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Abstract:
In this study a plan to initiate organizational self-renewal in a school system was developed and applied
in the public school system of Three Forks, Montana. The problem of the study was to determine if a
theoretical plan taken from behavioral science literature could in fact produce anticipated results. The
plan of this study attempted to develop a process for bringing members of the subgroups of the school
organization together to renew the organization. The plan was based on a self-study approach with data
feedback, the intent to develop more open, cooperative, and systematic problem solving and to deepen
the school community's motivation to improve its own system. The focus of the plan was to give
members of the student, faculty, community, and board subgroups of the organization an opportunity in
small group activities to experience a genuine change in the climate of the school system. The system
was expected to experience climate change—to be measured through assessment of attitude
change—and to initiate the development of task groups (structural change) to support comprehensive
self-renewal efforts.

Community members, students, school board members, faculty members, and administrators met in a
series of twelve community-wide meetings, and additional small group meetings, to consider problems
in their rural school system. In addition to relying on the volunteer participation of members of school
subgroups, the project provided for the selection of random groups of students and community
members who were asked to participate. A randomly-selected group of students and community
members comparable to the randomly-selected participant students and community members was also
used in the study as a non-participating control group. Participant and non-participant groups were
given pre-test and post-test questionnaires on school organizational issues, including how much people
felt they could express their opinions and have influence, how much people felt that they knew about
the school's program, how unified school community members were in their efforts to improve the
school, how much respect there was among school community members, how much the school was in
need of improvement, and how much people felt that the school board served the best interests of the
students.

The study was generally successful in producing new goals, channels of communication, and task
groups to act to solve some of the school's problems. Participants did learn and reapply problem solving
and interpersonal communications skills. The participants in the study, except for volunteer community
members, did show significant positive change in their attitudes toward the school. Non—participating
control group members did not change their attitudes significantly during the first year of this three
year study. The Three Forks Schools appeared to gain self-renewing characteristics as a result of the
initiation of the plan of the first year of the study. The researcher recommended that other school
systems replicate this study.
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In this study a plan to initiate organizational self-renewal in a school system was developed and applied in the public school system of Three Forks, Montana. The problem of the study was to determine if a theoretical plan taken from behavioral science literature could in fact produce anticipated results. The plan of this study attempted to develop a process for bringing members of the subgroups of the school organization together to renew the organization. The plan was based on a self-study approach with data feedback, the intent to develop more open, cooperative, and systematic problem solving and to deepen the school community's motivation to improve its own system. The focus of the plan was to give members of the student, faculty, community, and board subgroups of the organization an opportunity in small group activities to experience a genuine change in the climate of the school system. The system was expected to experience climate change—to be measured through assessment of attitude change—and to initiate the development of task groups (structural change) to support comprehensive self-renewal efforts.

Community members, students, school board members, faculty members, and administrators met in a series of twelve community-wide meetings, and additional small group meetings, to consider problems in their rural school system. In addition to relying on the volunteer participation of members of school subgroups, the project provided for the selection of random groups of students and community members who were asked to participate. A randomly-selected group of students and community members comparable to the randomly-selected participant students and community members was also used in the study as a non-participating control group. Participant and non-participant groups were given pre-test and post-test questionnaires on school organizational issues, including how much people felt they could express their opinions and have influence, how much people felt that they knew about the school's program, how unified school community members were in their efforts to improve the school, how much respect there was among school community members, how much the school was in need of improvement, and how much people felt that the school board served the best interests of the students.

The study was generally successful in producing new goals, channels of communication, and task groups to act to solve some of the school's problems. Participants did learn and reapply problem solving and interpersonal communications skills. The participants in the study, except for volunteer community members, did show significant positive change in their attitudes toward the school. Non-participating control group members did not change their attitudes significantly during the first year of this three year study. The Three Forks Schools appeared to gain self-renewing characteristics as a result of the initiation of the plan of the first year of the study. The researcher recommended that other school systems replicate this study.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The body of knowledge is growing about how to help various types of groups and social organizations deal with internal conditions that inhibit them and prevent their coping adequately with their internal and environmental problems. Bennis (1966), Chin (1969), Etzioni (1969), Hage (1970), Watson (1969), Walton (1969), Beckhard (1969), Blake (1969), and Rogers (1969) are examples of only a few of the men currently writing in the field of organizational development and self-renewal. Much has been written about planning for change, but as Hansen pointed out, "There are almost as many strategies, procedures, methodologies, and approaches to planning for change as there are scholars in the field and practitioners of the art." (Hansen, 1967: 25)

Argyris, author of several books on organizational change, has deplored much of the work that has been done by social scientists writing on the science of organizations. He wrote that for years many social scientists have separated thought from action, maintaining that the separation of the process of understanding organizations from the process of improving them was necessary for a science of organizations to develop. Argyris suggested that this separation has been one of the primary reasons for inhibiting systematic research in the area of planned change and for preventing the behavioral sciences from becoming more relevant and systematic. Argyris maintained that researchers agree that an important quality
of a theory should be its ability to predict accurately under different conditions, and in the case of organizations, the theory should be able to predict how and explain why the system will behave differently under different conditions. While Argyris believed that there were several ways of studying organizational change or development, he felt that the most powerful approach was for the researcher to go directly into an organization to actively help to plan and execute changes and to test in field research aspects of change theory. (Argyris, 1970: vi)

Argyris attributed the power in this approach to the following prerequisites required for carrying on this type of field research:

1. An accurate diagnosis of the system is required that can explain the reason it exists the way it does.
2. Specific predictions are required that attempt to explain the system's present state of ineffectiveness and the factors that may increase the system's ineffectiveness in the future.
3. The changes that are necessary, the sequence with which they may be brought about, and the probable resisting forces need to be made explicit.
4. Theories of change and intervention are required which can be used to help bring about the desired changes.
5. Finally, a theory of evaluation is required in order to measure the effectiveness of the change. (Argyris, 1970: vii)

Members of the organization who are allowed to help plan and bring about changes in an organization will not knowingly allow the development of a process that will make the system less effective. If theory on organizational change is to be tested, researchers must become actively involved in bringing about planned change to improve organizations. Dealing with broad organizational descriptions has not been looked upon by the empirically-minded researcher as a convenient
area for study, however. "Research in this area is meager if not practically nonexistent." (Argyris, 1970: vii) Most every statement that a researcher in organizational development finds to direct him in his field research must have been conceived as a hypothesis rather than an empirical generalization. Definitions of the meaning of system improvement, effectiveness, or health are necessary in studies of this type, and these definitions are normative. Yet, the picture is not as dim as it might seem. Since system improvement is normative, studies may be conducted in an organization to identify inconsistencies between what the members of the system want and what they are getting. While the researcher did not decide what members want, he might have helped them see if they were accomplishing their goals. The researcher helped the members of the system to examine the criteria they use to define success, and the researcher helped the society explore what new norms and evaluative criteria should be created. A researcher using this approach does not attempt to tell people what they ought to desire, what criteria of system success they should use, or what values they should accept or reject. However, a researcher who cares about the people he works with can help them develop a process by which information can be obtained, by which valid diagnosis will be made, by which people can be helped to make informed choice, and by which a wider variety of members of organizations can monitor their own decisions, once implemented. (Argyris, 1970: viii)

The school system, as a social organization, has become the focus of study of some writers interested in organizational development. However, descriptive studies of schools undergoing organizational develop-
ment process is meager in the literature. Investigations into organizational change have begun to be made by the Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon (Schmuck and Runkel, 1970: ix), the Cooperative Project for Educational Development at the National Training Laboratory (Watson, 1967: v), the Eight State Project (Morphet, Johns and Reller, 1967) and the Northwest Regional Laboratory Educational Change Projects (Schalock and Hale, 1968: 1-7). The processes recommended by writers connected with these projects involve getting as many school community members as possible to express their feelings on the results of the practices of the school.

Watson and Schmuck have written that promoting change in the schools, as in other institutions, is a far more difficult task than anticipated. If enormous inertia of the system seems to defeat all but the most determined and ingenious efforts, then a strong commitment to change by a few teachers or administrators in a school system is rarely enough. Rather, it appears that before fundamental reform can take place, all school personnel must be involved in a concentrated effort to remove both personal and institutional resistance to change. (Watson, 1969; Schmuck and Runkel, 1970)
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to develop and initiate in a school system organization a process which could improve the capabilities of groups in the organization to identify and clarify problems. The purpose was to involve organizational groups in sharing expectations of the school so that these expectations could become more acceptable to and understood by all groups — thereby integrating the organization around common goals. The problem of this study was to develop a plan of self-renewal for a school system to help the organization involve its various subgroups in setting priorities on expectations or objectives for the school. A second step in the problem was to apply the developed plan in the school over a period of approximately six months. A third step in the problem was to observe, record, and evaluate the results of the use of the plan. The outcomes of the study will be the developed plan or process of bringing about organizational self-renewal, as well as the description of the results of the application of the plan.

More specifically, the problem was to accomplish the following objectives:

(1) to develop from the literature of the behavioral sciences and organizational change an eclectic and creative plan for initiating organizational self-renewal in a school system through the use of cooperative subgroup decision-making concerning educational goals for the organization, and emphasizing the development of processes of problem-solving skills and interpersonal skills.
(2) to apply the plan in the Three Forks, Montana, school system, which has requested assistance in involving organizational subgroups, including community members, board members, student groups, and faculty groups, in appraising, clarifying, and renewing educational goals of the school system.

(3) to determine the degree to which the developed plan did, or did not, produce desired organizational self-renewal features constituted by the organization's responding to its environment by its creating new decision-making groups, goals, and channels of communication.

(4) to evaluate (using Mager's educational objectives model and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory's problem statement model) the quality of statements of educational goals made by subgroups of the project.

(5) to collect, tabulate, and evaluate through pre-test and post-test questionnaires any changes in the attitudes of project participants (experimental groups) and non-participants (control groups) toward organizational issues including satisfaction with the opportunity individuals are provided to express their opinions, the knowledge people have of the school's program, the amount of involvement of community members in educational planning, the degree that important school problems are aired for community discussion, the quality of the instruction and goals of the school, the level of respect held for people in the school community, the use of resources in the school, and the work of the school board and administration.

(6) to determine how participants in the project feel about the value of the project in general, as well as its specific phases and community meetings.

In summary, the success of the project was to be judged on its ability to produce (1) new channels of communication among the school's subgroups, (2) a democratically-derived statement of community expectations (standardized goals and problem statements) of the school from which the staff may make curriculum changes in the future, (3) a brief philosophy of education reflecting the attitudes of the community, (4) a positive change in the project participants'
attitudes toward the school, its goals, and its personnel, (5) a modified organization with newly formed problem-solving (task) groups that begin to share organizational development responsibilities and (6) positive participant attitudes toward the project and its phases.

Importance of the Study

Bennis made the following statement about organizational integration:

Any complex social system, which is the basic way we conceive of an organization, is made up of differentiated parts, the activities of which must be integrated into a unified effort if the organization is to cope effectively with its environment. (Bennis, Benne and Chin, 1969: 471)

Schools are not static. They have multiple and differentiated processes that are constantly in motion. One essential process for adaptation concerns the feedback that changes modes of interaction of the school with its environment so as to maintain goal directedness. Every time the feedback process results in a new plan for equilibration, the school has altered its structure by that much and is therefore a modified organization. Self-renewal in the educational organization is dependent on feedback and continual appraisal of superordinate objectives. Applying a process for initiating organizational self-renewal in an educational system may help the system achieve more capability for rapidly and efficiently adapting to current needs of students and society and thereby improve the educational organization and student achievement.
Another point is important, concerning a project which seeks to involve laymen in appraising educational goals. Lucio and McNeil made the following statements regarding the importance of lay participation in education:

The school has been one of the few institutions where a scattered public could recognize itself and express its interest. Inasmuch as citizens feel even more remote from civic, national, and international affairs, it is desirable to preserve those neighborly vehicles by which the individual is able to feel the effect of his voice in crucial public matters. Further, such participation makes possible the innovations and new creations which are essential in the execution of an adequate plan. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 132)

General Questions to Be Answered

The main question to be answered in this study was whether or not the developed plan for bringing about organizational self-renewal in a school system could truly bring about the integration of the purposes of the members of the organization through the restatement of educational goals and educational philosophy reflecting the interests and contributions of the people in the subgroups of the school. Self-renewal in an organization was described earlier in this paper as involving the subgroups of an organization in building new norms, procedures, and mechanisms for decision-making and planning when achievement of goals falls below expectations. In a school system where a survey indicated that people are generally not satisfied with the school's achievement of preferred goals, a basic question centered around whether or not the application of a self-renewal process could actually create new norms, procedures, and decision-making groups that could increase the satis-
faction people have with the school's achievement of its goals. If conflicts of interest over school goals was discovered, and if the organization appeared to lack integration of purposes, a question was whether or not the plan applied could bring about the resolution of conflicts and the development of positive participants' attitudes toward the school, its goals and purposes, and its subgroup members. It will also be very important to determine if school community members who did not participate in the project significantly changed their attitudes in a positive direction as a result of their association with participants in the project.

A critical question was whether or not a plan, as developed and employed by an individual researcher with individual personality traits and competencies, would be accepted by a given community, carried through to completion, and produce the expected results.

