small illustratied another facet of the accountability problem by reviewing the Newcastle Report; which was conducted in 1858, in England, on the subject of efficiency in education. The report stated that payment to teachers according to results of student exami-

---

[3]George B. Lawson, "Character, the Secondary School: Its Opportunity," Education, July, 1915, p. 628.

[4]Otis E. Randall, "Character Building in College," Education, June 15, p. 620.

[5]Kenneth E. Sills, "Character A Neglected College Entrance Requirement," Education, June, 1915, p. 615.

[6]Stanley Edwards Johnson, "The Fundamental Trinity of the Public Schools," Education, February, 1899, p. 393.

nations reduced quality of teaching drastically.[7] This would seem to invalidate our present acceptance of the principle of accountability through performance. Hapgood supported this in 1915, when he wrote that the same methods would not work to promote efficiency in schools as would promote efficiency in business and industry. He said that ". . . efficiency is determined by the worth of the governing end, "but at the same time he urged that ". . . educators need to change their operating concepts from 'What results can we get' to 'What results are we getting'?"[8]

Examining the relationships between accountability and objectives, Popham recently stated that the two do not necessarily go hand in hand.[9] This would seem to imply that the objectives of education are difficult to measure.

Reaching back to 1901, we find that Daniels, in Education, discussed hindrances to education: he felt that the public measured the performance of teachers much differently than they did that of other workers.[10]

---

[7]Allen A. Small, "Accountability in Victorian England, "Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1972, p. 438.

[8]Ernest G. Hapgood, "Efficiency in the Public Secondary School," Education, June, 1915, p. 633.

[9]James S. Popham, "Objectives '72," Phi Delta Kappan, March 1972, p. 432.

[10]Ernest Darwin Daniels, "Hindrance to Efficient Service," Education, January, 1901, p. 301.

Finally, Campbell made an astute observation in the Phi Delta Kappan in commenting on performance contracting when he said, "Everyone must be accountable who is part of the process." He went on to say that "No contractor in his right mind would agree to attempt what the average teacher does every day--if for no other reason than that neither he, nor the community, nor the child knows just what he is trying to accomplish." He maintained that performance contractors have dealt strictly with limited objectives under controlled conditions.[11] This indicates that public school teachers are working under a great handicap as compared to performance contractors because their objectives are not limited to the same extent as those of performance contractors.

The Problem and Purpose of the Study

Educators have been harrassed from all sides by demands that they publicly demonstrate their accomplishments. Administrators and school board members have been particularly concerned with these demands because they are the ones on the receiving end of most of the criticism and have to implement any accountability measures that are adopted. In order to carry out their responsibilities, administrators and school board members need a knowledge of as many facets of accountability as possible.

---

[11]Robert E. Campbell, "Accountability and Stone Soup," Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1971, p. 176.

The problem for this study is to review available literature describing the developments of the concept of accountability. This paper is an attempt to furnish some of that needed knowledge and to provide a bibliography of source material that will help to answer the needs of school administrators and school board members.

The literature utilized for this paper has been organized historically with some deviation where it will better serve to integrate the material. The researcher has endeavored to present material in a historical setting with the aim of determining the origins of Accountability in Education and identifying changes that have occurred in attitudes and ideas of the public and educators, who have in their writings furnished the material for this survey. Sources of material were primarily periodicals, reports, and speeches. Related sources were utilized as supportive materials or where primary materials were available.

Because accountability is a relatively new term in the field of education, research of available literature was conducted in many areas other than education and on many topics other than accountability in an attempt to make this survey comprehensive.

A comprehensive bibliography on the subject "Accountability in Education" is included as a part of the study in the hope that it will be of service to school boards, administrators, or anyone interested in doing further research on this subject.

Comparisons have been made by the researcher between the points of view presented by the general public, special interest groups thereof, and educators--as the researcher reported these views from the literature reviewed. The researcher attempted to coalesce these views into a report of what affect they may have had on education and to predict trends for the future in the area of accountability.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this paper the following terms and definitions have been used:

Accountability--The allocation of responsibility for results, including the consequences to those held responsible.[12]

PPBS or PPBES--Planning, Programing, and Budgeting (Evaluation) Systems--A generalized term applicable to any set of processes that are designed to systematize efforts within an organization to plan, allocate resources, implement, and evaluate its on-going activities.[13]

SPECS--School Planning Evaluation and Communication System. A special version of PPBS designed for schools.[14]

---

[12]Jacob Landers, "Accountability and Progress by Nomenclature: Old Ideas in New Bottles,: Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973, p. 540.

[13]Terry L. Eidell and John M. Nagle, School Planning Evaluation and Communication System, (University of Oregon), 1972, General Hearing.

[14]Ibid.

Career Education--Preparing all students as well developed people to enter successfully, either a job or some form of post-secondary educational system.[15]

Performance Contracts--Engagement of a private corporation to teach children, train teachers and implement total learning systems in schools.[16]

Summary

The history of accountability is difficult to trace prior to 1969, but it is evident that although some concern has been shown in the past by the public for results achieved by our schools in the United States, at no time has there been the outcry that has been heard during the last four years for specific tangible evidence of public school achievement.

This concern has been the result of changes in societal values and structures and the increasing costs of education. The public is demanding that educators furnish some proof of the amount and quality of learning achieved by students in the public schools as a result of tax dollars spent.

Cooperation of educators and the public is essential if the accountability problem is to be solved.

---

[15]Sidney P. Marland, Jr., "Career Education: Every Student Headed for a Goal," American Vocational Journal, March, 1972, p. 35.

[16]Dale Bratten, et.al., "Performance Contracting: How it Works in Texarkana," School Management, August, 1970, p.8

Chapter II

The Literature

The Need for Accountability

Accountability is currently a major concern in education, but the word has so many meanings and have been used so many different ways for so many different ends that the net result has been professional and public confusion. Writers have tended to interpret the concept of accountability within their own fields of interest; "Since most writers on the subject have been administrators, most of them equated accountability with improved supervision, administration, organization and management of change."[17] Nowhere is this more evident than in the writings of Leon Lessinger. Lessinger advocates the use of business management practices in the management of our education enterprises:

> . . . thanks to a set of recent developments, so far little noted, we can now sharply cut this waste of lives and money. In fact, the American educators now have an opportunity so far-reaching that, with a push from the public, we can transform our schools within this decade. This opportunity springs from several sources: from a new and sophisticated process of management that defines educational goals in measureable terms; from stimulating innovations discovered by new alliances among local schools, the federal government, and private enterprise from testing programs that can be used at low political, social and economic risk to discover what actually works; from the ability to avoid bureaucratic delay and put effective programs in the classrooms immediately; and from the

---

[17]Jacob Landers, "Accountability and Progress by Nomenclature: Old Ideas in New Bottles," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973, p. 539.

> growing acceptance of the idea that schools, like other sectors of our society, are accountable to the public for what they do--or fail to do.[18]

In a special message on educational reform, President Nixon stated on March 3rd, 1970, that school administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performances and it is in their best interests as well as the interest of their pupils that they be held accountable. Educational accomplishment should be measured ". . . by the results achieved in relation to the actual situation of the particular school and the particular set of pupils."[19] In May of 1970, James E. Allen, Jr., then Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, wrote:

> . . . the public is demanding performance and we need to develop measures to enable school people to be accountable in terms of objectives. The performance contract and accountability concepts are going to be very much in the forefront of educational thinking in the days ahead.[20]

Schwartz added credence to that statement, suggesting:

> Accountability will soon assume referance as the "in" word among educators. In its broadest sense, accountability in education

---

[18]Leon Lessinger, Every Kid A Winner, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970), p. 3.

[19]President Richard M. Nixon, The New York Times, (Report on a Speech), March 4, 1970, p. 28.

[20]James E. Allen, Jr., "Plans Priorities for the 70's, "Nations Schools, May, 1970, p. 52.

means that schools, administrators and teachers would be held responsible for the improvement in the performance of their students.[21]

If we accept the need for accountability in education, the next step must be finding the best ways of implementing the accountability concept. As Moellenburg stated in 1969, "Educators need to take action to set up assessment criteria before someone else does it for them."[22] Or as Lieberman noted "Failure of public schools to develop or accept able criteria procedures for accountability will lead to alternative school systems."[23]

There is one consideration that must be kept in mind when considering alternative systems, as Grieder reminds us in an article in Nations Schools, "Our system of government prohibits the use of public moneys for private interests. All arguments in support of the voucher system are specious when examined in the light of this great principle."[24] Grieder obviously has not convinced the Office of Education yet, but he may have a point.