A community is a very complex arrangement of social institutions and value systems. The educational institution is one part of the community network. An important consideration in this study is whether or not a sociological study of a particular community's inter-relationships and problems must precede the development of an educational self-renewal model so that particular mechanisms must be constructed to solve specific community problems. This study tested a self-renewal plan's ability to bring about planning among community members with unidentified differences and influences. The process was
developed as a model of school organizational self-renewal, and the process was not adapted to special identified problems in a particular community. Could a model of an organizational self-renewal process be applied and completed in a school system without developing specific mechanisms for solving specific community problems?

Discovering if members of the various subgroups participating in the project felt the same about the value of the project was of importance. Would some groups have more positive attitudes than others? Would the participants feel that each of the phases, meetings, and activities in the project were of value? Would parts of the project appear to need revision if the project were to be replicated?

Generally, could a school system successfully involve members of its subgroups in creating new goals and decision-making groups and thereby revitalize a traditional bureaucratic system? Could people be taught processes for writing and solving problems? Could interpersonal communications be improved through small group interaction in educational planning meetings? Could the educational expectations of a community be unified to provide a school system the direction and support necessary for improving education by better meeting the needs of the people it served?
In summary, was the project successful as measured by its ability to produce (1) new channels of communications among the school's subgroups? (2) democratically-derived statements of community expectations (standardized goals and problem statements) of the school from which the staff may make curriculum changes in the future? (3) a brief philosophy of education reflecting the attitudes of the community? (4) a positive change in the project participants' attitudes toward the school, its goals, and its personnel? (5) a modified organization with newly formed problem-solving (task) groups that begin to share organizational development responsibilities? (6) positive participant attitudes toward the project and its phases?
General Procedures of the Study

The study grew out of a university independent study project in sociology which began with a review of behavioral science literature on organizational change as it might be applied to schools as organizations. A variety of plans for initiating organizational self-renewal in an educational system were studied. From a combination of theories that seemed logical and meaningful to this researcher, a plan for initiating a self-renewal process in Three Forks, Montana, school system was developed, emphasizing the diagnostic aspect of self-renewal processes described in the literature.

The researcher attended the "Human Interaction in Education" workshop at the Center for Studies of the Person in La Jolla, California; the "Research Utilizing Problem-Solving" workshop sponsored by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWRL) at Great Falls, Montana; and the "Interpersonal Communications" workshop sponsored by the NWRL at Helena, Montana. This training provided the researcher with practical laboratory experiences which supplemented his knowledge of change processes as found in the literature. Experience gained in the workshop was used to revise and complete the plan for organizational self-renewal in a school system.

An agreement was made with the superintendent and school board of the Three Forks, Montana, school system to implement the plan in that school system. Meetings were held with the board and superintendent to consider the developed plan for the Three Forks Schools.
A survey including school organizational concerns was developed to give to all members of the school community, and the results of this survey were used to determine the interest people might have in educational concerns and in getting involved in an educational planning project. All community members, students, board members, and teachers were given an opportunity to indicate if they would like to volunteer to participate later in the year in small group discussions about education.

From the response to this survey, the school board decided that there was a strong community interest in cooperatively planning to improve the educational system by trying to do a better job of meeting more of the expressed needs of the community. The researcher and the school superintendent were encouraged to seek funding for the project, and they discussed the proposed project with members of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Helena, Montana. State officials invited the Three Forks Schools to submit the project for federal funding under Title III of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act. Funding was needed to provide project materials, secretarial services, director's salary, evaluator's salary, and travel for project participants wishing to investigate innovations. The project was submitted for Title III ESEA funds in early October, 1970.

Three months later the project was funded with $17,500.00. An evaluator was hired for the project to help develop measures to determine the success of the project. The evaluator, project director (the
researcher), the school superintendent, and consultants from Montana State University cooperated to develop processes to be used in the project, to refine a questionnaire to be used to measure part of the results of the project, and to clarify criteria for measurement of the performance of expressed objectives of the project.

The project community meetings were ready to be started in January of 1971. A pre-test of the attitudes of the school community members toward their school was administered early in January before community meetings for sharing expectations and developing educational goals got underway. The pre-test was administered to a control group and to a participant or experimental group. To attempt to increase the representation of most community groups in the project, community members and students were selected at random and asked to participate in the project with people who had indicated in the earlier survey that they would like to volunteer to be part of the planning project. There were, then, two types of participants in the project — those that volunteered without being asked to participate, and those that agreed to participate after being told that they were randomly-selected to participate. The control group that the pre-test was administered to was a randomly-selected group of the same size as the randomly-selected participant group; the control group members did not take part in the community meetings of the project. The control group was used to determine the carry-over, if any, of attitudes of participants in the project to non-participants, and to be a gauge of community response to the educational planning project.
The phases of the initiation of the project, from the gathering of opinions to the development of task groups of people to work on carefully developed problems fitting into defined school goals, continued from January through May. In early May a post-test was given to participant and control groups to measure any changes in the attitudes of the people toward their school after the project was initiated. The project process was evaluated on the basis of its ability to actually produce anticipated outcomes—primarily, did the developed plan create organizational self-renewal in the school system? The goals developed by community members working in the project were evaluated for their quality. Each of the six phases of the project and each of the community meetings in the phases of the project were evaluated by participants in the project.

During the project a record of activities and products of meetings was kept so that other researchers might replicate the process. In Phase VI, the evaluator of the project and the project director cooperated to analyze and summarize the results of the project. A report of the plan to initiate the project was submitted to Title III ESEA officials in Helena, Montana, with a request for continuation funds to help the task groups developed in the project to continue their effort in bringing about the improvement and self-renewal of their educational system.
Definition of Terms

In this study the term organizational self-renewal refers to a process in which members of the subgroups of a complex social system, such as a school, share expectations of desired outcomes of the organization, study how well the organization meets stated purposes, and develop problem solving task groups of organization members to solve identified problems.

Groups of people working to solve problems may consider all of the factors, vectors, or forces related to one given problem. The term force-field analysis refers to a systematic consideration of the many issues or forces related to solving a particular problem. Some forces will help people solve problems, and some forces will oppose the solving of problems. In force-field analysis the many factors at work in the "field" of a problem are identified and considered for their interrelationships so that people may become very clear about what needs to be done to solve a problem.

Limitations of the Study

The plan selected for this study was limited to the initiation of organizational self-renewal in the particular school system of Three Forks, Montana. The project was also limited to starting a process that will not be completed as an end in itself. Self-renewal was considered in this project to be a continual need. The project was limited to identifying problems in a school system, to the discovery
of conflicts among subgroups concerning priorities placed upon various objectives, and to the discovery of means of resolving these conflicts through use of communications research. This project was not directed toward affecting major change in a school system directly. This project was limited to increasing subgroup satisfaction with organizational problem-solving and formulated specific educational goals rather than to personality development, though the latter may be a concomitant result. The project was limited to a time period of no more than one year, a period in which the superintendent, researcher, and board members expected to be able to produce results in terms of new goals, new decision-making groups, and improved attitudes toward the school and its programs and personnel.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LITERATURE

Introduction

While results of field research on plans for organizational development and self-renewal in school systems are generally lacking in the literature, writing on theories of change in schools is not difficult to find. In this chapter a selective over-view of organizational development literature related to schools is presented. Since one of the outcomes of this study is a particular plan of organizational self-renewal, Chapter IV in this paper includes a description of the rationale taken from the literature for various aspects of the developed plan. Chapter IV presents general theories of organizational change that provide a background for this study. The first section of Chapter II is a description of the school as it might be perceived as a kind of organization. The second section begins to clarify the meaning of "self-renewal" in a social organization. A third section presents thought on subgroup involvement in school goal development. The fourth section identifies the general type of planning model used in this study, and the last section summarizes suggestions for sequences of activities aimed toward creating organizational development.
School Systems as Social Organizations

Schools may be described as open, living systems, contained within, but constantly influencing and being influenced by the environment. They are complex social systems stabilized by role expectations, goals or objectives, and interpersonal norms. Individuals within a faculty behave predictably largely because of their adherence to shared expectations for what is appropriate in the schools. Schmuck wrote that norms are compelling stabilizers because individuals in the school monitor one another's behaviors. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 3) It is the strength of this sharedness that makes a school organization so resistant to modification; but which, at the same time, offers a tool for planned change.

If organizational change in the school is to be viable and stable, changes in interpersonal expectations must be shared so that each person knows that his colleagues have changed their expectations in the same way he has changed his own. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 3)

Bringing about the integration of an organization is contingent upon the sharing of expectations among subgroups of the organization, and organizational change projects rely heavily upon the use of small group activities which involve frequent exchanges of individual expectations and perceptions. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 135)

As an open system, an organization's efficiency may be measured by how completely resources are used in developing its products. Schmuck defined a school's efficiency as "the degree to which resources, such as quality of curriculum materials, are optimally integrated
and processed so as to produce the desired products—capable, competent, and responsible persons. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 4) Four postulates are basic to theories of school organizations as open systems, and they are summarized below: (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 4)

1. Schools are composed of basic units or components—the people and the curriculum. These components are organized into subsystems by means of the communication of information, by decision-making, job allocation, and program evaluation. Subsystems might include building groups of teachers, curriculum committees, departmental groups, community groups, various student groups, and administrative cabinets.

2. Schools are oriented toward goals. Subsystems are organized presumably to achieve system's goals and they are organized with functional differences. Administrative groups may forecast about the future and attempt to accommodate changing times; classroom teachers may diagnose the learning needs of their students; students may consider the relevancy of their curriculum; and parents and community members may judge the consequences of school policies.

3. While schools defend themselves within the political framework of bureaucracy (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 91) and often become rigid and closed, they still, to some degree, are always changing. They must react to environmental influences with feedback mechanisms.

Every social system must have the benefit of appraisal, if it is to survive, or grow beyond survival. Every social system also tends to seek equilibrium or a steady state.
Unfortunately, the equilibrium sought is sometimes a stationary one, and it inhibits change. (Morphet, Johns and Reller, 1967)

Certain subgroups in the school system manifest openness to the outside environment, such as the administration in relation to the school board; teachers in relation to innovations and administration; students to teachers, community members, and peers who express knowledge of environmental needs; and community members to administration, especially in terms of financial support of the schools. Schmuck stated that strain within schools occurs when one subsystem brings into the school district certain new practices and another subsystem is mostly closed to the new practices. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 5) This could likely occur when a new superintendent attempts to innovate in a school system through forced change, expecting teachers and board members to comply.

4. Schools are made up of many resources within their subsystems that at on given time are not being used. Schmuck referred to the adaptive resources of the school as a "variety pool." (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 5) While the variety pool may include a number of irrelevant or even deleterious processes in relation to its goals, it is necessary, if a school system is to be effectively adaptive, for the system to see, support, and facilitate the emergence of whatever resources exist for maximizing its educative functions — this process being a type of force-field analysis. (Jung, 1966: 1)
Organization Development through Decision-Making on Expectations and Objectives of the Organization

These four postulates above have been considered very relevant to the construction of projects aimed at the development of the school organization. Since the school is made up of various subsystems, helpful interventions are likely to be more efficient if they deal with subsystems and not just randomly selected components. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 5) Concerning the goal-directedness of the school, Lucio wrote the following statement:

Change in schools will occur more rapidly when more attention (e.g., measurement of product or outcomes from the school experiences) is given to the results of practice. Goal ambiguity encourages the institutionalization and ossification of teaching procedures. The failures to state goals operationally and to collect evidence regarding the extent to which our practices are successful have led to acceptance of existing practice, not to the search for better (more effective and economical) practices." (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 118)

Schmuck emphasized that the total school takes its shape from the ways the functional subsystems connect their efforts to one another, and for this reason, organizational development should focus on relationships within and between subsystems. (Schmuck and Runkel, 1970: 30)

Schmuck made the following statements concerning organizational development in a school system, after he and others completed projects in Oregon and Washington schools:

Since the goals of a school district lie in its interaction with its environment, an intervention in a school system should be designed to effect the inter-responsiveness of the system with its environment. Interventions should be aimed
at making every subsystem in the school more open to the influences of every other subsystem. Interventions should help the school define its variety pool by identifying system-wide resources and help the school build communication connections between components and subsystems. Interventions quite often lead to formations of problem-solving groups that did not exist in the formal structure of the school before the intervention. If school organizations are to be truly adaptive, they must be able to form new subsystems, change them, or dispose of them as needed. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 6)

When schools are faced with community demands for change, there are at least two plans these schools can follow. A school can re-model itself into a more adaptive form to meet the new demands of the community, e.g., the middle school, or the community school. Another plan is to involve the subsystems of the school in cooperatively building new norms and procedures that help the educational organization constantly to monitor the changing community, to compare the results of its own reactions to what it would accept as achievement of its goals, and to construct new forms whenever the achievement of goals falls below expectations. Schmuck of the University of Oregon called this latter plan flexible organizational problem-solving (Schmuck and Runkel, 1970: 2), and John Gardner called it organizational self-renewal. (Gardner, 1963: 18)

Lucio and McNeil have written that success of industrial experimentation which provided for group members to participate in decisions quickly led to similar practices in school supervision. Participation in the decisions to effect change in industrial settings was found to overcome group resistance to change and to lead to higher productivity.
Lucio and McNeil suggested that findings from studies of small group behavior may have been applied to readily to school situations, especially when people with authority outside of groups were not considered as influencing group decisions and when discussions in small groups were expected, by themselves, to bring about change and action. Participation in decision-making was found to be essential in effecting change, but discussion was not. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 112) Also Marquis, Guetzkow, and Heyns found that acceptance of goals is heightened by a goal-setting procedure involving participation or at least the feeling that one has the opportunity to participate if he wished. The possibility of participation was found to be more important than the actual participation. (Marquis, Guetzkow and Heyns, 1951: 58) Even though contemporary literature is not clear why participation is so effective, there is evidence that participation in decision-making is a strong force for helping organizations modify their goals and for helping individuals find reasons for honoring the total organization. If individuals find organizations to be significant to them, they may want to seek new and creative behaviors which will benefit the organization, and consequently themselves. Lucio and McNeil wrote that explanation of factors underlying the relation between participation procedures and goal acceptance is only starting. They made the following statement concerning goal acceptance:

Although participation increases the likelihood that a goal will be set which is congruent with individual goals, sometimes individual preferences are set as one engages in
group participation. Kelley and Thibault suggest the possibility that discussion leads to more adequate knowledge of the goal and its value to participants as well as a more realistic view of its attainability. Perhaps, too, a positive evaluation of the goal is derived from hearing that other members value it. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 135)

Whenever decisions about the school are being made, those individuals who have the greatest expertise relative to the questions at hand should be given an opportunity to contribute their knowledge. Yet, as Lucio and McNeil so strongly emphasized, this does not mean that the expert makes the decision, although his data should influence it. Lucio and McNeil stated that there must be a recognition of the responsibility that legal authorities or agents have for the actual decisions of policy and the execution of measures ensuring obedience.