---

[21]Ron Schwartz, "Accountability," Nations Schools, June, 1970, p. 31.

[22]Wayne Moellenburg, "National Assessment: Are We Ready?" The Clearing House, April, 1969, p. 421.

[23]Myron Lieberman, "An Overview of Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1970, p. 40.

[24]Dr. Calvin Grieder, "Educational Reform is Necessary, Inevitable," Nations Schools, August, 1970, p. 14.

Many educators, as well as other leaders, believe that education is slighting its research obligations, pointing out that education spends much less money for research than do other major functioning segments of our civilization.[25] If the National Institute of Education, recently commissioned by our government, actually functions as a management resources center or research center for all of public education in this country, it could very well perform a vital role in the accountability process. Watson feels that all personnel in our school systems do not have to be trained edcators; in particular, administrators could come from other disciplines. He does feel very strongly that the system should constantly measure itself against its own standards, and in the process everyone's work would be constantly evaluated and their performance re-directed accordingly. He also stated that some de-centralization is necessary in some large school systems before they will become responsive to needed change.[26]

---

[25]Bernard C. Watson, "Rebuilding the System: Practical Goal or Impossible Dream," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971, p.349.

[26]Watson, Ibid.

T. M. Stinnett, visiting professor at Texas A.M. University, observed, "There is a point in school size beyond which the quality of education deteriorates rapidly.[27] Wesley K. Summers, Director of Instruction, Bryan Texas Public Schools noted that schools have two organizational structures: Operational and Instructional. The operational structure handles the mechanics (that is purchasing, scheduling, transportation, bookkeeping, etc.); while the instructional structure is devoted to the teaching/learning process and is the prime concern of the school. The organizational structure supports the instructional one. The danger is always that operational functions start to become dominant and instructional considerations start to take second place. This is prone to happen where schools get too big and operational problems become large and too numerous.[28]

Another factor in the coordination of oganizational and instructional needs is the problem of public relations. "It is difficult to be accurate and fair while under pressure from news media to respond to various volatile situations. Educators are not comfortable in the arena of news gathering.[29]

---

[27]T. M. Stinnett, "Re-ordering Roles and Goals," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1970, p. 43.

[28]Wesley K. Summers, "School Management and Social Responsibility", The Clearinghouse, September, 1969, p. 3.

[29]Arthur H. Rice, "Public Relations Problems Impede Community Support", Nations Schools, August, 1970, p. 12.

Part of the demand for accountability stems from the taxpayers loss of confidence in public schools due to negotiations by teacher groups. Teachers are starting to act like unionized workers, who in the eyes of the consumer public, have lost their pride in workmanship. Some of this feeling about the American worker has been transferred to teachers.[30]

Perhaps the problem of pinpointing solutions for the school that wants to become more accountable for more results is epitomized by analyzing the following statement made by Voegel in the Audio Visual Instructor: "We don't know what it costs to improve a kid's reading ability by one year-all we know is what it costs to keep him in school for one year."[31]

The Commissioner of Education for the State of Colorado says that ". . . people want some proof from the educational system that it is doing what it is supposed to do". Evidently American educators agree with this statement, since forty six out of the fifty states have instituted assessment programs or plan to create them soon.[32]

---

[30]Robert E. Jennings and Mike M. Milstein, "The School Budget: Achieving Public Support for Educators", Educational Leadership, October, 1970, p. 41.

[31]G. H. Voegel, "Accountability and Performance Contracting", The Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971, p. 16.

[32]Donald D. Woodington, "Accountability from the Viewpoint of a State Commissioner of Education", Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972, p. 95.

John R. Dettre, Assistant Professor of Secondary Education at the University of New Mexico adds this comment: "Group efforts tend to be done less effectively because responsibility cannot be fixed on the individual. Incompetents are carried by productive members." Faulty products of education are deficient human beings. He promotes Pride of Workmanship as the answer to each individual performing as part of the group. However, it is also part of the problem because the individual has trouble seeing his contribution in the end product and getting recognition for it. He avers that Pride of Workmanship can be achieved; however, there is serious doubt that it can be bought.[33]

A biting comment was made by a Community School Superintendent from the Bronx, New York: "Parents say, 'You called yourselves Educators, I didn't. I accepted you for what you said you are--I merely ask that you do what you profess to be able to do. This is no time to tell me that you don't know how.' Educators are copping out--passing the buck."[34]

---

[33]John R. Dettre, "Pride of Workmanship", The Clearinghouse, February, 1969, p. 323.

[34]Edythe J. Gaines, "Accountability, Getting Out of the Tangled Web", The Nations Schools, October, 1971, p. 55.

David J. Irvine summed up educators feelings when he said, "The educational system of the future will be shaped by men in purposive fashion or it will, by default, be shaped by accident, tradition and the senseless forces of environment."[35]

---

[35]David J. Irvine, "Specifications for An Educational System of the Future:, Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1972, p. 312.

Suggested Approaches

In actually tackling the problem of accountability, there are many approaches that can be taken. John W. Porter, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Michigan, offered the following model:

1. Identification of common goals.
2. Development of performance objectives.
3. Assessment of needs.
4. Analysis of Delivery Systems.
5. Evaluation of progress.
6. Recommendations for improvement.

This model requires educators to say 'This is what we are going to do and how we are going to do it. We will report whether we have indeed accomplished what we said we were going to do.'[36]

This model does indeed provide most of the ingredients that would seem to be necessary for an improvement program, but a number of educators might disagree with the ordering of priorities represented here, and would immediately ask for more specific instructions under each major heading as listed.

Another approach was given by the Commissioner of Education of the State of Colorado:

> It is in this progression that Education becomes truly accountable--establishing goals, setting specific objectives, devising programs to meet the objectives, carrying out the programs, measuring their degree of success, comparing costs

---

[36]John W. Porter, "The Accountability Story in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972, p. 98.

and performance under alternative programs, revising and trying again.[37]

Again most of the necessary ingredients for improvement exist, but are lacking specifics for accomplishment of the program. In conjunction with Woodington's model it was found that there was basic agreement among superintendents of the state on the meaning of accountability; however, at least half of them said that they would need assistance in eleven accountability activities. Among topranked needs: 1) development of evaluation instruments and procedures to ascertain achievement and performance levels as measures of student accomplishment of stated goals; 2) development and selection of the most feasible programs to meet objectives; 3) specific performance objectives; 4) long range plans. (Evaluation of present educational programs was one of the most crucial needs.) This agrees with comments on above cited models.[38]

Another approach was made by educators connected with the Mesa, Arizona system: "School planners should begin from bits of measurable performance objectives based on validated systematic assessment of needs." A tri-level assessment model is needed--needs of community and society, and needs of implementing educators must be

---

[37]Woodington, loc.cit.

[38]Ibid.

included. Objectives should be stated in terms of measurable pupil outcomes, then teacher behaviors can be matched and other needs assessed.[39]

Two other approaches that have been tried in the quest for solutions to the accountability problem are Performance Contracting and the use of Voucher Systems. Performance Contracts have been tried by a number of schools all over the country, but perhaps the ones that were concluded at Texarkana, Arkansas[40] and Gary, Indiana[41] have received as much publicity as any. In Texarkana, the program was concluded under a cloud because of allegations of "teaching to tests", and in the Gary project the contract was not renewed because it did not conclusively prove its superiority over the normal public schools methods. In both cases there is strong evidence that the school's association with a performance contractor did lead to some improvements in both school systems. James A. Mechlenberger, Director of Research, National School Boards Association, wrote: "BRL's (the Gary contractor's) contract was cancelled but was not a complete failure--it functioned as a change

---

[39]Fenwick English, et al, "Educational Success Planning, Reducing Chance as an Aspect of School Innovation," The Audio Visual Instructor May, 1971, p. 20.

[40]Dale Bratten, et al, "Performance Contracting, How it Works in Texarkana," School Management, August, 1970, p. 8.

[41]James A. Mechlenberger, "Epilogue: The Performance Contract in Gary," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973, p. 562.

agent, forcing changes in programs that were beneficial to the schools."[42] Elmer Vruggink, Assistant Superintendent for the State of Michigan, backs up this theory: "When all is said and done, the performance contract can act as a vehicle for internal reform."[43] "Performance contracting is a management technique for getting people to look at something new", Webster believes. A recent position paper from the Michigan Education Association stated:

> Ultimately, the reason for success of the "outsider" is that he brings to the school a well thought out system and operates the system free and unencumbered by the school administration of the District.[45]

In a report rendered for HEW, the Rand Corporation found performance contracts disappointing--from one tenth to one and seven tenths of a grade level below all expectations relative to pupil performance. However, they also reported: "People who are not a permanent part of the school system seem to be freer to implement rational changes in the classroom than are regular school personnel."[46] All of the

---

[42]Ibid.

[43]James A.Mecklenberger and John Wilson, "The Performance Contract in Gary," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973, p. 562.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Mecklenberger and Wilson, loc. cit.

[46]"Washington Report," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1972, p. 391.

information available to date tends to indicate that although performance contracting has not been a complete success, it has not been a complete failure either; and it has definitely been a factor in effecting change in administrators and teachers.

Voucher systems have been tried, again with government support, as another method of making the schools more accountable for education. By allowing the student to attend the school of his choice, the voucher system would break up the near monopoly conditions presently imposed by our public school systems. Mario Fantini, Dean of Education at State University College in New York, had one proposal that might work if it could be funded. He proposed that each school system provide four to seven different types of schools and issue vouchers to parents so that their children could attend the school they liked best.[47]

Two other accountability systems employed are PPBS or PPBES, standing for Planning, Programing, and Budgeting Systems, with the second plan integrating an evaluation step into the process. Both of these systems are adaptations from government operations and from the business world. William A. Serrette, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for School District Number Two, Billings, Montana, had this to

---

[47]Mario Fantini, "Options for Students, Parents and Teachers: Public Schools of Choice," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1971, p. 541.

say about PPBS after attending an administrators conference at Denver, Colorado in October of 1969:

> At the present time, the main problem is adjusting a tool such as PPBS, which works well in business and industry, to education; where the products and results are more difficult to determine. Schools take children as they come, the parents as they are, and operate in the community as it exists. Schools produce something which is not measurable in all cases, and which may manifest itself, even when measurable, only long after the individual being educated has left the school program. Nevertheless, it is argued that schools, and each part of them, do have immediate objectives which can often be measured, or at least judged by competent observers. We can no longer hide behind the statement that we cannot measure the results of our educational programs. Operating a program without a plan for achieving intermediate objectives obviously cannot be justified.[48]

In talking to Mr. Serrette this Spring, this researcher was told that PPBS can provide some answers for school districts at the organizational level, but that it left something to be desired at the instructional level. "PPBS can become a helpful tool for decision making in education, but PPBS must have as its focal point, the instructional process and what happens to children."[49]

PPBS has been partially adopted by both Florida and California and is under consideration by many other states, so it should soon be

---

[48]William A. Serrette, Conference Report, October, 1970.

[49]Serrette, Ibid.

possible to determine just how well it is going to serve as a management system for educational units.[50]

Another system that is being developed by the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, at the University of Oregon is SPECS: School Planning, Evaluation, and Communications System. This system does incorporate specifics for managing within the instructional area.[51]

Obviously a number of management systems are going to be developed and tried in the process of satisfying the demand for accountability. It remains to be seen which systems will rpovide the most satisfactory answers for the demands that are being made on education.

John F. Goodlad, Dean of the Graduate School of Education for the University of California at Los Angeles states that "Change is most effective when it comes from within--the school must change itself."[52] This might explain the reluctance of educators to respond to the accountability problem--it has been forced on them by ousiders.

---

[50]Lawrence P. Grayson, "Costs, Benefits, Effectiveness. . .," Education Digest, September, 1972, p. 6.

[51]Terry L. Eidell and John M. Nagle, School Planning Education and Communications System, (The University of Oregon), General Learning Corporation, p. 1-5.

[52]John F. Goodlad, "The Child and His School in Transition," Education Digest, April, 1973, p. 10.

The failure of educators to come to grips effectively with the accountability problem has been further aggravated by the power struggle going on in education between teachers and administrators and school boards at the negotiations table. This struggle is detracting from education as a whole and is resulting in bad publicity and a loss of public confidence.[53]

A prime reason for the delay in activating some sort of accountability system in education is the fact that it is no longer fashionable or an accepted practice in many areas for an individual to exert leadership in a group. Dr. John F. Travers of Boston College says that the practice of administration today asserts the superiority of group thinking--get together with, instead of in front of, subordinates. Group action predominates and individual leadership is discouraged. Initiative and leadership are not being developed in classrooms any more; if anything, these qualities are viewed with suspicion and society labels such individuals as authoritarian if they

---

[53]Harold E. Turner, "Mobilizing Political Power for Action," Educational Leadership, October, 1970, p. 41.

have an idea of their own or dare to differ from the group on basic policy.[54] This is supported by Whyte:

> In group doctrine, the strong personality is viewed with overwhelming suspicion. The cooperative are those who take a stance directly over the keel. The man with ideas--in translation, prejudices--leans to one side of, worse yet, heads for the rudder. Plainly he is a threat. Skim through the current group handbooks, conference leaders' tool kits, and the like, and you will find what sounds very much like a call to arms by the mediocre against their enemies.[55]

Daniel E. Griffiths asserts that individuals make better decisions than groups.[56] and Jesse Sears, in the Nature of the Administrative Process, states: "Management is necessary to get things done in accord with objectives--managing is impossible without the authority to direct and command."[57] The group decision making process is lengthy and fraught with peril, for there is a tendency in group decision making to leave responsibility for mistakes to "someone else".

Many people seem to believe that accountability in education should rest with the teachers. Fredrick L. Hipp, Executive Director of

---

[54]Dr. John F. Travers, "Leadership and Administration," American School Board Journal, September, 1960, p. 41.

[55]William H. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man, (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956), p. 60.

[56]Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory,(New York: Appleton Centry Crofts, Inc., 1959), p. 104.

[57]Jesse Sears, The Nature of the Administrative Process, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950), p. 8.

the New Jersey Education Association says in answer to a question on accountability:

> Transfer to the teaching profession:
> Authority to administer standards of professional practices and ethics for all educational personnel.
> Authority to accredit teacher preparation institutions.
> Authority to establish and administer standards of professional practice and ethics for all professional personnel.
> Authority to govern inservice and continuing education for teachers.[58]

Mr. Hipp's use of the words "all professional personnel" will leave his suggestions open to considerable criticism.

D. D. Garland presented a similar view in an article that he wrote for the Phi Delta Kappan, in September of 1970; "The teaching profession cannot be held accountable until it is granted responsibility for itself. Self governance is necessary in accreditation standards, teacher preparation, and in-service training."[59]

New Jersey is making some changes in this area of teacher education and certification. They have established a Performance Evaluation Project to study the feasibility of eliminating course credits as a basic criterion for certification and developed minimum performance standards for initial certification and means of measuring performance which will require performance of certain behaviors--

---

[58]Fredrick Hipp, "Two Views of Education: Boardman and Teacher," School Management, March, 1973, p. 28.

[59]D. D. Garland, "The Profession's Quest for Responsibility and Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1970, p. 41.

demonstrations of abilities rather than of knowledge. Some thirty other states are studying or developing some form of performance based teacher education and certification.[60]

Alvin Lierheimer says, "Certification has been essentially unresponsive to changes in society and in the schools. It has come to be only a tool of exclusion, not one of qualification."[61] One school in California has challenged the system by hiring a superintendent without a "ticket". David Reeves is the only non-credentialed superintendent in the country, with a background and a Masters Degree in Business Administration. Reeves feels that professional managers (business) are less inhibited about making changes than are most school superintendents. He feels that teachers and staff must participate in decision making and program development, but he also feels that everyone must know who the boss is. He does not like tenure for teachers and would substitute termination pay for tenure. He feels that the present administrator and teacher training school staff should be transferred to business and management schools and to industry including local sources. He characterizes educators as a relatively immobile group.[62]

---

[60]Robert A. Roth, "Certifying Teachers: An Overhaul is Underway," Education Digest, April, 1973, p. 24.

[61]Alvin P1 Lierheimer, "Changing the Palace Guard," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1970, p. 20.

[62]Jonathan Hoffman, "Superintendent Without a Ticket," Education Digest, April, 1973, p. 30.