Wide participation should take place not in formulating or deciding policy but in judging the consequences of that policy; the registering of approval or disapproval of the consequences may occur through political channels. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 86)

Subgroup Participation in Planning

Today a concern appears to exist that an intellectual elite may take over the responsibility of selecting a plan for curriculum development in our schools and thereby violate the rights and welfare of an unwary public. Lucio and McNeil felt that this concern centers around a larger social issue:

Is society best served by the method of practical intelligence, whereby all learn how to participate in the process of planning—a method which seeks to develop common purposes for life? Or is it best served by the method of reason, whereby men of expertness ... are given the authority for planning...? (Lucio and McNeil,
If the school organization uses the first alternative, administrators and consultants, who may be called organizational resources or change agents, strive to make the school a center for social reconstruction by involving adults and students in solving problems and in goal setting. Such questions as "What do we want our community to be like in 19 —" and How can the school best cooperate?" might be asked. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 131)

Reaction to this planning process has increased lately as the trend toward national curriculum projects has grown. The college subject-matter specialists are returning to the schools in many areas to direct thinking in curriculum development. Myron Lieberman wrote that national curriculum projects had to be supported to replace "one of the most pathetic sights on the curriculum educational horizon — myriads of local school communities, whose members have had little or no scientific training, trying to produce a modern science curriculum." (Lieberman, 1960: 60) Participation of teachers in curriculum development projects does not appear to result in greater pupil achievement than that which occurs when the curriculum is planned either by supervisors alone or by teachers working individually. (McGuire, 1959)

Yet the value of involving various subgroups of a school organization in the planning and appraisal of some parts of the school organization cannot be denied. If the general educational objectives of the school organization can be agreed upon by the differentiated subgroups in the organization, integration of the subgroups may be increased.
and integration of the organization around these general educational objectives, or superordinate organizational goals, can bring about adaptability. (Hage and Aiken, 1970: 125) The interrelationship between differentiation and integration of the subgroups of an organization has been described as being very important.

Any complex social system, which is the basic way we conceive of an organization, is made up of differentiated parts, the activities of which must be integrated into a unified effort if the organization is to cope effectively with its environment. (Bennis, Benne and Chin, 1969: 471)

Getzels developed a model for explaining social behavior through the use of the assumption that structurally school administration may be conceived as the hierarchy of subordinate and superordinate relationships within a social system; functionally, however, administration may be conceived as using the hierarchy of relationships as a locus for allocating and integrating roles in order to achieve the goals of the social system. Normative dimensions of activity in a social system must be coordinated with personal dimensions of a social system for individuals to be satisfied with a social organization. (Getzels, 1958: Ch. 7) Etzioni also wrote about the importance of objectives or purposes in formal organizations saying that purposes must be fulfilled at least to the extent that environmental requirements are met or these organizations will cease to exist — or be substantially restructured. (Etzioni, 1961: 3)
Planning Models

Numerous persons and groups have developed models of planning objectives and processes. Carefully designed models may provide frameworks of reference for thought, decision, and organization of effort. Models need not be rigid formulas for preparing plans, but they can provide general concepts of major elements of planning processes and of relationships between elements. By comparing a number of such models, planners can analyze the relative usefulness of alternatives and make deliberate choices of those deemed best for their specific purposes. (Hansen and Sandberg, 1969: 41)

Chin has summarized several plans for bringing about constructive change. He conceptualized three major types of strategies—the empirical-rational type, the normative-reeducative type, and the power strategies. In the first, change to be made is shown to be desirable and then it is brought to the attention of the potential changee. If the change is shown to be reasonable because it gives the individual some gain, he is expected to adopt it. In the normative-reeducative type a change agent is used to activate forces within a "client system" to alter the system itself. The emphasis might be said to be on people technology rather than on thing technology. The intention is to reeducate the changee, or the client system, to produce an outgrowth of creative resources from people within an organization to actualize planned change. By limiting the alternatives or
consequences of people's acts, in power strategies the imposition of power alters the conditions within which other people act. Compliance and submission are basic processes for the changes in the power strategy type. (Chin, 1966: 43)

Chin's own preference is clearly for the normative-reeducative strategy, which emphasizes involvement of people in the planning process to permit them to change their own outlooks and desires—in a sense, reeducate themselves to new norms and, thus, creatively innovate in ways that bring about the ends envisioned by the plan they themselves have created. (Chin, 1966: 44) In the project described in this dissertation, the normative-reeducative model was heavily relied upon.

Initiation of Self-Renewal through Identification and Diagnosis of Problems

Hansen proposed the following pattern of planning for change. He wrote that this pattern was a hybrid of several other patterns.

(1) Identification of problems; (2) diagnosis of the problem situation; (3) clarification of the diagnostic findings; (4) search for solutions; (5) mobilizing for change; and (6) making the actual change decisions. (Hansen, 1967: 25)

Hansen emphasized the importance of identifying problems to determine the necessity for change. He wrote that a problem is likely to exist in an educational organization when purposes and policies of the organization are not clear or consistent; when stated policies, once
developed and made explicit, are not matched by the operational procedures of the system; when people within the system see no possibility of operating differently; and when those who operate the organization want to change, but simply do not know how to bring change about. (Hansen, 1967: 26)

The initiation of a plan of self-renewal in a school system must involve a diagnosis of problems, their clarification, a search for solutions, and most importantly, these preliminary steps must lead to setting goals and objectives for change, establishing priorities, and developing change strategies. (Hansen, 1967: 28) Lorsch and Lawrence emphasized very strongly that considerable weight be placed on the diagnosis of organizational problems prior to the change effort to create an awareness of the need for change and to provide the motivation to develop the effort. They wrote that diagnostic data gathering about what concerns individuals in the organization should not be cursory and should be made through the use of surveys, rather than interviews with a few significant leaders. The main point made by Lorsch and Lawrence was that the change agent should learn what the concerns of individuals in the organization were before planning extensive action programs in advance. They also felt that more time spent in providing feedback to members in subgroups of the organization, as part of the diagnostic phase, was time well spent. While they wrote that they were aware of the argument that diagnostic analysis
was often overdone, they felt that if the effort were guided by a
well developed conceptual framework with a clear problem focus, the
diagnostic work would lead toward action and not away from it. By
helping an organization to gain skill in identifying, clarifying, and
finding solutions to problems, Lorsch and Lawrence felt that they were
leaving an organization with a "new kit of tools which they could con­
tinue to apply to similar problems in the future." (Bennis, Benne and
Chin, 1969: 468-477)

The instructional system developed by Jung (Fish, 1969: 7)
and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory was designed
to help educators use research in problem solving in a manner not un­
like that discussed above. In Jung's program called Research Utilizing
and Problem Solving (RUPS) the assumption is made that if the instruc­
tional manager is to perform his known instructional tasks to the
highest degree of effectiveness and efficiency, he needs to have skills
in research utilization and problem solving, force-field analysis,
listening, communicating, knowing how to be a helper and a helpee, giv­
ing and receiving feedback, and working with peers and superiors. (The
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory has developed a workshop
called Interpersonal Communications for helping people to build com­
munications skills.)

Basic to the RUPS process is the idea that when people attempt
to solve problems, they frequently leave out diagnosis of the problem
in the problem solving process. Continuous attention to a diagnosis of problems is basic in the RUPS process. Steps in this problem solving approach include the identification of the problem, the diagnosis of the problem situation, consideration of action alternatives, and initiation of action plans. This sequence of steps was employed in the Three Forks project, and units of the Interpersonal Communications materials of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory were used. Part of the RUPS process was used, also, in one phase of this project—the building of communications and problem-solving skills. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory has prepared materials which may be used for teaching groups of people communication and problem-solving skills. (Schalock and Hale, 1968: 2-5)
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the procedures used in this study to develop a plan for initiating organizational self-renewal in the Three Forks Public Schools, to apply the plan in that school system, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the application of the plan in producing anticipated results.

Preparation of a Plan for Initiating Organizational Self-Renewal in the Three Forks Public School System

Planning for the development of an organizational self-renewal project for the Three Forks Public School Districts J-24 and 24-24, Three Forks, Montana, began in February of 1970 when the school board of the Three Forks Schools expressed an interest in a project of this type to the new superintendent they had hired for 1971. The superintendent, Jack Kreitinger, spoke to the Three Forks school board about a needs assessment process that he and a fellow doctoral student (the researcher and Kreitinger had studied the Cooperative Project for Educational Development of the National Education Association’s National Training Laboratory, and they had applied part of the model of needs assessment by helping students and faculty members in the Ennis Public High School District No. 52, Ennis, Montana, to share ideas about how that high school might be improved. The researcher directed an evening meeting on April 29, 1970, to demonstrate brainstorming and elementary
force-field analysis techniques for the board and their wives. The techniques were taken from National Training Laboratory group processes as presented in classes and community workshops conducted by Dr. William R. Lassey, Professor of Sociology, and Dr. George Hossack, Professor of Group Dynamics, at Montana State University, and as participated in and observed by the writer. After positive response to the group activities, the board requested Kreitinger and the writer to investigate developing an organizational self-renewal process that could be applied in the Three Forks Schools.

In a personal conference the researcher contacted Dr. John O. Picton, Research and Development Specialist of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland. Picton indicated that field research on school organizational development was only beginning to be undertaken, and that the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory was investigating the development of a model for organizational self-renewal in school systems. Picton referred the writer to Dr. Chester Hausken, Director of the Project for Improving Instruction in Small Schools, who was in charge of the development of a NWREL model for school organizational self-renewal. Hausken reported by a telephone conversation with the researcher that the NWREL model was not developed completely, but that some of the work on the model might be helpful in the Three Forks project. Hausken shared sources of information including Organizational Training for a School Faculty by Richard Schmuck at the University of Oregon. The investigator began designing a process for application in
Three Forks. The sources and rational of the developed process are included in Chapter IV of this paper.

The investigator attended a RUPS (Research Utilization in Problem Solving) workshop at Great Falls, Montana, during the week of October 12, 1970; an Interpersonal Communications workshop at Helena, Montana, during the week of November 11, 1970; and Carl R. Roger's "Human Interaction in Education" workshop in La Jolla, California, during August of 1970.

Ideas from the literature and the workshops mentioned above, as well as from the course work completed by the researcher, were combined in the development of a plan for initiating organizational self-renewal in the school system.

In September of 1970 the researcher met with the Three Forks school board to give them information on the process being developed and to discuss methods of determining community interest in such a project and ways of getting people involved in the project. A survey of public opinion was considered appropriate. As a possible means of funding the project the board instructed the superintendent and the writer to seek Federal funding for the project.

Mr. Harold W. Rehmer, Director of Title III ESEA in Helena, Montana invited the investigator and Kreitinger to attend a proposal writing workshop for the preparation of the project as an innovative model for Montana schools. The writer and Kreitinger attended the workshop held October, 1970, in Helena, Montana.

In refining the plan for the project, the investigator requested
the consultation of Mrs. Francis Jackson, trainer for the NWREL in the RUPS workshop. In a personal conference, November 3, 1970, Mrs. Jackson offered suggestions for the time sequence of activities and for the division of the project into phases. The writer also personally interviewed Mr. Ronald Mattson, Superintendent of the Shelby (Montana) Public Schools in 1969, about a community action project that he conducted which involved the use of a questionnaire that was similar to the need-for-the-study survey being developed for this study.

The project was Federally funded on January 1 of 1971 with a grant of $17,500. The writer was named as the project director. The project was ready to be started in mid January of 1971.

As part of the design of this study and to satisfy regulations as a Title III ESEA project, an evaluator not working in the implementation of the project was hired to help the project director determine the project's attainment of stated objectives. Bruyn recommended that the evaluator should be outside the system to insure objective evaluation and to avoid the "salutory type" of evaluation often written by directors of innovative projects. The evaluator was also very helpful to the project director purely from a practical point of view; the development and implementation of the project was very time consuming and an outside evaluator was very welcome.

Description of the School Organization and the Population

The Three Forks Schools are made up of two schools, a K-6 ele-
mentary building with 196 students and ten teachers, and a junior-
senior high school with 202 students and 14 teachers. The Three Forks
School District has a joint high school district (District J-24) serving
the communities of Logan, Trident, and Three Forks, and an elementary
district (District 24-24) serving Three Forks and Trident. The town of
Three Forks had a population of 1,185 in the 1970 census. Community
members over the age of 18 in the Three Forks, Trident, and Logan area
numbered 1,054 in January of 1971, as indicated by the writer's count
of these adults on power company and tax rolls. The school system is
under the administration of a superintendent who is also the high school
principal. The elementary school and grades seven and eight are under
the administration of a full-time principal. The school board is com-
posed of six members, one representing the Logan area. The school
system did not have a PTA or community support group in operation. The
principle industries in the larger Three Forks community are farming
and ranching, small businesses, and labor in railroading, cement manu-
facturing, and talc processing. The Three Forks community is a rural
white community thirty miles from Bozeman, Montana, the location of
Montana State University. A new school superintendent was hired in
July of 1970 to replace a retiring superintendent who continued to live
in Three Forks. School board members reported to the researcher that
decision-making in the Three Forks Schools was accomplished in the past
by the superintendent and school board. There was no community task
groups working to improve or evaluate the school organization. The
school system could have been described as a traditional monocratic system. (Morphet, Johns and Keller, 1967: 67) There had been no educational needs assessment projects done in the community. The school board members reported that they were the source of communication that the school superintendent had with community interests. The elementary school and junior high school levels were organized with self-contained classrooms, graded structure, and group-paced instruction. The high school was graded and departmentalized with group-paced instruction. Students had been governed by the administration through the application of a comprehensive set of rules for behavior in "The Three Forks Student Handbook."

Sampling Procedures

Rationale for Sampling Procedure. The plan outlined in Chapter IV for initiating organizational self-renewal in the Three Forks Schools is designed to assess community educational needs, to combine needs into goal statements, to convert needs into problems to solve, and to create task groups of people to begin working to solve problems. The main thrust of the process is to involve the subsystems of the school organization in this educational planning project. As Schmuck wrote,

"Since the goals of a school district lie in its interaction with its environment, an intervention in a school system should be designed to effect inter-responsiveness of the system with . . . every other subsystem." (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969: 6)

The school as an organization has been conceived by Talcott Parsons as
being composed of the subsystems of administration, teachers, students, school board members, community members, and various subgroups belonging to these subsystems. (Parsons, 1961: 56)

School board members volunteered to participate in the project. There were six members of the board and a clerk of the board who began to participate in the project. Twenty-four teachers in the elementary and secondary levels were asked by the superintendent to participate and each teacher was paid one hundred dollars through federal funds for participating in the project. It was reasoned by the project director and the superintendent that teachers in a system where teachers had never been asked to discuss educational issues with community members would be more willing to attend evening meetings if some real incentive were provided. All staff members chose to participate. The superintendent and the elementary school principal attended the meetings of the project and provided input into the project, but the administrators did not regularly participate in small group discussions of issues. It was reasoned by the superintendent and the project director that communication among staff, students, and community members might be better if the status of the administrators' positions were removed. Groups frequently requested the superintendent and elementary school principal to answer questions or to offer suggestions, however.

While the administrator, teacher, and the school board groups were small enough so that all members of these groups could conveniently be involved in the project, it was not considered feasible to involve all
396 students or all of the community members. A means of sampling was devised. It was assumed that students in grades one through six would probably not be mature enough to discuss general educational goals for the school. The 202 students in grades seven through twelve were determined to be the student subsystem. Names of students were obtained from school roles. All community members in the Three Forks School Districts J-24 and 24-24 who were not members of the above mentioned groups were considered as part of the community member subgroup. Community members' names were not readily available for use in this study, since no single registry included all names of people of 18 years or older living in the Three Forks School Districts. A city directory was not available in the town of Three Forks.

Many community members and students were expected to volunteer to be involved in the project, but the project director reasoned that more effective communications in the community might be encouraged if representatives of most social groups in the community were given a chance to be involved in the project. As Lucio and McNeil have written, the bringing about of the integration of an organization is contingent upon the sharing of expectations of all people served by or related to the organization. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969: 135) It appears to the writer that rarely are all taxpayers given an opportunity or do they take the opportunity to share their expectations of the use of public funds, however.

A review of literature on sampling procedures was made to deter-
mine the most appropriate and convenient method of sampling students and community members. It was desired that all members of these samples should have an equal chance of being asked to participate in the project, as well as an equal chance to volunteer. A random sampling procedure was determined as most appropriate in this study for sampling students and community members. Since a study of all of the variables in the student and community populations was not within the scope of this study, a stratified sample was not considered as useful as a random sample. While stratifying a sample generally improves the sample if one can be sure of the factors or variables relevant to the sample, the stratification of a sample does require the making of choices for stratification. (Ostle, 1963: 47) The writer could not find any conclusive study in the literature to indicate which social variables are most relevant to sampling populations to be involved in educational planning projects. In the absence of knowledge of relevant variables, random sampling was employed.

Ostle made the following statement concerning the random sample:

A good sample is one from which generalizations to the population can be made; — to generalize from a sample to a population, we need to be able to deduce from any assumptions about the population whether the observed sample is within the range of sample variation that might occur for that population under the given method of sampling. Such deductions can be made if, and only if, the laws of mathematical probability apply. The purpose of randomness is to insure that these laws apply. (Ostle, 1963: 45)

The choice of random sampling made it possible for the writer to avoid making subjective choices involved in stratifying a sample and to avoid
having to explain criteria of stratified sampling to selected people, an important consideration in a project in which people selected for participation may wish to know how they were selected.

The writer made the assumption that not all students and community members selected at random and asked to participate in the project would do so; however, the use of the random sampling procedure was aimed at increasing the membership of people in the project beyond that of volunteers alone. Over-sampling was planned to insure that randomly-selected participants were represented in the project. It was reasoned that the chances of participants in the project sharing their knowledge of school goals with a wider variety of non-participants in the community would be increased if randomly-selected participants, in addition to volunteers, were encouraged to participate.

To measure attitudes-toward-school changes in participants, and to determine changes, if any, in attitudes-toward-school of non-participating students and community members as a result of association with participants in the project, control groups and experimental (participant) groups of students and community members were selected at random. The evaluator of the study was given the responsibility of helping the project director to measure attitude changes in participant and non-participant students and community members.

In order to sample the community members, it was necessary to make a list of the names of all the members. This was a time consuming task requiring the compilation of names obtained from the following
sources:

1) Registered voters for the precincts of Trident, Logan, and Three Forks

2) Three Forks School District census lists for the Trident, Logan, and Three Forks areas

3) County assessor mobile home owner's list

4) County assessor real property owner's list

5) Power company billing list

6) Telephone directory for Three Forks, Logan, and Trident

The resultant list was reviewed by the school clerk and a postal employee who were well-acquainted with Three Forks School District people.

The Community Member Samples. The community member list with 1,054 names was numbered, and a random number table was used to draw control group and experimental group samples of 30 members each. The total population was composed of 526 males, or 49 percent, and 528 females, or 51 percent. Of the total 86.3 percent lived in the Three Forks area, 10.5 percent in Logan, and 3.1 percent in Trident.

To give the control group and the experimental group a less experimental and cold sounding flavor to community members, the control groups were called "opinion-giving" groups and the experimental or participant groups were called "discussion" groups.

The community member discussion group sample had 15 men, or 50 percent, and 15 women, or 50 percent. Eighty-six percent of the members of the sample were from the Three Forks area, 10 percent were from the Logan community, and 3 percent were from Trident. In the opinion-giving
group (non-participant control group) there were 13 men, or 43.3 percent, and 17 women, or 56.7 percent. Eighty percent of this opinion-giving group lived in the Three Forks area, 13.3 percent in Logan, and 6.6 percent in Trident. The random sample was considered very adequate in representing the geographical and sex proportions in the population.

Both samples were also checked for age distribution. In the samples 43.2 percent of the selection was between the ages of 20 and 50 years of age, and 56 percent were over 50 years old. This appeared to be a large proportion of older people. The presence of a larger proportion of community members who might not have children in school was considered to be potentially significant in this study. It was reasoned that getting older people without school children to become involved in a school project would be more difficult than to involve parents. A study was made to check the validity of the random sample in reflecting the age distribution of the population. Information was obtained from the Director of the Montana State Information System, Division of State Department of Planning and Development. It was found that in Montana (1970 Census) 50 percent of the population was between the ages of 21 and 64, compared to 52.8 percent for Three Forks. In the State, 9.9 percent were over 65, compared to 11.9 percent for Three Forks. It was found that 31.9 percent of the people in the State were ages 5 to 19, while only 29.4 percent were in this group in Three Forks. The study indicated that 8.2 percent in the State were under age 5, with 6 percent in this group in Three Forks.
From this information, it appeared that the Three Forks community may have had a larger percentage of older or retired people than some communities. An insurance company study of the Three Forks adult population seemed to verify this assumption. Mr. W. R. Hamilton, local Three Forks area insurance agent, did a survey in 1966 for potential insurance accounts in the area. Mr. Hamilton handled fourteen lines of insurance and insured most members of the area. The survey indicated that approximately 60 percent of the adult population was 55 years of age or older. The random sampling, then, seemed to represent the age distribution of the community member population.

The Student Samples. From the names of the 202 students in grades seven through twelve were selected two random samples of 36 students—one group to be the opinion-giving group and the other to be the discussion or participant group. There were 35 girls and 37 boys in the samples, as compared to 99 girls and 101 boys in the total student population. By grades, the samples were distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Seven</td>
<td>10 of 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Eight</td>
<td>15 of 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Nine</td>
<td>14 of 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Ten</td>
<td>13 of 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Eleven</td>
<td>11 of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Twelve</td>
<td>9 of 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods of Collecting Data

The Survey Used to Determine the Need for and Interest in the Project. A survey was developed to determine whether or not community members would be interested in a school project to evaluate and improve
the system, and to determine as objectively as possible whether or not the school board members' assumption was correct that the community had little understanding or respect for the school as an organization. From organizational development literature, and particularly from Hage and Aiken's model of social change as found in their book Social Change in Complex Organizations (1970), questions on the health of the school as an organization were designed. (Hage and Aiken, 1970: 80) The survey may be found in Appendix A, page 156. The questionnaire includes issues related to how much people feel that they have a voice in school affairs, how much people know about the school's programs, how much people respect each other, how much people seem to work together to improve their system, and how much people are satisfied with their school and its personnel. The school board wished to know whether or not community people really did feel that the school was a valuable organization that everyone respected and felt a part of. The survey was sent through the mail to all community members in the Three Forks Joint School Districts. An included card gave people interested in volunteering to participate in the project an opportunity to send their name and telephone number back to the school. The card is included with the survey in Appendix A, page 162. Students, faculty members, and board members were given an opportunity to answer the survey, also. Students wishing to volunteer to participate in the project were asked to leave their names with the school secretary. Board members, faculty members, and students completed the survey in school, October of 1970.
The survey was checked for face validity by a panel of experts at Montana State University, including Dr. Robert J. Thibeault, Dr. William R. Lassey, and Dr. George Hossack.

The Questionnaire Developed to Measure Attitude Change. Before the meetings of the planning project aimed at initiating organizational self-renewal began, the evaluator and the project director desired to pre-test the attitudes of participants and a control group of non-participants toward organizational issues. The questionnaire developed as a pre-test and post-test was a slight revision of the survey constructed to measure the need for the study. The questionnaire (Appendix A, page 163 to 165) included twenty-one questions related to the school's organizational health. The evaluator rechecked the validity of the questionnaire and he also conducted reliability tests on the instrument. Appendix B, page 168, includes details of the reliability check. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was calculated using the raw score formula. When given to a variety of test groups of community members of rural Gallatin Valley, of which Three Forks is a part, the correlation coefficient ranged from .82 to .99, which was considered by the writer to be adequate for a questionnaire to be used in a sociological study of this type. (Ostle, 1963: 76)

The developed questionnaire was administered in early January as a pre-test, and in May as a post-test. Each individual in participating and non-participating groups—including board members, faculty members, volunteer students, volunteer community members, randomly-
selected students, and randomly-selected community members in the participant or discussion group; and randomly-selected students and randomly-selected community members in the control or opinion-giving group—was pre-tested. The school board was pre-tested at a board meeting; and the faculty at a faculty meeting. The two randomly selected student groups were taken out of class on an afternoon and were given the pre-test. Volunteer students were given the pre-test when they came to the high school office to volunteer to participate in the project.