Blanche Blank, Professor of Political Science of Hunter College of New York, would carry educational reform to even a farther degree. She advocates the banning of the college degree as a job requirement. "It is no longer a guarantee of the better life and has created emotional problems for adolescent college students. College would better benefit older citizens." She feels that the present college population oscillates between apathy and hostility because they are prisoners of economic necessity. Such actions would ". . . recapture the genuine and variegated dignity of the workplace along with the genuine and more specialized dignity of the university."[63]

Daniel V. Levine, Director of the Center for Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, claims that urban schools are not functioning in terms of some of their major purposes. A good education should include a minimal level of academic skills needed to compete successfully for rewarding employment--schools should teach skills and attitudes needed for learning outside school and for leading satisfactory lives as adults, including an effort to use rational planning and technical competence in the task of educating masses of citizens in an urban society. He also says that all other rational bureaucracies are suffering from the same problems--complexity and overload, goal displacement, deficiencies in communications and decision

---

[63]Blanche D. Blank, "A Questions of Degree," Intellectual Digest, April, 1973, p. 8.

making processes, and social and psychological distance between client and institution. "The by-products of complexity become too abstract to be believed." Shcools must be less complex: reduce social and psychological distance between school and pupil/parent and provide specifically for feedback on every aspect of school operation.[64]

Komosky supports Levine: within the system, "Materials and methods are not judged by students, . . . "the consumers; "and ninety percent of materials on the market are not evaluated and re-shaped by student comment".[65] William M. Wayson, Professor of Education at Ohio State University maintains:

> . . . An accountable system must implement every decision maker, at every level, to direct feedback from persons affected by decisions. Staffs must share a sense of common purpose which lifts them above daily crises and squabbling. They must feel important--be involved.

Basic decisions should be made close to the problem and natural consequences must be readily apparent to be decision maker. In-service training must develop and function in each school to deal with its specific problems. He also makes the point that "learning involves conflict, tensions and uncertainties".[66]

---

[64]Daniel V. Levine, "Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971, p. 329.

[65]Kenneth P. Komosky, "50,000 Educational Consumers Can't Be Wrong--But Who is Listening," The Audio Visual Instructor, September, 1971, p. 13.

[66]William W. Wayson, "Organizing Urban Schools for Responsible Education," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971, p. 344.

Neidermeyer and Klein reported on one Teacher Accountability System that worked at the Mesa School System in Arizona: The program consisted of two cycles--appraisal and approval. Pupil performance was the primary criterion. The teacher submitted instructional objectives at the end of the semester, then the data was checked for attainment. During the improvement cycle, the teacher submitted lesson plans, preassessment data, and instructional objectives to a team of fellow instructors; they observed and reported on achievement. Then the principal received the information at the end of the year for evaluation. This plan was oriented to student learning and teachers helping one another to improve.[67]

Harold H. Pemke, Professor of Education at Auburn University, believes that adoption of the quarter system by high schools should solve some accountability problems. It would spread out graduates for the job market and give teachers more options in their work.[68]

In discussing an area such as accountability, it would be a dereliction not to include comment on school structure and budgeting. Jennings states that in adding specialists such as psychiatrists, guidance counselors, nurses, and teachers' aides, schools have also

---

[67]Fred Niedermeyer and Stephen Klein, "An Empirical Evaluation of a District Teachers Accountability Program," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972, p. 100.

[68]Harold H. Pemke, "Accountability and the Quarter System," Education Digest, April, 1973, p. 17.

added a layer of bureaucracy (department heads, administrative assistants, directors of transportation, personnel, etc.)--all of which require more money. The addition of complex hardware and software: labs, films, T.V., programmed learning devices, etc.--add to costs. Teacher militancy is increasing salaries faster than before, in addition, the middle class is growing--it will not support such things as busing. The wealthy are losing influence to other groups, realigning their role as school supporters. Finally, educators are now involved in re-structuring of social values; so mistrust of the system grows.[69]

J. Michael Palardy, Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Supervision for the University of Georgia, writes that most large school systems operate from a tall structure--that is many levels of command with the teacher at the bottom with little or no opportunity for leadership. He recommends flattening of the structure with the consequence of more teachers per supervisor and the chance for teachers to exercise more leadership, plus more contact between teachers and administrators.[70]

---

[69]Robert E. Jennings, "The School Budget: Achieving Public Support for Education," The Clearinghouse, April, 1969, p. 458.

[70]J. Michael Palardy, "Needed: Requiem for a Structure," The Clearinghouse, February, 1960, p. 360.

One of the demands being heard increasingly of late is the one to provide more occupationally oriented training in our public schools. Velma Adams, former Executive Editor of School Management, says, "Since eighty five percent of students do not go to college, we should program our schools to provide vocational training for eighty five percent of them".[71] This cry for more career education has been heeded by many school systems in our country, and as a result career centers are being built to serve youngsters of junior high and high school age.

Sidney P. Marland, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education said:

> . . . We know that education, as a joint process of teaching and learning, works only when it is conducted for a purpose on the part of the learner, as well as the teacher. I believe that all education must have a defined, stated purpose. I think we can agree that the purpose of elementary and secondary education in the United States is to prepare all students as well developed people to enter successfully either a job or some form of post-secondary educational system.
>
> . . . There is a destructive gap between school and job, and the way to eliminate it is to bridge it ourselves as teachers. To accomplish these objectives we think that the curriculum should be built around jobs and work.
>
> An important aspect of career education would be that opting back into school would be as easy as opting out. We can bring these concerns and all of our extra, separate efforts together in a meaningful way if we have the wisdom, the courage, and the will to find a large new consensus on what the schools ought to be. Career Education can be that goal.[72]

---

[71]Velma A. Adams, "Vocational Training: Still Someone Else's Children", School Management, February, 1970, p. 360.

[72]Sidney P. Marland, Jr., "Career Education: Every Student Headed for a Goal", Educational Digest, (September, 1972), p. 2. (from American Vocational Journal), (March, 1972).

Alternative schools present a solution to the problem that some people feel exists in our public schools (alternative schools are all schools operating outside the normally accepted "one-through-twelve" public school systems and the university and four year colleges). Judith C. Areen, writing for the University of Chicago School Review, feels that alternative schools are growing because parents are dissatisfied with public schools for pedagogic, cultural, and political reasons. She characterizes the public schools as a monopoly that is insulated from the public, offering them no choice. She makes the point that historically, schooling has been forced upon more of our population for longer periods of time without parallel improvements in the system. Districts have become larger while power has become more concentrated in fewer hands. Since the larger a system is, the more resistant it is to change, we must go outside the public schools to institute change.[73] John H. Fischer, President of Teachers College, Columbia University, also sees some advantages in alternative schools that have appeared recently, due in virtaully every case to the broad latitude their teachers and directors enjoy in collaboration with community people

---

[73]Judith C. Areen, "Alternative Schools: Better Guardians Than Family or State", The University of Chicago School Review, February, 1973, p. 175.

and responding to children's need.[74] Andrew Greeley comments on this same subject: "Non-public schools are necessary to provide an alternative. . . Public education needs competition. . . state financed monopoly tends to grow soft and inept because of lack of competition".[75] The final word on the possibilities of alternatives in education has to be that of Ivan Illich in "Alternatives to Schooling". Outside of teaching the three "R's", he would do away with all curriculum as it exists in our schools, at every level, and only teach to people what they need to know to create their own liveable enironment or to satisfy individual desires. He would do away with all preknowledge and all certification, assuming that if all technology were to be made available to everyone, educators would be able to serve everyone impartially and everyone would be able to solve their own problems: they would build their own houses, fix their own cars, and instead of building mass low income housing for the poor, furnish them the tools and knowledge and help them build their own houses".[76]

---

[74]John H. Fischer, "Who Needs Schools", Saturday Review, September, 1970, p. 78.

[75]Andrew M. Greeley, "Public and Non-public Schools--Losers Both", The University of Chicago School Review, February, 1973, p. 195.

[76]Ivan Illich, "The Alternative to Schooling", Saturday Review, June, 1971, p. 44.

An alternative to one of the problems in satisfying all of the needs implicit in the accountability theme is the fact that accountability is an intangible ingredient in educational results. At the same time, without it the educator has no claim to his product--he cannot show success when it is achieved nor can he account for his failures.[77] Regardless of the system or approach that is to be taken to make our schools more accountable, Rice believes:

> . . . the American public is in no mood to pay the escalating costs of education unless it sees greater value and better results from this tremendous investment, and education is given a reasonable priority in the budgeting of state and federal revenues. Educators must: 1)Give the public more evidence that the quality of education is improving. This means greater efficiency in school management and more effective instruction in the classroom. 2)Give the public more reason to believe that teachers and administrators are working together to achieve the purposes of education which the citizens of this country have established and endorsed. 3)Provide leadership for a pattern of financing public education in which all citizens participate through federal, state, and local taxation.[78]

Alternative Considerations

There are indications that the school administrator is changing and adapting more of late than he had previously done. Perhaps there is a connection between this observed behavior and the push for accountability. Theodore Miller, Assistant Editor of School Management, reports that superintendents are becoming more sensitive to human needs, more flexible, and have greater desire to be decision makers. "He

---

[77]Campbell, op. cit.

[78]Arthur H. Rice, "Priorities for Education in the 80's", Nations Schools, December, 1970, p. 16.

listens better and adapts faster; hangs tough on major policies, and gives more in minor areas."[79] William Goldstein, Principal of Trumbull High School of Trumbull, Connecticutt, speaks out on a different aspect of administration: "Principals are so beleagured with supervisory details and problems of discontent that he only has time to respond and re-act--he has no time for his primary job, that of improving and supervising the learning process."--and asks the following questions which he feels must be answered before a principal can be truly accountable:

1. What is the best way to teach reading?
2. What constitutes a "Relevant curriculum"?
3. Indeed, what is "curriculum"?
4. What is the relationship between fact and concept?
5. How do children learn best?
6. Does grading really serve a reasonable, non-mechanical purpose?
7. Do disruptive students belong in the public schools? If so, how can they best be taught?
8. How much experimentation with new methods and content is enough?
9. How much student discipline and control are too much?
10. Is it possible to estimate "priorities" in the teaching process without regimenting and standardizing the whole business of education?[80]

---

[79]Theodore Miller, "Anatomy of the New Superintendent", School Management, February, 1970, p. 36.

[80]William Goldstein, "Divorce from Intellect: Pathology of the Principalship", The Clearinghouse, December, 1969, p. 195.

Heger voiced similar thoughts in an article in the Clearinghouse: "Administrators are so busy putting out fires--looking for solutions to problems, that they have no time for the real education problems.[81]

Gregorc and Hendrix feel that our problems in education are due to unmotivated teachers, and that their lack of motivation stems from a lack of recognition, not enough pay differentials, a need for new methods of certification, and need for more responsibliity.[82]

---

[81]Herbert K. Heger, "Educational Change and Pedogogical Validity", Clearinghouse, May, 1971, p. 563.

[82]Anthoney F. Gregorc and David F. Hendrix, "One Man's Opinion", School Management, March, 1973, p. 8.

Summary

From this review it can be seen that the question of the best means of solving the accountability problem is still unanswered. There are many systems that will work to manage the tangible aspects of education such as budgeting, organization, and communications between staff members; but no system, as yet predicted, promises to identify the intangibles in education so that they can be measured, tested, and valued. Every student and educator possesses unique qualities that affect the educational process, as does the interaction between student and educator. Pressures put on participants in the educational process, and environmental influences outside the school become part of the educational process even though they are not controllable from within the school system. It is entirely possible that the public will have to accept certain things in the educational process as un-identifiable or un-measureable.

Chapter III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The idea of accountability in education can be traced at least as far back as Ancient Greece. It is a changing process, complicated by changes in society's moral values, environmental influences, economic pressures, vocational aspirations, population and demographics, and ethics of family life. Despite these difficulties, a poll conducted by Nations Schools, in 1970, showed that ninety percent of the country's administrators favor a system of teacher accountability.[83]

Different systems of management have been tried or are in use as partial solutions to the accountability problem. Some of them have sufficed as control and information devices for the organizational and budgeting aspects of education; but none, as yet, have satisfactorily answered the questions in the instructional area, related to satisfying the intangible needs of students.

Performance Contracting and the use of Voucher Systems have seemingly failed to provide necessary answers in the instructional domain of education, however, they have functioned as "change agents", causing some improvements to be effected in curriculum and methodology.

---

[83] "Opinion Poll," Nations Schools, December, 1970, p. 38.

There is some evidence that educators have not cooperated whole heartedly in these ventures; so it is probable they have not as yet had a fair trial.

Alternative schools are active in experimentation in education, but generally suffer from a lack of funds.

Larger school systems have had more difficulty in becoming accountable for results than have small schools due to their complex organization. Communications are slow because of infrequent contact between the many echelons. Furthermore, teachers and students often have not been consulted frequently and feel alienated.

There are some concrete signs that education is listening to its constituency: both vocational education and career education are results of needs expressed by students and demands made by parents and employers.

The present system of education and certification of educators is under fire from both teachers and some segments of the public. Teacher groups in particular are demanding more voice in their own training and licensing.

The problems of administering schools are growing to the point where the administrator spends all of his time "putting out fires" instead of supervising teachers, improving curriculum, and communicating with his "school community".

Conclusion

Accountability in education is coming of age; a development thought long overdue by many. It will be guided by management systems presently being developed in research agencies and piloted in public school systems. Future programs will need to incorporate methods for the control of the affective intangibles which are presently holding up the realization of a complete accountability package.

Performance Contracting may continue to be utilized as an experimental adjunct to recognized school practices, but will probably not become a major factor in every day school offerings. If continued, it will undoubtedly cause some effective changes in perspectives of educators and result in some good innovative practices in the classroom. It does not seem likely that it will attain large scale adaption into our public school systems because of opposition from educators and because of the loss of control by educators and school boards. Many responsible educators are convinced taht the wholesale application of business methods to the educational process will result in a sterilization of the human thought process and an eventual debasement of all mankind because of the inherent profit motive underlying all business activities.

The voucher system sounds good and looks good to many laymen, but probably will not succeed on any large scale because of expense, and fragmentation of goals and objectives.

The complex organization of large schools and school districts is responsible for many communications problems in our schools and sometimes causes dissatisfaction among teachers and staff. Either more satisfactory communications systems will need to be devised or the complex organization of school systems must be simplified to give more responsiblilities to teachers. The latter idea seems to me to have the most merit, as it will not only give more recognition and satisfaction to teachers; but it will also reduce school costs by the elimination of some administrative positions. Any change in organizational structure must provide more time for the principal to manage his staff and work on curriculum improvement.

It appears that teachers and administrators may force some changes in present certification procedures and in teacher and administrator training. They are demanding and probably will eventually get more voice in teacher training and certification procedures.

Administrators are becoming more aware of the necessity for good public relations in their school communities which will probably result in pertinent courses of instruction being included in college programs required for their certification.

More research is needed in education. In particular, the teaching function needs to be analyzed in depth, and records kept of attitudes, backgrounds, and methods of successful teachers; so that these attributes can be incorporated into teacher training programs.

School administrators should be made aware of the inherent dangers of mis-using the group decision making process. It is a valuable tool in management, but final decisions must be made where the responsiblity lies, at the management level. This group decision making process has been taking place in the area of accountability and is responsible for much of the delay in systems being established and implemented. It is only fair to say that this delay has worked to the advantage of States like Montana, where the pressure for the institution of accountability is still bearable.

We must be careful that reforms proposed do not result in all of public education being drug down to the lowest common denominator rather than improvements accruing to all of education

Educators have been charged with pulling their own house down around their ears by self castigation, but this willingness to face up to internal problems is the reason our schools have survived and still remain the only institution with an optimistic hope for improving society.

Recommendations

Accountability in education is such a broad topic that has been impossible to treat all areas in this paper; however, consistant with the coverage that has been possible, the following recommendations are made:

1. A study should be made at the national level on the history of accountability, in education, so that educators can realistically appraise accountability demands. There is no doubt but what some of the demands being made stem from problems outside of education. A screening of the past would certainly identify some of these as "passing fancies: and automatically eliminate them from consideration in the formulation of accountability systems.

2. A delineation must be made as to what education can be held responsible for, and these limits must be established and publicized in such a way that the public accepts them to prevent misdirection of resources. These responsibilities must then be established by the state so that educators and school boards know what is expected of them.

3. Performance Contracting and Voucher Systems should be employed together, as an experiment, in the area of vocational training. The expertise of business in vocational areas should enable them to do a superior job of training in this field, providing they keep costs to an acceptable level.

4. All schools and school systems should take yet another look at their organizational structures to assure themselves that their organization does indeed exist to support the instructional program, and that it does provide first person communications between administrational and instructional levels on a regular and frequent schedule. The possibility of simplifying vertical structure should be honestly investigated and action taken where possible to assign more responsibility to teachers and do away with intermediate administration to the extent possible.