The community volunteers, who returned to the school the cards sent in October to the community asking for volunteers in the project, were called and asked to come to a preliminary project meeting at which time the community volunteers completed the pre-test. Each of the community members in the randomly-selected participant and non-participant groups were contacted at their home by the evaluator who gave each person a pre-test to complete. The evaluator explained to each selected person how the person was selected to "give his opinion" or to become a "discussion" group member. The evaluator also gave each person a general description of the project that was planned.

Each person in the randomly-selected community member groups was asked to fill out the pre-test which would be called for later by the evaluator, and each person was asked to cooperate in the project in their randomly-selected role. The community member pre-testing continued through the first two weeks of January. The evaluator made 257 house calls, seeing 164 people to distribute the pre-test. The com-
pleted pre-test was collected from 82 people who agreed to cooperate. Broken down by samples, 52 community members were interviewed to get 36 to cooperate as non-participants; and 81 were interviewed to get 46 to cooperate as participants. (It was reasoned that over-sampling beyond the desired number of 30 people per group would be required to obtain at least 22-25 people to attend project meetings and to allow for meaningful statistical evaluation of any attitude change in groups.) The participant group was over-sampled by 16 members to compensate for the anticipated "drop-out" during the meetings of the project.

The last meeting of the project was held on April 26, 1971, and two weeks later the post-test questionnaires were administered. The school board and the participating and non-participating community members were mailed questionnaires. Each member was contacted by telephone, asked if the questionnaire had been received, thanked for their cooperation, and asked to return the questionnaire. In the third week those whose returns had not arrived (as indicated through the use of coded questionnaires) were called again. The staff members were each given a post-test which was placed in their school mail boxes. The student groups were post-tested during an afternoon while school was still in session.

Performance Objectives. While data for the measure of any attitude changes among groups can be measured in this study through data collected in the study questionnaire, the achievement or lack of achievement of some of the objectives must be determined on the basis of
performance or non-performance of the objectives. For example, the developed plan either creates problem-solving task groups and new goals, or the plan does not. The plan is either carried through to completion, or it is not.

**Progress Reports.** In accordance with federal project recommendations that "once the program is in operation, Implementation Evaluations are conducted to provide the project director with information on the extent to which the specified elements of the program have been implemented as planned" (Klein, 1970: P-1), the evaluator of this study developed a brief survey to give to students and community members during the middle of the project phases. The progress reports are included in Appendix D, page 292.

**Application of the Plan**

The first community-wide meeting of the project was held in January of 1971. The plan to initiate organizational self-renewal in the Three Forks School System continued with community meetings held from January through April. Since the plan was not an end in itself, but to originate a process, meetings continued after task groups were developed. Meetings were being held in June of 1971 when this paper was completed. The initiation of the project was considered complete by May of 1971, when the task groups began to function.
Data from surveys and questionnaires used in this study was collected, tabulated, evaluated, and presented in Chapter V of this paper. Chapter V also includes a discussion of the ability of the study to produce anticipated performance objectives.

Results of the survey given before the project was submitted for federal funding were summarized by percentages of individuals and groups responding to objective choices, and written answers to open-ended questions were recorded to be included in the project needs assessment phase.

Results of the pre-test and post-test questionnaire were analyzed by the project director and the evaluator, and the evaluator charted the results in detail. (DoBush, 1971)

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test (Ferguson, 1966), a non-parametric test to check the difference between panel observation, was used to analyze the results of the pre- and post-tests. In this study a direction of the differences between pairs of respondents was desired. Siegel stated that the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test was the most useful test for the behavioral scientist wishing to tell the sign of the difference between pairs and the rank of the difference in terms of absolute size. (Siegel, 1956: 75) The Mann-Whitney U Test, a non-parametric test for comparing groups when the "t" test assumptions cannot be met (the pre-test and post-test questionnaire involved ordinal data), was used to compare participant and non-partici-
pant group attitude changes as a result of the project. This (the Mann-Whitney U Test) is one of the most powerful of the non-parametric tests and it is a most useful alternative to the parametric "t" test. (Siegel, 1956: 116) Results on individual questions in the questionnaire were analyzed as a group and separately.

Statistical Hypotheses

While the questions to be answered in this study are mostly related to whether or not the plan developed could actually accomplish the stated objectives, two experimental hypotheses may be stated. The first null hypothesis is that the experimental project will cause no change in the attitudes of the school community members toward the school. A second null hypothesis is that there will be no change of attitude in either the participating or non-participating groups after the initiation of the plan.
CHAPTER IV

A PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

This chapter presents the plan developed in this study as a model for initiating organizational self-renewal in a school system. The plan—as conceived after the organizational self-renewal descriptions by Schmuck and Gardner—generally attempts to involve the subsystems of the school in cooperatively building new norms and procedures that should help the school to constantly monitor the changing community, to compare the results of its own reactions to what it would accept as achievement of its goals, and to construct new forms whenever the achievement of goals falls below expectations. (Schmuck and Runkel, 1970: 2) (Gardner, 1963: 18)

This chapter includes a section on the sources from which the plan was developed. Following this section is a description of the phases of the plan itself. General information is given about the preliminary planning for phases, the community meetings that were part of each phase, the approximate amount of time involved in the phases and meetings, the type of materials or activities used in meetings, and the evaluations used for each phase and its meetings. Detailed descriptions of meeting agendas and materials are included in Appendix C, page 171, of this study.

Sources for the Plan

While the general theories of organizational development that have already been described in Chapter II provided the background theory for
this study, the specific processes and activities for the study were taken from a variety of models of social development which this writer had studied or participated in.

The plan to be described in this chapter is a normative-reeducative organizational self-renewal project as previously described in Chapter II, page 18. The project was an effort to improve the ability of a school organization to be responsive to changing needs of students by training subgroups of the school system to use a process of needs assessment, goal formation, and communications skills development. It was planned that representative volunteering and randomly-selected members of the subgroups of the school organization would interact to assess the needs of the organization and to share (in peer groups and across peer groups) sets of critical written feedback on school practices and problems. The participant groups were to have the opportunity to call on outside professional resources to provide information on larger community needs and innovations, and the groups were to learn to use educational research to write educational behavioral goals that could be interpreted into specific classroom behavioral objectives. After expressing feedback about the current system, and after assessing the needs of the students in the system, participant groups were to produce written statements of the new goals of the school system. These new goals, reflecting the cooperative efforts of all participants, were to help integrate and renew the organization. All groups participating
in the project were to be placed on a collegial basis (Morphet, Johns and Reller, 1967) and considered part of the organization's "variety pool." (Schmuck and Runkel, 1969: 5) The director or facilitator of the plan was not to be a member of any of the subgroups—the ideal change agent playing a rather ambiguous or new role in the system. (Bennis, Benne and Chin, 1969: 258) The director's purpose was to be to encourage other people to express their ideas and feelings, to present processes for helping participants to develop achievable goals and more effective communications skills, and to help participants to keep informed about other participants' interests. The project director in this plan was expected to have a strong background in human behavior, group dynamics, and sociology, as well as a good understanding of school administration.

While preparation for the application of this plan was being made, the project director gained acceptance among members of the school community—built ideosyncratic credit (Holland, 1969: 35)—by providing counseling services on a part time basis in the small rural school which did not have a personal counselor. The counselor role is described by Rogers as very suitable for helping organizations develop through a feedback sharing process. (Rogers, 1970: 8)

The plan developed in this study relies heavily upon a combination of three components of programs of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory—Higher Level Thinking Abilities, Research Utilization in Problem Solving, and Interpersonal Communications. The plan also has
some similarities with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory's developing Change Process Model for small schools. However, this latter program being developed at the NWREL was not completed and disseminated at the time of the writing of this study, so this change model was not used in total as the plan for this study. The major features of each of these four programs of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory are summarized below.

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, funded through the Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education, is a non-profit organization with administrative offices in Portland, Oregon. Many instructional systems are under development at the Lab, which has focused effort on the three areas of Improving Teaching Competencies (Program 100), Intercultural Programs (Program 200), and Improving Small Schools (Program 400). Program components 122 (Higher Level Thinking Abilities), 132 (Research Utilization in Problem Solving), and 141 (Interpersonal Communications) are all part of Program 100. Program component 415 (Change Process Model) is part of Program 400 which seeks to improve education in rural schools.

Higher Level Thinking Abilities. This NWREL instructional system was based on the work of the late Dr. Hilda Taba of San Francisco State College. As part of her extensive research on ways teachers can assist students to think at higher levels, several thousand children in the San Francisco Bay area were involved in a nine-year study to identify the teaching strategies which contribute to higher level thinking.
Taba identified four levels of thinking ability which were part of the assimilation of large bodies of knowledge, relating this information to previously learned knowledge, and discovering new knowledge. Taba's research results were developed into a teaching process by the NWREL. In the process, the following steps were identified.

1. Recall of previously learned or memorized facts
2. Organization of specific facts according to concepts or categories
3. Interpretation and statement of relationships, inferences, generalizations, and principles
4. Application of discovered knowledge to new or different situations (the highest level of thought)

(Fish, 1970: 14)

Research Utilization in Problem Solving. The RUPS materials include nineteen information packets which introduce basic concepts and techniques for problem solving. Eight exercises and guides for participants to use in building their skills are also included. Objectives of the training design are to increase educators' skills for systematically carrying out a five-step method of problem solving:

1. Identify the Problem
2. Diagnose the Problem Situation
3. Consider Alternative Actions
4. Try Out a Plan of Action
5. Adapt the Plan

Materials from RUPS units on Identifying Problems, Diagnosing Problems Using Force-Field Analysis, Diagnosing Team Work Relationships, the
Concept of Feedback, Deriving Implications of Action Alternatives, Planning for Action, and Small Group Dynamics were used in this study.

Interpersonal Communications. Basic to the work of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory is the concept that increasing the effectiveness of communication within a school building or school system should facilitate efforts to improve instruction; it should provide for better planning, implementation, and evaluation of innovative programs. (Fish, 1970: 141)

Units in the program include exercises and materials on paraphrasing, behavior description, describing feelings, nonverbal communicating, communication patterns in a school building, communicating under pressure, and assessment of knowledge. Parts of exercises and materials that seemed appropriate for use with community-wide participants were used in this study.

NWREL Change Process Model. While the following model was used in this study as a point of reference for dividing the initiation of a plan of organizational self-renewal into stages or phases of development, it may be noticed that the plan to be presented later in this chapter is how the Change Model Process developed by Watson is similar in several respects. Opinion leader identification was not stressed in the plan of this study, since an alternative procedure (volunteering and random sampling) was used. However, the goal of both plan and model is the development of a process for creating a community environment receptive to the adoption of innovative practices in schools. (Hausken, 1970: 415)
Following is an outline of this NWREL Change Process Model.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Small Schools Program
THE COMMUNITY-ORIENTED CHANGE PROCESS MODEL – Stages of Development

PREPARATION & NEEDS ASSESSMENT
(Approximately 2 months to complete)

PREPARATION (1-3 days)
Meet with Board and Administrators – Explain COCPM
Letter of Invitation COCPM/Document Status of Education
Arrange Schedule of Events
Documentation Team completes A-V story on status of education
Methods: Tape-slide presentation showing present status of education

NEEDS ASSESSMENT (Approximately 5 days)
Meeting with Board and Administrators – Final Arrangements
Meeting with Faculty/Administrators—Design of Survey
Community Meeting
Explain Process
Interviews
Gather Information
Meetings with Students—Gather Data
Meetings with Board and Administrators. From Data:
Determine Community Action Team
Preliminary Report on Needs Assessment
Next Steps
Methods:
A printed document which summarizes the factual data, value & opinions of the community toward education
A representative group from the community who will work toward school improvement

SKILLS BUILDING WORKSHOP &
SITE VISITS TO PROMISING PROGRAMS
(Approximately 2 Months to Complete)

SKILLS BUILDING WORKSHOP (5 days plus . . .)
Meeting with Community Action Team
Use simulation, group skills to identify educational problems, diagnose them and plan for the future
Select site visitors from Community Action Team
An informal communication system will be established
Goals and objectives of the school will be written
Skills Building Workshop - continued

Methods:
  A priority listing of school problems
  A representative group of community leaders who are skilled in problem solving techniques
  A written statement of educational goals and objectives
  An informal Communication system

SITE VISITS TO PROMISING PROGRAMS (3-5 days)
Site visitors tour other schools where innovative programs are in operation, gather information on them, plan a presentation to back home groups and give them

Methods:
  Actual visits to innovative programs
  Materials collected from sites on new programs
  Slides/Tapes presentation to students, community and staff

INSTALLATION OF NEW PROGRAMS & EVALUATION
(Approximately 2 weeks)

INSTALLATION OF NEW PROGRAMS (3-5 days)
Faculty and Community Action Team members will be involved in workshop at school in which educational alternatives selected by Community Action Team and agreed upon by Board will be installed. Teachers will hold open house for community to explain them

Methods:
  Expert help in learning to use new materials & methods
  Demonstrations of using new techniques

EVALUATION (2-4 days plus . . .)
Community Action Team members will be helped to use techniques of evaluation that will measure the degree of success the "new programs" have enjoyed. A written report will be produced.

New plans will be formed based on these reports

Methods:
  The C.A.T. will have skills that are appropriate for assessing the new programs
  Recommendations for attacking new problems

The NTL - COPED Model. The Cooperative Project for Educational Development (COPED) developed in New York with the help of the National
Training Laboratory was a model of organizational self-renewal used in the development of the plan of this study.

The purpose of the New York Region COPED team was to formulate, apply, evaluate, and disseminate some variations of a basic strategy of planned change in collaboration with several school systems. The plan was intended to help these school systems become self-renewing. A self-renewing school system was considered to have the ability to continuously sense and adapt to its changing external and internal environment in such a manner as to strengthen itself and optimally fulfill its goal of providing quality education for children. (Watson, 1969: 81-82)

The major steps of the plan were as follows. The COPED project was expected to be developed over approximately three years.

1. Clarify expectations of the parties involved (the superintendent and members of the focal group, the board, and other members of the system, and COPED staff) regarding the purposes of the program, the probable time schedule, the amount of effort (dollars and time) likely to be required, role relations and responsibilities of COPED staff and organization members, methods of collecting data for diagnosis and assessment, and use to be made of data (including publication).

2. Collect information from system members, usually through interviews and questionnaires. The data will be used to aid diagnosis and planning by the focal group and as a benchmark from which to assess progress.

3. Use the information obtained to formulate statements of how goals, attitudes, and beliefs in different groups in the system agree with or are discrepant from one another and what problems most urgently need solution. These data are thus a kind of mirror in which to examine the state of the school system.

4. In a meeting off the job (a "temporary system"), the members of the focal group, using the data from step 3 as a springboard, examine their own current operations, work on problems shown in the data, and improve their own problem solving effectiveness as a team. This is done by proceeding through steps like the following:
a. Problem sensing or identification: How does each member see the situation?
b. Diagnosis: Reasons or causes for the problem.
c. Setting change objectives or targets: What needs to be changed?

For those change objectives which relate to the functioning of the focal group itself, the following steps are followed:

d. Locating or inventing alternative solutions: ways of operating, new structures, new procedures that promise improvement.
e. Weighing the likely cost and gains of each alternative.
f. Deciding which alternative to try or apply.
g. Planning how to implement the decision (who, what, how, when, where).

For those targets relating to the larger system, the focal group carries out the following step:

h. Planning how to check their diagnosis and their ideas regarding change targets with members from other levels in the organization, both above and below themselves. Data collected in Step 3 or new data or both may be used here.

5. Carry out plans from Step 4 with the relevant other groups. Steps 2, 3, and 4 are repeated with other groups in the system in off-the-job and on-the-job meetings with the board, administrative council, school faculties, committees, teachers and their classrooms. As this process of problem solving and change continues, it is steered by the focal group.

6. Set up structures and procedures to institutionalize and support continuing self-renewal processes. These may vary considerably but might include:

Regular meetings of existing groups (Cabinets, administrative councils, principals, faculties). Some of these may be held off the job for intensive work.
New roles (director of special projects, proposal-writer, demonstration teacher, and so on).
New procedures (methods for goal clarification, instrument to get feedback from children to teachers, scheduling to allow time for personal and organizational development, and so forth).
New groups (a research and development council, project groups to try out and diffuse specific innovations, and so forth).
7. Phase out active participation by COPED staff (complete by end of second year).

8. Complete an assessment of the change program to date. A crucial issue is: Has the school system become self-renewing, continuing to improve and develop under its own initiative after the COPED-encouraged change effort is terminated?

9. Feed the findings back into the school system.

10. Disseminate accounts of the methods and results of the change program to other school systems, professional associations, researchers, state departments of education, and those responsible for preservice and in-service education of teachers and administrators.

(Watson, 1969: 83-84)

Sequential Steps of an Educational Project. The plan developed in this study was considered to be made of a series of steps arranged logically and orderly. The following illustration, page 64, developed by Dr. Lyle Berg, Director of the Division of Educational Research and Services at the University of Montana provided a framework for viewing the plan. (Berg, 1970: vii)

Watson's Principles of Resistance to Change. Goodwin Watson, Director of the Laboratory for Applied Behavioral Science, Newark State College, wrote about methods educators might use to reduce resistance to change. Watson's principles on reducing resistance to change were strongly taken into account in the development and application of the plan in this study. Watson's thirteen points are summarized below:

A. Who brings the change?
   1. Resistance will be less if administrators, teachers, board members, and community leaders feel that the project is their own—not one devised and operated by outsiders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GOALS: Prepare some general goals. Work on a project plan. NEEDS: Ascertain a broad educational need. (Assess what is. Determine what ought to be).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FUNDING: Secure project funding. Select and train personnel. Refine evaluation techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PROJECT OPERATION: Implement treatment and first phase evaluation. Continue with training. Reassess objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FEDERAL FUNDING PHASE-OUT: Record significant change in project direction. Prepare for transition to other funds. Final evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FOLLOW-UP: Follow-up evaluation of original project members. Revise project aims and objectives to suit current needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Resistance will be less if the project clearly has whole-hearted support from top officials of the system.

B. What kind of change?
3. Resistance will be less if participants see the change as reducing rather than increasing their present burdens.
4. Resistance will be less if the project accords with values and ideals which have long been acknowledged by participants.
5. Resistance will be less if the program offers the kind of new experience which interests participants.
6. Resistance will be less if participants feel that their autonomy and their security is not threatened.

C. Procedures in instituting change.
7. Resistance will be less if participants have joined in diagnostic efforts leading them to agree on the basic problem and to feel its importance.
8. Resistance will be less if the project is adopted by consensual group decision.
9. Resistance will be reduced if proponents are able to empathize with opponents, to recognize valid objections, and to take steps to relieve unnecessary fears.
10. Resistance will be reduced if it is recognized that innovations are likely to be misunderstood and misinterpreted, and if provision is made for feedback of perceptions of the project and for further clarification as needed.
11. Resistance will be reduced if participants experience acceptance, support, trust, and confidence in their relations with one another.
12. Resistance will be reduced if the project is kept open to revision and reconsideration if experience indicates that changes would be desirable.

D. Climate for change.
13. Readiness for change gradually becomes a characteristic of certain individuals, groups, organizations, and civilizations. They no longer look nostalgically at a Golden Age in the past but anticipate their Utopia in days to come. The spontaneity of youth is cherished and innovations are protected until they have had a chance to establish their worth. The ideal is more and more seen as possible.

(Watson, 1969: 22-23)
Evaluation Model. The following general evaluation model developed at the Center for the Study of Evaluation in the Graduate School of Education at the University of California at Los Angeles was used to guide the development of an evaluation of the plan of this study. (Klein, 1970: A)

UCLA Evaluation Model

Evaluation is the process of determining the kinds of decisions that have to be made, and selecting, collecting, and interpreting the information needed in making these decisions.

These decisions may be classified into five evaluation activities as follows:

1. Needs Assessment: Needs Assessment involves stating the objectives to be met and determining how well an existing program is doing relative to meeting these objectives. This information is used to identify the school or program's needs.

2. Program Planning: In Program Planning, the evaluator provides the project director with tools to help make planning decisions. He also builds into the program the procedures that will be needed for assessing whether it is operating as planned and how well it is achieving its objectives.

3. Implementation Evaluation: Once the program is in operation, Implementation Evaluations are conducted to provide the project director with information on the extent to which the specified elements of the program have been implemented as planned.

4. Progress Evaluation: In Progress Evaluation, the evaluator provides the project director with information about the progress of the various parts of the program toward meeting its objectives. This information is used to modify the program where necessary.
5. **Outcome Evaluation**: Outcome Evaluation provides information about the success of the program as a whole, so that the project director can make decisions such as whether the program should be retained, extended, or discontinued.

From the RUPS problem solving process, then, and from the NWREL Interpersonal Communications skills development materials, the questioning and thinking strategies of Taba Higher Level Thinking Abilities, and self-renewal models of COPED and the NWREL, the following Plan for Initiating Organizational Self-Renewal in a School System was developed. An outline illustration of the phases of the plan is presented below preceding a narrative description of the application of the plan in the school system of Three Forks, Montana.

**Narrative Description of the Application of the Plan in the Three Forks Schools**

The plan to initiate organizational self-renewal as mentioned in the preceding outline was applied in the Three Forks School organization during the 1970-71 school year. This section of this study describes the specific meetings held in Three Forks, Montana. In this section general information is presented on the phase meetings. Appendix C, page 171, describes community meeting agendas, handout materials, and evaluations used in the meetings.

**Preparation.** On April 29, 1970, the writer met with the school board members of the Three Forks School Districts, the superintendent of the schools, and the spouses of the superintendent and board. The superintendent was scheduled to retire at the end of the 1970 school year.
OUTLINE OF THE PHASES OF THE PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM
(Events are above the time line; products are below the time line)

PREPARATION

* Meet with administrators and board to explain plan

* Demonstrate small group activities to board, administration, and wives and begin assessing need for the project

* Meet with the board and other opinion leaders to study and personalize a community survey on need for project and interest people have in participating

* Complete survey, send it to community at large, and tally results; build idiosyncratic credit

* Plan tentative schedule of project events with superintendent

* Present survey results to board and faculty to stimulate interest in the project

* Get federal funding; finalize plan; hire evaluator and secretary

__________________________ approximately four months __________________

Community leaders participate in diagnosis and make project theirs
PHASE 1: GATHER OPINIONS, GET INVOLVEMENT, BEGIN NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Meet with board and administrators; finalize schedule of meetings; discuss random sampling for involving students and community
- Meet with faculty, students, and community volunteers to pre-test their school attitudes and to present project events and information on random sampling procedures; begin needs assessment small group activities
- Complete random-sampling of students and community members and get them selected to participate; pre-test non-participant community members' attitudes toward the school
- Begin community meetings for needs assessment and sharing of opinions: Your Concerns About School, Wants and Don't Wants in an Ideal School
- Preliminary report of needs assessment; survey report; make additions to written needs statements
- Begin communications skills development activities

_________________________ approximately two months _______________________

Written statement of opinions of community toward education; mixing of ideas; acceptance of all opinions; interest in new experiences of groups; Pre-test of community attitudes toward the school before plan is implemented
OUTLINE OF THE PHASES OF THE PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

(Events are above the time line; products are below the time line)

PHASE II: GROUP, LABEL, AND CATEGORIZE OPINIONS—IDENTIFY MAIN ISSUES AND CONFLICTS

- Community meeting to complete needs assessment with administrator speeches; apply Taba Process to categorize opinions
- Small groups combine into larger groups to build consensus on which issues need problem solving approach and which issues are ready for action
- Begin diagnosis of problem situations
- Determine issues about which more information is needed
- Elect advisory action group representing community, board, students, and faculty to
  - Help draw together and present work done in community-wide meetings
  - See that plans are carried through
  - Help plan community meeting agendas
  - Be responsible for coordinating project

_________ approximately two weeks _________

Written statement of the main concerns of the community about education; a manageable set of problems to work with; a representative community group to see that the project continues to bring educational improvements
OUTLINE OF THE PHASES OF THE PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

(Events are above the time line; products are below the time line)

PHASE III: GET NEEDED INFORMATION—CLARIFY ISSUES—INTERPRET DATA—IDENTIFY PHILOSOPHIES OF EDUCATION

* Community meetings for presentation of speakers, films, slides, and activities to clarify issues related to change; identify philosophy of education values

* Each presentation followed by sextet discussions for mixing of reactions of students, teachers, community members, and board members

* Continued emphasis on building communications skills through small group activities

* Advisory group draws together the results of Phases I and II to be presented back to the community for use in Phase IV

* Make arrangements for Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory assistance in the problem solving workshop of Phase IV

__________________________ approximately one month _________________________

Continued development of an informal communications system and mixing of ideas; creation of atmosphere of inquiry; information retrieval before priorities on problems are set; a group of people informed about changes in education
OUTLINE OF THE PHASES OF THE PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

(Events are above the time line; products are below the time line)

PHASE IV: CONVERT NEEDS INTO GOALS—CONVERT NEEDS INTO PROBLEMS TO SOLVE

* Weekend community workshop with "outside experts" who build skills in problem solving through use of simulated activities in problem identification, diagnosis, and planning for the future

* Continued practice in communications skills

* Ranking, and rating of issues; practice in the use of force-field analysis; writing problems in behavioral terms; study implications of problems

* Study and use Mager's model of behavioral objectives; apply Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory model for problem statements; study implications of problems

* Advisory group meets to summarize workshop and problem statements

[approximately one month]

Written statement of school goals, philosophy, and problems to be worked on by task groups; a priority listing of problems; an action group of people becoming skilled in problem solving processes
OUTLINE OF THE PHASES OF THE PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL OF A SCHOOL SYSTEM

(Events are above the time line; products are below the time line)

PHASE V: DEVELOP TASK GROUPS TO ACT ON PROBLEMS—MOBILIZE FOR ACTION

* Community meeting for presentation of the written products of community effort; naming of volunteer people to be part of task groups to work on specific problems

* Task groups meet and begin their work
  - Analyze force-field of problem
  - Continued diagnosis and information retrieval—seek expert advice
  - Visit other schools with promising programs
  - Decide who works on what and when
  - Determine when reports will be made to the community

* Advisory group keeps report of task group output and determines when additional community meetings should be held

_________________________ approximately six weeks __________________________

(Continual renewal effort!)