5. Each administrator should report weekly on a standard format requiring only "fill in" of items as to how his duty time was spent. These reports should be analyzed periodically and changes made, where necessary, to afford the supervisors necessary time to supervise, attend to curriculum matters, and to fulfill their public relations responsibilities.

6. Every accrediting institution should meet at least once each year with appropriate committees of the State Education Association, State Administrators Association, and the Superintendent of Education for the State to make improvements in teacher and administrator certification and training.

7. The importance of leadership should be stressed in all administrators training programs.

8. Courses should be offered at colleges and universities in management systems, and seminars with trained business adminstrators integrated into these courses.

9. Educators must spend more time on public relations, in particular they must publically stress the positive accomplishments of education.

10. Above all, educators must resist the danger of the trend "back to normalcy" that always sits in during and after a period of change.

11. Our educational program is, was, and always will be the people's own; worked out and adopted in response to public demands. As it has been developed; so it must continue to be re-vamped, changed, developed, and expanded to meet the needs of a continuously changing social order.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Velma A. "Vocational Training: Still for Someone Else's Children?," School Management, February, 1970. p. 360.

Allen, James E., Jr. "Plans, Priorities for the 70's," Nations Schools, May, 1970. p. 52.

Areen, Judith C. "Alternative Schools: Better Guardians than Family or State?," The University of Chicago School Review, February, 1973. p. 175.

Blank, Blanche D. "A Question of Degree," Intellectual Digest, April, 1973. p. 70.

Bratten, Dale, et al. "Performance Contracting, How It Works in Texarkana," School Management, August, 1970. p. 8.

Campbell, Robert A. "Accountability and Stone Soup," Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1971. pp. 53 & 67.

Daniels, Ernest Darwin. "Hindrance to Efficient Service," Education, January, 1901. p. 301.

Dettre, John R. "Pride of Workmanship," The Clearinghouse, February, 1969. p. 323.

Education Index. Ann Arbor Michigan: H. W. Wilson Co., July, 1969-June, 1970. Vol. 21.

Eidell, Terry L. and John M. Nagle. School Planning, Evaluation, and Communications System. University of Oregon: General Learning Corporation, 1972.

English, Fenwick, et al. "Educational Success Planning: Reducing Chance as an Aspect of School Innovation," Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971. p. 20.

Fantini, Mario. "Options for Students, Parents and Teachers: Public Schools of Choice," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1971. p. 541.

Fischer, John H. "Who Needs Schools," Saturday Review, September 19, 1970. p. 78.

Gaines, Edythe J. "Accountability: Getting Out of the Tangled Web," Nations Schools, October, 1971. p. 55.

Garland, D. D. "The Profession's Quest for Responsibility and Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1970. p. 41.

Goldstein, William. "Divorce From Intellect: Pathology of the Principalship," The Clearinghouse, December, 1969. p. 195.

Goodlad, John F. "The Child and His School in Transition," Educational Digest, April, 1973. p. 10.

Grayson, Lawrence P. "Costs, Benefits, Effectiveness: Challenge to Educational Technology," The Education Digest, September, 1972. p. 6.

Gregorc, Anthony F. and David F. Hendrix. "One Man's Opinion," School Management, March, 1973. p. 8.

Greeley, Andrew M. "Public and Non-public Schools--Losers Both," The University of Chicago School Review, February, 1973. p. 195.

Grieder, Dr. Calvin. "Educational Reform is Necessary, Inevitable," Nations Schools, August, 1970. p. 14.

Griffiths, Daniel D. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc. 1959.

Hapgood, Ernest G. "Efficiency in the Public Secondary School," Education, June, 1915. p. 633.

Heger, Herbert K. "Educational Change and Pedagogical Validity," The Clearinghouse, May, 1971. p. 563.

Hipp, Fredrick L. "Two Views of Education: Boardman and Teacher," School Management, March, 1973. p. 28.

Hoffman, Johnathan. "Superintendent Without a Ticket." Education Digest, April, 1973. p. 30.

Illich, Ivan. "The Alternative to Schooling," Saturday Review, June 19, 1971. p. 44.

Irvine, David J. "Specifications for an Educational System of the Future," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1972. p. 312.

Jennings, Robert E. "The School Budget: Achieving Public Support for Education," The Clearinghouse, April, 1969. p. 458.

Johnson, Stanley Edwards. "The Fundamental Trinity of the Public Schools," Education, February, 1899. p. 393.

Komosky, Kenneth P. "50,000 Educational Consumers Can't Be Wrong--But Who's Listening," Audio Visual Instructor, September, 1971. p. 13.

Landers, Jacob. "Accountability and Progress by Nomenclature: Old Ideas in New Bottles," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973. pp. 539-546.

Lawson, George B. "Character, The Secondary School: Its Opportunity," Education, June, 1915. p. 628.

Leles, Sam. "Educational Structure: Is It Capable of Innovation?," The Clearinghouse, February, 1970. p. 368.

Lessinger, Leon. Every Kid a Winner. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970.

Levine, Daniel V. "Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971. p. 329.

Lieberman, Myron. "An Overview of Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1970. p. 40.

Lierheimer, Alvin P. "Changing the Palace Guard," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1970. p. 20.

Marland, Sidney P., Jr. "Career Education: Every Student Headed for a Goal," Education Digest, September, 1972. p. 2.

Mecklenberger, James A. "Epilogue: The Performance Contract in Gary," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973. p. 562.

Mecklenberger, James A. and John Wilson. "The Perfromance Contract in Gary," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973. p. 562.

Miller, Theodore J. "Anatomy of the New Superintendent," School Management, February, 1970. p. 36.

Moellenberg, Wayne P. "National Assessment: Are We Ready?," The Clearinghouse, April, 1969. p. 421.

Mosely, Francis S. "The Urban Secondary School: Too Late for Mere Change," Phi Delta Kappan, May 1972, p. 558.

Niedermeyer, Fred and Stephen Klein. "An Empirical Evaluation of a District Teacher's Accountability Program," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972. p. 100.

Nixon, President Richard M. The New York Times. Report on speech. March 4, 1970. p. 28.

"Opinion Poll," Nations Schools, December, 1970. p. 38.

Palardy, J. Michael. "Needed: Requiem for a Structure," The Clearinghouse, February, 1960. p. 360.

Pemke, Harold H. "Accountability and the Quarter System," Education Digest, April, 1973. p. 17.

Popham, James S. "Objectives '72," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1972. p. 432.

Porter, John W. "The Accountability Story in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972. p. 98.

Randall, Otis E. "Character Building in College," Education, June, 1915. p. 620.

Rice, Arthur H. "Projections and Priorities for the 80's," Nations Schools, December, 1970. p. 16.

_____. "Public Relations Problems Impede Community Support," Nations Schools, August, 1970. p. 12.

Roth, Robert A. "Certifying Teachers: An Overhaul is Underway," Education Digest, April 1973. p. 24.

Schwarts, Ron. "Accountability," Nations Schools, June, 1970. p. 31.

Sears, Jesse. The Nature of the Administrative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

Serrette, William A. Conference Report. October, 1970.

Sills, Kenneth E. "Character, A Neglected College Entrance Requirement," Education, June, 1915. p. 615.

Small, Allen A. "Accountability in Victorian England," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1972. p. 438.

Stinnett, T. M. "Re-ordering Roles and Goals," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1970. p. 43.

Summers, Wesley K. "School Management and Social Responsibility," The Clearinghouse, September, 1969. p. 3.

Turner, Harold E. "Mobilizing Political Power for Action," Educational Leadership, October, 1970. p. 41.

Travers, Dr. John F. "Leadership and Administration," American School Board Journal, September, 1960. p. 41.

Voegel, G. H. "Accountability and Performance Contracting: Implications for Supportive Staff," Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971. p. 16.

Washington Report. "Performance Contracting Results are Mixed," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1972. p. 391.

Watson, Bernard C. "Rebuilding the System: Practical Goal or Impossible Dream," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971. p. 349.

Wayson, William W. "Organizing Urban Schools for Responsible Education," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971. p. 344.

Weiss, Edmond. "Educational Accountability and the Presumption of Guilt," The Educational Digest, April, 1973. p. 21.

Whyte, William H., Jr. The Organization Man. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956.

Woodington, Donald D. "Accountability from the Viewpoint of a State Commissioner of Education," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972. p. 95.