Creation of a changed organization with new subsystems for solving problems; use of resources of larger community; renewing of the school organization; problem solving action; initiation of a plan of organizational self-renewal; decentralized decision making
OUTLINE OF THE PHASES OF THE PLAN TO INITIATE ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-RENEWAL IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM
(Events are above the time line; products are below the time line)

PHASE VI: EVALUATION AND PREPARATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE SELF-RENEWAL PROCESS

* Post-test participant and non-participant community members' attitudes toward the school; compare pre-test and post-test results

* Project director and advisory group measure the extent that the plan created a self-renewing organization; measure achievement of expressed objectives

* Summarize evaluations of project's phases and meetings

* Prepare application for continuation funding for the project

* Advisory group meets to plan events for the following year

______________________________ approximately one month ________________________________

Evaluation of the success of the project; continual application of skills developed in the project; planning for recycling plan

THE INITIATION OF THE PLAN WAS EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED IN APPROXIMATELY ONE YEAR

Project meetings and outcomes were expected to be publicized for the general public as the project progressed.
The superintendent elect, John M. Kreitinger who had worked on a sociological project with the writer, and his wife also attended the meeting. A demonstration of National Training Laboratory type small group discussion processes was given by the writer. Participants were asked individually to write on note cards good things they had heard about the school. Written ideas were then shared in discussions among trios and sextets of men and women. A second activity included using the listing and sharing activity (used in RUPS and NTL workshops) to discuss what the participants felt that they would and would not want in an ideal school. A third activity included brainstorming on "What Concerns Me about Education Today." The participants discussed how much more information was brought out for discussion by use of the small group technique. The meeting was concluded with a presentation of the potential value of a self-renewal project, and board members gave the superintendent elect and the writer verbal permission to consider developing an organizational self-renewal project for the Three Forks Schools.

The writer began development of a self-renewal plan for the Three Forks Schools in May of 1970 as a doctoral thesis. The general plan was submitted in August of 1970 as a doctoral thesis proposal; in August the writer was given permission to proceed on the project by the Three Forks school board. An example of a survey of the attitudes of school community members toward their school as an organization was prepared by the writer in September of 1970 and presented on September 21,
1971, at a meeting of the board, superintendent, and a local business woman. The group completed the survey and offered suggestions for its revision to personalize it for Three Forks. The revised survey, included in Appendix A, page 163, was approved by the board to be sent to all community members whose names could be obtained readily from local water department listings, telephone directories, and school census lists for the Three Forks School Districts. The survey was ready for distribution through the mail on October 23, 1970. Eight-hundred forty-four survey instruments were sent to community members 18 years of age or older. Forty-four surveys were returned by the post office as dead letters. This indicated that the sources used for obtaining community members names were not as accurate as they might be. Faculty and students were given the survey to complete in school on the afternoon of October 24. Four-hundred twenty-one responses were collected by November 10, 1970, and the results were summarized in percentages for the board to study to determine community interest in participating in an educational discussion project. The results of the preliminary survey, see Appendix D, page 292, were presented to the board and superintendent at a meeting November 16, 1970. The board felt that the 421 responses seemed to indicate a strong community-student-faculty interest in improving the school system. An application for federal funding of the project was prepared by the writer. The board officially endorsed the application for Title III ESEA funding for the project. The Montana Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction announced
the funding of the project in mid-December of 1970. With the approval of funds, a secretary and a project evaluator were hired to work with the project director.

The superintendent and the writer met several times during October of 1970 to plan tentatively the events of the project. The writer was hired on a part time basis as an elementary and secondary school counselor; the faculty and students had time to become accustomed to the presence of the project director and it appeared to the writer that he was not viewed so much as an outsider in the school system after several counseling interviews.

Another irregularity in the preparation of the project caused a need for a revision in the evaluation design of the project. Since only slightly over half (52.6 percent) of the preliminary surveys were returned and since a second set of surveys could not be sent out because they had not been coded, the preliminary survey could not be used as a test of all community members' attitudes toward the school. The survey results were very valuable as an indication of the interest responding community members had in expressing their opinions and in participating in an educational planning project, but the results could not be assumed to represent the total community's attitudes toward the school. The additional comments written on the survey by respondents to the survey (see sample of these comments in Appendix D, page 300) were also very useful in the project as a beginning of an assessment of the opinions of some of the community members interested enough in edu-
cational issues to respond to the survey. The writer recommends that if this study were replicated, however, the preliminary survey should be coded to make it possible to obtain more than a 52.6 percent return of completed surveys given at the start of a new school year. Testing of opinions would then be possible before the new superintendent intervened in the system, and the contamination of the new administrator could better be determined.

Phase I: Gather Opinions, Get Involvement, Begin Needs Assessment. On December 21, 1970, the writer met with the board and superintendent to announce that federal funds had been allocated for the project.

Before the project was officially started with community meetings, the writer-project director and the evaluator (hired, as required by Title III ESEA guidelines, to help determine the project's achievement of its objectives) desired to administer a pre-test of the school organization attitudes of participants in the project, as well as the community at large, before project community meetings began. To provide a measure of the attitudes of all social groups within the community, a random sampling procedure, as described in Chapter III was employed. The test used as a pre-test and post-test and results of validity and reliability checks on the test is included in Appendix B, page 167. The testing was conducted to determine any change in school community members' attitudes as a result of the implementation of the project. The testing was done even though the writer and evaluator were aware of Dr. Chester Hausken's (Director of Program 100 of the NWREL) com-
ment in a telephone conversation in November of 1971 that the NWREL had found that testing often interfered with the development of cooperative planning projects.

During the last of December and the first week of January of 1971 community members' names and students' names were listed, numbered and experimental and control groups were selected at random from student and community member populations. A chart was made of the names of people selected to participate in the project and those people selected as a control group of non-participants. Also the page of random numbers from which the selection was made was reproduced. Transparencies of the samples, the page of random numbers, and methods of collecting names of community members were made into a presentation to show participant groups to explain concisely the processes used to encourage people to get involved in the project. The writer also wished with the presentation to disway any fears that any manipulation might be involved in requests to students and community members to become involved in the project. The writer desired community members to understand that all people's opinions were equally of value in the normative-reeducative project, and that no "type" of person's opinions were looked on as more desirable than any other's.

On January 18, 1971, the board met to consider the selected samples and to review the sampling process. Board members felt that the randomly selected groups very much represented the social groups of the community. The board also reviewed the names of project par-
participants who had volunteered as indicated by their returning to the school a card (see Appendix, page ) which was sent to the public with the preliminary survey. The board members and the superintendent stated that they felt that the volunteer group included many people who had been influential in school affairs in the past. The board felt that if the people volunteering and selected to participate would do so, there would be great potential for unifying the community's educational plans.

On January 13, students selected as members of participant and non-participant groups were given the pre-test. The two groups of students met separately. The non-participant group was told that they were in an important "opinion-giving" group. The participant group was told that they were part of an important "discussion" group. After the pre-test was given, the presentation on the sampling procedures used in the project were explained. Students in the participant group were asked to come to the first community meeting to be announced later. Mr. Chester Schendel, Principal of the Elementary School, made a brief speech to the students on the need for them to be part of planning ahead for an improved school. On January 15 a student body meeting was held to present an overview of the project to present sampling methods, and to ask for student volunteers.

Faculty members of the elementary and secondary levels were given the pre-test on January 14 at a faculty meeting held after school. After the pre-test was administered, faculty members were
given the presentation on sampling procedures used to involve more than volunteer students and community members in the project. Faculty members were very interested in seeing the names of selected individuals, and also the names of volunteering people, students and community members. There seemed to be some apprehension on the part of some faculty members about involving some of the selected people in the project—people who appeared to be viewed by faculty members as sources of irritation. The superintendent and the elementary school principal made a statement in support of the project and encouraged teachers to get involved in the project.

On January 28, 1971, a meeting was held for community members who had volunteered to participate in the project. The names of volunteer community members were accumulated from cards returned to the school. Each person sending back a card indicating that he or she would like to volunteer was called on the telephone by the project director, thanked for volunteering, and asked to come to the evening meeting, at which time information about the project would be given. Sixty-six people attended the meeting for volunteers. The pre-test, a revision of the preliminary survey to determine the need for the study, was administered to the volunteers at the start of the meeting. The superintendent then introduced the project director, secretary, and evaluator. The random sampling procedures for increasing involvement in the project were explained and volunteers were asked to contact in the next week individuals in the community member participant samples and to
ask these randomly selected people to participate in the project. Volunteers were given handouts describing the project, and the volunteers were asked to give a copy of the handouts to each randomly-selected participant that they contacted. Volunteers seemed to be very pleased to have the responsibility to contact randomly selected participants.

The school board chairman and Dr. William R. Lassey, professor of sociology at Montana State University, gave brief presentations in support of the project. A large portion of the January 28 meeting was taken up with trio and sextet activities aimed at opening channels of communication among people and at encouraging volunteers to begin needs assessment through listing their satisfactions and concerns about school. Specific exercises used in this meeting and an evaluation of this meeting are included in the meeting agenda, Appendix C, page 173.

Opinions written by participants were combined by participants working in sextets, and this data was collected on newsprint which was displayed for participants to see at the end of the meeting. The mixing of gathered opinions began in the project as small groups shared opinions and ideas in trio and sextets and as participants milled around the high school cafeteria meeting room to read the comments written on newsprint taped on the walls with masking tape. During the last week of January as volunteer participants were contacting randomly-selected community member participants to ask them to come to the first community-wide meeting on February 8, 1971, the evaluator was going to the home of each randomly-selected control group or non-
participant member to administer the pre-test of attitudes toward the school organization. Volunteer participants frequently heard inquiries from community people about the evaluator's asking people about the school, and the superintendent received a telephone call from one community member who wanted to know if the school was aware of the evaluator's activities. A news release about the project's purpose was printed in the local Three Forks newspaper to inform the general public after pre-testing was completed.

Some individuals were expected to decline participating in the project because of commitments and lack of interest. The expectation was shown to be true, especially with community member groups. Of non-participating or control group community members, fifty-two community members were interviewed to get 36 to agree to cooperate as non-participating or control group members; 81 randomly-selected community members were interviewed to get 46 to agree to cooperate as participants. Participant groups were heavily over-sampled because the project director and the evaluator expected that a large portion of the participants would probably not attend all of the project meetings. Thirty-six non-participating students selected at random all agreed to participate.

Fifty-one participant students selected at random were contacted by the project director to get 36 to agree to participate. It was hoped that between 25 and 30 individuals selected at random for each of the student and community member groups would participate in
the meetings with 66 community volunteers, 24 faculty members, and 6 board members. While the project could conceivably function without randomly-selected participants, and while the writer was not optimistic about the regular attendance of randomly-selected participants, the inclusion of these participants in the plan of the project was reasoned to provide a means of increasing the possibility that individuals who were not part of the existing power structure could gain some influence, and thereby identify with the school rather than oppose it. More involvement would increase the potential for unifying more parts of the organization around common purposes. The writer did not, however, expect volunteer participants who might be part of the existing power structure of the school community to have less involvement or influence in the project than would the randomly-selected participants.

The writer hoped that involving randomly-selected participants might also give the school organization access to new "variety pool" sources in individuals who had not been actively part of the organization.

The first community-wide meeting for students, faculty, board and community members was held on February 8, 1971, at 7:30 P.M. in the Three Forks elementary school gymnasium. Folding chairs which could be moved into trio and sextet groupings were used. An overview of the purpose of the project and the sampling procedures was given, and then small group activities for beginning to assess needs were started. Communications exercises aimed at helping people get acquainted were used to begin the meeting. These exercises were modeled after those
presented at a National Individualized Instruction Conference at Palo Alto by Dr. Lacey Hall, Director of Combined Motivations Systems, Inc., Chicago. The major portion of the meeting consisted of recording participants' ideas about what they would and would not want in an ideal school. The agenda for this meeting, with the activities used, the handouts distributed, and the evaluation of the meeting are described in Appendix C, page 179.

On February 11, 1971, the writer, Superintendent Jack Kreitinger, and Dr. William R. Lassey of the Center for Planning and Development at Montana State University met to discuss the effectiveness of the project to this date. Dr. Lassey had attended the first meetings of the project as a consultant observer. Critical evaluation of the meetings was discussed, anticipated outcomes of the first year of the project were reviewed, and a tentative schedule of events of the project was revised. The report of the planning session is included in Appendix C, page 186.