APPENDIX A

A SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

A SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Anshen, Melvin. "The Program Budget in Operation," (Chapter 12 in the book, Program Budgeting, ed. by D. Novick, Harvard, 1965.) Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1965.

Baker, William P. (Chairman). Interim Report of Advisory Committee on Achievement and Evaluation to Assembly Education Committee. San Jose, California. June, 1968.

Baker, William P. "The Search for Quality--What's New in Evaluation?" Journal of Secondary Education, Burlingame, California, December, 1969.

Baker, William P. "Accountability--A La California," California Association of School Administrators.

Burkhead, Jesse. Input and Output in Large City High Schools. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1967.

Beaubier, Edward W. (Project Director). "Project Evaluation," California Elementary School Administrators Association, Project on Evaluation, Long Beach, California, June, 1970.

California Association of School Business Officials. Souther Section, School Budget Research Committee. Program Budgeting in Public School Districts, April 14, 1967.

California State Department of Education, "State-Wide Testing Programs in California," leaflet, Sacramento, California, September, 1969.

Deeney, John B. A P.P.B.E.S. for the Bozeman Public Schools. Doctoral Thesis. Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana. June, 1971.

Donaldson, John. "The Chapter and P.P.B.S.," California Teachers Association.

Dyer, Henry S. "Systems Analysis from the Viewpoint of Education Research," Talk given at 1969 Educational Leadership Conference, Manchester, New Hampshire, April 7, 1969.

Echeverri, Keith. (Consultant) "The Way to Relevance and Accountability in Education," Report of the Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation, Sacramento, California, April, 1970.

Elkins, Eugene R. Program Budgeting: A Method for Improving Fiscal Management. (Publication #14) Bureau of Government Research, West Virginia University, Morgantown, Virginia, 1955.

Fisher, G. H. "The Role of Cost-Utility Analysis in Program Budgeting," (Chapter 3 in the book, Program Budgeting, ed. by D. Novick, Harvard, 1965.) Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1964.

_____. The World of Program Budgeting. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1966.

Fitzsimmons, Warren Biggs. A Model for a Public School Program Budget. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Colorado State College, 1966.

George Washington University. State-Local Finance Project. Planning for Educational Development in a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System. Prepared for the Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Hagen, John Walter. A Three Dimensional Program Budget Format for Public Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles, 1968.

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

Hill, LaMar L. and Frank L. Mattox. Program Budgeting in Public School Districts. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern California, 1967.

Hill, Roy C. (Chairman). "A Consideration of Implementing Activity on Educational Goals and Objectives," Report of ad hoc committee, California Association of School Administrators, Burlingame, California, September 23, 1970.

Hirsch, W. Z. "Education in the Program Budget," (Chapter 7 of the book, Program Budgeting, ed. by D. Novick, Harvard, 1965.) Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1965.

Hirsh, W. Z. Integrating View of Federal Program Budgeting. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1965.

_____. Toward Federal Program Budgeting. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1966.

Jungherr, J. A. Can Small School Districts Use a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System? Paper presented at the New York State School Business Official Annual Meeting, May 21, 1968.

Kammerer, Gladys M. Program Budgeting: An Aid to Understanding. University of Florida, Gainseville, Florida: Public Administration Clearing Service, 1961.

Kershaw, J. S. and R. N. McKean. Systems Analysis and Education. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1959.

Lessinger, Leon M. "The Powerful Notion of Accountability in Education," Journal of Secondary Education, Burlingame, California, December, 1970.

Lewis, Edmond L. (Editor). "Educational Goals and Objectives," California School Boards Association, Sacramento, California, September, 1969.

Lindman, Erick L. A Three Dimensional Program Account Classification System for Public Schools. (Working Paper No. 6) Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, University of California, Los Angeles, June, 1968.

Loughary, John W. Man-Machine Systems in Education. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1966.

Lowe, Frank A. "How to Initiate a Performance Budget," pp. 1-7 of Performance Budgeting and Unit Cost Accounting for Governmental Units. Municipal Finance Officers Assocation, Chicago, Illinois, 1954.

McCullough, J. D. Cost Analysis for Planning-Programming-Budgeting Cost-Benefit Studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1966.

Manasse, Fred C. Crisis in School Finance. New York; H. B. Maynard Co., Inc., 1967.

Midwestern States Educational Information Project. Documentation of Project Development and General System Design. Des Moines, Iowa: MSEIP, Department of Public Instruction, Grimes State Office Building, July, 1968.

Mitchell, Edward E. What is PPBS? Paper presented at the New England Institute for School Business Officials, May, 1968.

Novik, David. Orgin and History of Program Budgeting. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1966.

_____. Program Budgeting: Long-Range Planning in the Department of Defense. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1962.

_____. (ed.) Program Budgeting . . . Program Anaysis and the Federal Budget. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University press, 1965.

Perkins, Joseph L., Jr. "PPBS for Education," leaflet, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, New York City, New York, (undated).

Position Paper on PPBS. Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, California.

Quade, E. S. Systems Analysis Techniques for Planning-Programming-Budgeting. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Sabine, Creta D. A Budget Format for Use in the Public Schools of Arizona. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Arizona State University, 1968.

Sherwood, Robert Petersen. Cost Implications of Specific State Legislative Requirements: An Application of Program Budgeting to Selected California Unified School Districts. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley, 1965.

Smithies, A. "A Conceptual Framework for the Program Budget," (Chapter 2 in the book, Program Budgeting, ed. by D. Novick, Harvard, 1965.) Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1964.

Stanford Research Institute PPBS Staff. Planning-Programming-Budgeting System in the New York City School System . . . An Introduction. Office of Business and Administration, Board of Education of the City of New York, Brooklyn, New York, June, 1967.

Stegeman, William H. "Planning, Programming and Budgeting Systems," California Journal for Instructional Improvement, May, 1970.

Stohl, Robert. PPBS and the Teacher. California Teachers Association.

Terhue, George A. Performance and Program Budgeting Practices in the United States and Canada. Municipal Finance Officers Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1966.

Williams, Harry. Planning for Effective Resource Allocation in Universities. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.

ARTICLES

Ackerly, Harold E. "For Better Public Relations Use A Performance Budget," Nations Schools, February, 1951. p. 37.

Anderson, Lynn F. "Performance Budgeting," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol. 53, 1967. pp. 371-379.

Barbour, William H. "Program Budgeting," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol. 53, 1967. pp. 148-154.

Bethke, Paul. "Program Budgeting," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol 53, 1967. pp. 154-156.

Boyer, E. Gil. "PPBS: As a Tool for Recording Data for Better Education Legislation," Leadership for Education; Proceedings of the National Conference of State Legislators, December 4-6, 1966. pp. 69-72.

Bragin, Jeanette. "Program Budgeting," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol. 53, 1967. p. 156.

Burkhead, Jesse. "The Theory and Application of Program Budgeting to Education," Trends in Financing Public Education: The Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on School Finance, National Education Association, April, 1965. pp. 180-190.

Chambers, George A. "The Concepts and Problems of Planning Program-Budgeting Systems," Journal on State School Systems Development, Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1968. pp. 223-236.

Furno, Orlando F. "Program Budgeting and School Quality," AEDS Monitor, April, 1967. pp. 13-16.

Hartley, Harry J. "Economic Rationality in Urban School Planning: The Program Budget," Urban Education, 3(1), 1967. pp. 39-49.

Hill, Donald W. "Progress Report on Program Budgeting in Chicago," Trends in Financing Public Education: The Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on School Finance, National Education Association, April, 1965. pp. 191-193.

Hill, LaMar L. "Program Budgeting in Public School Districts," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol. 53, 1967. pp. 157-160.

Hitch, Charles J. "The New Approach to Management in the U.S. Defense Department, Management Science, October, 1962. pp. 1-8.

_____. "Plans, Programs and Budgets in the Department of Defense," Operations Research, January-February, 1963. pp. 1-7.

James, H. T. "Modernizing State and Local Financing of Education," Education Digest, Vol. 30, December, 1964. pp. 13-17.

Jungherr, J. A. "Planning-Programming-Budgeting for Public School Districts," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol. 53, 1967. pp. 134-147.

Mattox, Frank L. "Program Budgeting in Public School Districts," Proceedings of the Association of School Business Officials, Vol. 53, 1967. pp. 161-163.

McGowan, Wayne F. "How to Apply a Program-Planning-Budgeting System in Your State," Leadership for Education; Proceedings of the National Conference of State Legislators, December 4-6, 1966. pp. 79-85.

Murphy, Joseph S. "The Quiet Revolution in Government Planning Techniques," Management Review, April, 1968. pp. 4-12.

Richardson, E. Gordon and George A. Chambers. "Cost Accounting for Education," School Business Affairs, November, 1967. p. 288.

Rowen, Henry S. "Long-Range Planning," Leadership for Education; Proceedings of the National Conference of State Legislators, December 4-6, 1966. pp. 69-72.

Sabine, Creta D. "Budget Model for Use in Public Schools," School Business Affairs, August, 1968. pp. 203.

Seckler-Hudson, Catheryn. "Performance Budgeting in the Government of the U.S.," Public Finance, Vol. VII, 1952. pp. 327-345.

Stimbert, E. C. "Progress Report on Programmed Budgeting in Memphis," Trends in Financing Public Education: The Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on School Finance, National Education Association, April, 1965. pp. 194-198.

Struve, Theodore A. and Gustave J. Rath. "Planning-Programming-Budgeting in Education," Educational Technology, Vol. VI, June 15, 1966. pp. 1-14.

Swanson, Austin D. "The Cost-Quality Relationship," The Challenge of Change in School Finance: Proceedings of the Tenth National Conference on School Finance, April 2-4, 1967. Sponsored by the Committee on Education Finance, NEA.

Takasaki, Richard S. "Translate Programs into Dollars with Federally-Tested Budget," College and University Business, May, 1967.

Tough, Coulson and James Sharp. "A Systems Approach to Budgeting Can Open Communication Bottlenecks," College and University Business, May, 1968. pp. 68-71.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "Educational Administration in the Decade Ahead," School Life, January, 1961.

Zanfino, Frank J. "Get Ready for Cost Accounting," College and University Business, April, 1968. pp. 57-63.

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Dwight, and Peter Wagschall. "A New Look at Credentialing," The Clearinghouse, November, 1969.

Bain, Helen. "Self Government Must Come First, Then Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1970. p. 413.

Bair, Medill. "Developing Accountability in the Urban School," The Educational Technician, January, 1971.

Barro, Stephen M. "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1970.

Bhaerman, Robert D. "Accountability, The Great Day of Judgment," The Educational Technician, January, 1971.

Briner, Conrad. Administration and Accountability, College of Education, Ohio State University, October, 1969.

Chavez, Simon J. "Performance Accountability in Teacher Education," The Audio Visual Instructor, March, 1971.

Cohodes, Aaron. "Inside Out," Matrons Schools, October, 1970.

Combs, Arthur and Sidney Jourard. "Two Humanists," Media and Methods, December, 1971.

Costa, Arthur L. "Who's Accountable to Whom?," Educational Leadership, October, 1970.

Cunningham, Luvern. Our Accountability Problem, College of Education, Ohio State University, October, 1969.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Moving Forward in Educational Accountability: Florida's Program," The Educational Technician, January, 1971.

Denemark, George W. "Teacher Education: Refrain, Reform, and Revolution," Educational Leadership, March, 1970.

"Differentiated Staffing O.K., But More Research Wanted," Nations Schools, September, 1970.

Dreilsurs, Rudolph and Marvin Chernoff. "Parents and Teachers: Friends or Enemies," Education, November-December; 1970.

Erickson, Edsel L., et al. "The Educability of Dominant Groups," Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1972.

Finley, Robert M. "Stop Stumbling Over Technology," Nations Schools, October, 1970.

Fischer, Stanley. "Dropouts Drop Back in at DeKalb," Nations Schools, August, 1970.

Ginberg, Eli. "Vocational Education Is Not the Answer," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1971.

Green, Edith. "The Business of Education," (an interview), Nations Schools, December, 1970.

Grieder, Calvin. "Administrator's Clinic," Nations Schools, August, 1970.

Harrison, Charles H. "The Superintendent as Power Broker," School Management, February, 1970.

_____. "Public Relations," Nations Schools, July, 1970.

Hemfel, Marvin W. "Accountability and Technology," The Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971.

Henthoff, Margaret. "A Family Dialogue," Saturday Review, September 19, 1970.

Henthoff, Nat. "The Schools We Want," Saturday Review, September 19, 1970.

Hitchens, Howard Jr. "Accountability," The Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971.

Hohlfield, Marsha. "Public Relations," The Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971.

Husen, Torsten. "Does More Time in School Make a Difference?," The Education Digest, September, 1972.

Hyer, Anna L. "From Gold Stars to Green Stamps," The Audio Visual Instructor, May, 1971.

Kane, Robert K. Accountability, The Agitator. Association of Graduates in Instructional Technology, The University of Southern California, April, 1970.

Lessinger, Leon. "After Texarkana, What?." Nations Schools, December, 1968.

_____. "How Educational Audits Measure Performance," Nations Schools, December, 1969.

_____. "On Educational Accountability," The Clearinghouse, April, 1971.

Levenson, William B. "School Principals On the Crossfire Line," The Clearinghouse, December, 1971.

Mayer, Frank C. "Internal Communications," The Clearinghouse, January, 1970.

McAdams, Richard P. "Avoiding Court Cases: A Guide for Administrators," The Clearinghouse, January, 1970.

Ostrander, Raymond H. and Ray C. Dethy. A Values Approach to Educational Administration. American Book Company, 1968.

"Outlook for Teacher Incentives," Nations Schools, November, 1970.

Parsons, Talcott. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach To the Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, September, 1956.

Payne, James S. "Teaching Teachers and Teaching Mind Readers," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1972.

"Performance Contracting," Nations Schools, October, 1970.

Pifer, Ann. "The Responsibility in Higher Education," The Education Digest, September, 1972.

Primack, Robert. "Accountability for Humanists," Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1971.

Robinson, Donald W. "Accountability for Whom? For What?," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1970.

Rosengren, William R. "Structure, Policy and Style," Administrative Science Quarterly, December, 1970.

Samples, Robert. "Discountability," Media and Methods, December, 1972.

Saretsky, Gary. "Every Kid a Hustler," Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1971.

Schrag, Peter. "End of the Impossible Dream," Saturday Review, September, 1970.

Schrank, Jeffrey. "The Institution Trap," Media and Methods, December, 1970.

Schwartz, Ronald. "Performance Contracts Catch On," Nations Schools, August, 1970.

Seltz, Judith. "A Teacher's Guide to Performance Contracting," Grade Teacher, April, 1971.

Simons, Herbert D. "Behavioral Objectives: A False Hope for Education," Elementary School Journal, January, 1973.

Stanford, Barbara. "How Innovators Fail," Media and Methods, October, 1971.

"The Truth About Out Public Schools Changing Times," The Kiplinger Magazine, June, 1954.

Thompson, Ralph. "Imperatives in Education," The Clearinghouse, February, 1970.

"Total Performance Package Dispute Still Unresolved," Nations Schools, December, 1970.

"Two Districts Will Try Incentive Contract Plans," Nations Schools, December, 1970.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Testing for Accountability," Nations Schools, December, 1970.

Van Til, William. "Back to Normalcy," Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973.

Warshaw, Miriam. "Accountability and Aquarius," Media and Methods, December, 1970.

APPENDIX C

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ERIC SOURCES

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ERIC SOURCES

Allen, James E. Jr. ERIC #ED 031 804, 1969.

Barson, John and Gardner Jones. ERIC #ED 011 959, 1965.

Bormuth, John. ERIC #ED 031 777, 1969.

Case, C. Marston. ERIC #ED 025 851, 1969.

Harmon, W. G. ERIC #ED 040 491, 1968.

Hoffernberg, Marvin. ERIC #ED 031 803, 1969.

Huff, Robert A. ERIC #ED 040 672, 1970.

Jones, Gardner, et al. ERIC #ED 031 897, 1969.

Kiesling, Herbert J. ERIC #ED 039 726, 1970.

Marlsle, Susan Meyer. ERIC #ED 039 711, 1970.

Miller, James G. ERIC #ED 039 728, 1970.

Molmar, Andrew. ERIC #ED 027 755, 1969.

Postman, Neil. ERIC #ED 039 718, 1970.

Schramm, Wilbur, et al. ERIC #ED 018 982, 1967.

Speagle, Richard E. ERIC #ED 039 725, 1970.

Temkin, Sanford A. ERIC #ED 040 503, 1970.

Warren, Malcolm W. ERIC #ED 034 921, 1969.

Wessel, C. J. ERIC #ED 032 100, 1969.