Community members met on February 15, faculty members met on February 18, and students met on February 18 to study data gathered to date on participants' concerns and satisfactions with school and their opinions on what an ideal school should and should not have. Data gathered was studied by the project director and secretary, and the data was divided into groups of items that seemed to go together (Taba Process). The categories that data seemed to fall under were labeled 1) school personnel; 2) instructional method and evaluation;
3) the school's educational program; 4) school policies, rules, and student behavior; 5) community, administration, faculty, and student relationships; 6) subject matter suggestions; and 7) school facilities and services. The division of the data was done by the project director to facilitate the distribution of written material to project participants who were to read through all of the data. The meetings on February 15 and 18 provided for all of the expressed opinions of people to be read by all project participants, thereby providing a chance for everyone's opinions to be heard. In addition to reading the written materials, participants at the February 15 and 18 meetings also were encouraged to write additions to the statements of opinions, if some item had been overlooked. Participants read a section of the data individually, and then in sextets the opinions recorded were discussed. Much controversy appeared to be reflected, and it seemed that many issues that had only been gossiped about were brought out for airing. Communications skill development activities were used to vary group discussions of the materials. Agendas, handouts, and evaluations of these meetings are described in Appendix C, page 190. By February 18 all participant groups had had the opportunity to express their opinions about the school. The project participants had not, however, heard the opinions of the school administrators. The superintendent and the elementary school principal were asked on February 12 by the project director to begin preparing a statement of their concerns and expectations for the school. At a community-wide meeting
on March 1, 1971, both administrators gave speeches about their opinions on school development needs. The issues in the speeches had been categorized and labeled by the project director in advance, and typed copies of the administrators' opinions were given to project participants at the March 1 meeting. Norming and paraphrasing communications exercises taken from NWREL Interpersonal Communications materials were presented in these meetings. With the administrators' presentations the gathering of opinions of Phase I of the project was completed.

Written material gathered in Phase I was distributed to all project participants to read and study in preparation for the identification of main issues in Phase II. To the writer it appeared that many participants who seemed to very much enjoy voicing their opinions during the first meetings of the project became very frustrated when they heard many opinions contrary to their own. Also many people had difficulty reading the many pages of data. Participants seemed to have less enthusiasm for small group activities at this point in the project. Attendance levels at project meetings began to drop as the gathering of opinions led into the grouping and labeling of data.

Appendix E, page 305, includes a chart of the attendance of project participants by group. In summary, Phase I produced a written statement of the opinions of the community toward education, a mixing of ideas in an atmosphere of acceptance, and the beginning of new communications channels among people who may not have known each other before.
Phase II: Group, Label, and Categorize Opinions—Identify Main Issues and Conflicts. After the administrators' speeches were presented and discussed in sextets at the March 1 community-wide meeting, the 126 participants attending the meeting were divided into seven groups to begin grouping, labeling, and categorizing the needs assessment data gathered to this date in the project. Before the March 1 meeting the project director had prepared seven faculty members in the use of the Taba Higher Level Thinking Abilities grouping and labeling process. Each teacher was given a handout (see Appendix C, page 206) on the use of the process, and each teacher agreed to lead 18 to 20 project participants in reducing each of the seven sections of collected data into main issues. The seven categories of data, already mentioned, were 1) school personnel; 2) instructional method and evaluation; 3) the school's educational program; 4) school policies, rules, and student behavior; 5) community, administration, faculty, and student relationships; 6) subject matter suggestions; and 7) school facilities and services—the labels of groups of data that seemed to the project director and secretary to go together. While dividing the data into general categories was considered by the project director to be a necessary task to facilitate the work of the project participants, the director felt that for him to do all the work of categorizing and labeling main issues would be unwise, since project participants would not need to go through the development of higher level thought on school problems themselves if the work were done by the project
director. One of the main focuses of the project was to create a self-renewing organization, which required that members of the organization themselves learn a process for determining main issues in gathered data.

At the March 1 evening meeting the 126 participants were divided into seven groups of 18 people. Each group was given a faculty leader who was instructed to determine the main issues and conflicts in one of the seven topics of data gathered in Phase I. Each of the seven groups categorized and labeled issues and wrote the results on newsprint taped on the walls of the elementary school gym for all participants to see. Each of the seven groups also determined which issues seemed to be the center of conflicts of opinion and thereby needing clarification. Groups identified issues that needed a problem solving approach and others that could be solved by immediate action. The agenda, handouts, evaluation and samples of products of this meeting are described in Appendix C, page 203. Some people attending the March 1 meeting were very frustrated by the activities of this meeting. The categorizing and labeling may have been a very unusual process for many people. While the teacher-leaders appeared to be able to conduct the activities of the process very well, some people seemed confused about what was being done. However, the meeting did produce the written categories and labels desired.

During the March 1 meeting an advisory group representing project participant groups was elected. The advisory group was elected
to become well-informed about project processes and the activities or project members working on problems and to see that project work was carried through. The advisory group was formed as a citizens' council to carry on the project after the project director initiated the process. The group provided the project director and school superintendent with information on how the community might best be served. The advisory group members were given the responsibility for coordinating project events and for helping to plan agendas for meetings. The group also was given the responsibility of selecting sources of information to present to participants at community meetings in Phase III, and the group was expected to draw together and present results of work accomplished in community meetings. A handout given to project participants to explain the functions of the advisory group is included in Appendix C, page 226. Students elected two representatives, community members elected two representatives, faculty members elected two representatives, and board members elected two representatives. A group of eight to twelve people was reasoned to be a convenient size to allow frequent meetings to be held and to encourage open communication. Research has also indicated that this size group is best for the development of communication among the members of the group. (Rogers, 1969: 10) In the student election there was a tie between two individuals, so both students and the additional one were included in the advisory group. The group of nine members elected at the March 1 meeting was also expanded to include two more community mem-
bers and two more students at a later meeting to satisfy community members and students who wanted broader representation. The two community members elected at the March 1 meeting happened to be from the same rural area, and community members wanted to elect two more people from the town of Three Forks. The students elected at the March 1 meeting were in grades eight and nine, and students thought some older high school students should be included. The advisory group members felt the requests were logical, and the project participant groups were given an opportunity to elect the new members they desired to represent the groups mentioned.

On March 4 the advisory group met to draw together the results of the work of the seven groups that categorized and labeled issues on March 1. The advisory group combined the results of the seven groups to determine the main issues and concerns in all the data collected. This advisory group used the Taba process of grouping, categorizing, and labeling as lead by the project director. The group identified 15 major issues in the 88 issues listed by participants in the March 1 meeting. The chart of the combined issues (see Appendix C, page 211) was prepared for distribution to project participants at the next community meeting. On March 4 the advisory group reviewed films and activities suggested by the project director for clarifying some of the issues of conflict in the project—individualized instruction, student freedom and responsibility, discipline, and vocational education programs. The advisory group elected members of its group to
introduce presentations made to participants during Phase III of the project—the search for needed information to clarify issues. The project director felt that the presentation to clarify issues would be received better if community members who were well known were to make the presentations.

The educational issues for development that had been identified in the project were presented to the public through local newspaper articles. The public was continually reminded that anyone in the community was welcome to come to the project meetings.

**Phase III: Get Needed Information—Clarify Issues—Interpret Data.** Three community-wide meetings were held on March 8, 15, and 22 for presentation of information to clarify issues. Agendas and evaluations of these meetings are included in Appendix C, page 224. On March 8 an effort was made to provide project participants a means of identifying their educational philosophy and to encourage participants to examine the values they held that provided a base for their educational philosophy. An educational philosophy questionnaire by Burton and Bruchner (Burton and Bruchner, 1960: 245) and a revision of a chart by Morris (Morris, 1961: 340) of major educational philosophies were used to structure an activity to assist participants in identifying their educational philosophies. Results of the questionnaire seemed to indicate that participants were about equally divided between idealism and pragmatism, and a smaller group leaned toward realism. The results of the questionnaire were used for discussion
only in this project. While the identification of the value systems of the participants would probably have been very useful to the participants and to the project director, it was not possible in this study to include in the plan a comprehensive value identification study. The project participants seemed to react in one of two ways to the philosophy activity—either they enjoyed it very much, or they disliked it entirely. That the plan of this study is more pragmatic than idealistic cannot be denied, since the plan is based on a belief in the practical intelligence of the common man and on the value of cooperative planning for change. It appeared, at any rate, that the Phase III meetings of the project may have been resented by some project participants. While the advisory group stated emphatically that information offered in community meetings in Phase III was for the purpose of clarifying the meaning of issues of conflict, especially new ideas in education, some participants appeared to think that advisory group members were presenting information on new ideas to make all people believe in them. A strong effort was made by the project director and the advisory group members to assure project participants that while cooperative planning required everyone to concede some in their point of view, the purpose of the project was not to bring about the implementation of major change that all participants did not understand or desire.

The advisory group met on March 10 and March 16 to plan Phase III meetings, to consider methods of encouraging participants to
attend meetings, and to make plans for the problem solving workshop of Phase IV.

Phase IV: Convert Needs into Goals—Convert Needs into Problems to Solve. The project director, evaluator, superintendent, and advisory group discussed the application of the NWREL Research Utilization in Problem Solving workshop materials and processes as presented by the project director. The group felt that to conduct the full twenty-eight hour workshop with participants in the project would not be possible, since participants could not arrange to meet at the same time during work days. The group also felt that part of the RUPS workshop—the identification of problems and the diagnosis of problems—had been partly accomplished. The building of problem solving skills through the use of force-field analysis was considered as a necessary activity to precede task group development. The project director contacted Dr. John O. Picton of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory to request assistance in the development of a modified RUPS and Interpersonal Communications workshop to be used in the Three Forks project. Picton and the writer discussed the progress of the project and decided that having consultants outside the project to conduct a workshop to convert identified needs into goals and problem statements for task groups to work on would be desirable. The use of outside consultants presenting RUPS and Interpersonal Communications concepts would provide a restatement of and supplement to skills being practiced in the project, and the new people might add a new source
of interest to stimulate participants to deepen their skills.

Dr. Picton contacted Dr. Donald Schliesman and Dr. Alexander Howard from Central Washington State College in Ellensburg, Washington, and asked them if they would develop a workshop to meet the needs of the project. Both men had been trained in Interpersonal Communications and RUPs workshops sponsored by the NWREL. Dr. Schliesman and Dr. Howard agreed to come to Three Forks to do the workshop, and the writer and the consultants corresponded to develop further plans.

The outcomes of Phase III were considered to be the retrieval of information on new ideas in education and on conflicts of interest participants had. The Phase was also expected to continue the development of informal communication channels, the mixing of ideas of project participants, and the development of an atmosphere of inquiry about educational improvements.

On April 2 and 3 a problem solving workshop patterned after the RUPs workshop of the NWREL was conducted by Dr. Donald Schliesman and Dr. Alexander Howard. The advisory group used advertisement with incentives to encourage more people to attend the workshop. The Friday evening meeting was attended by 90 participants. Communications skills were reviewed and the 15 identified educational issues of Phase II were converted into goal statements. A general goal or purpose of the Three Forks Schools was begun to be developed. The Saturday morning meeting, attended by 66 participants, concentrated on non-verbal communications skills and a refinement of the goal or problem
statements for the school system. During the Saturday afternoon meeting which was attended by 59 people, communications skills of behavior description and perception checking, as taken from the NWREL Interpersonal Communications materials, were stressed, and the goal statements written earlier were ranked in priorities. Force-field analysis, as included in the NWREL RUPS workshop, was demonstrated and practiced late Saturday afternoon. Saturday evening information on features of successful task groups was given, and the 61 participants completed a task-maintenance exercise taken from the RUPS workshop. A general statement of the goal or purpose of the school system was developed by groups Saturday evening. The agendas, handouts, and evaluations of the workshop meetings are described in Appendix C, page 255.

The advisory group met on April 13, 15, and 20 to draw together the results of the Phase IV workshop, to combine the general purpose or goal statement, and to combine and refine the statement of problems written in behavioral terms. Excerpts from Robert F. Mager's Preparing Instructional Objectives (1962) and "Four Guidelines for Writing a Problem Statement," taken from the NWREL RUPS workshop materials (see both handouts in Appendix C, page 280) were used by the advisory group to refine the goal statements written by participants in the Phase IV workshop. Criteria of educational philosophies found in Van Cleve Morris' book Philosophy and the American School; an Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (1961) were used by
the advisory group to identify the philosophy suggested by the community developed general goal of education. Advisory group members constructed a philosophy of education for the school that seemed to represent the ideas of project participants. The 15 main educational issues identified in the project as the areas the school should work to improve were combined into seven areas for task groups to work on. The seven areas included 1) improving school financing; investigating consolidation; and updating buildings, facilities and equipment, 2) need for vocational education, 3) expand the program to meet individual beginning needs and interests; develop a broader, less competitive P.E. program; and decide who teaches values, 4) improve school-community-board relationships; and define student freedom and responsibility, 5) emphasis on the primary grades and get a good start in kindergarten, 6) adult education needs, and 7) maintain a good staff; clarify teacher duties, prerogatives, and respect, hire a counselor; and investigate the usefulness of tenure. Appendix C, page 280, includes problem statements on these areas. One of these areas, maintain a good staff, was considered a professional responsibility and not to be a community task group responsibility.

Phase IV was designed to produce a written statement of school goals, philosophy, and problems to be worked on by task groups. Priorities were placed on problem statements to indicate which issues were considered most important. The phase also trained a group of people in problem solving processes. People who participated in the
workshop were interested in activities although people seemed to tire quickly with so much sitting.

**Phase V: Develop Task Groups to Act on Problems—Mobilize for Action.** A community-wide meeting was held on the evening of April 26 for the distribution of developed statements of philosophy, goals, and problem statements for the school and for the naming of task groups to begin work on solving problems. The advisory group and project director expected that three or four problems could probably be worked on at one time. At the April 26 community meeting the RUPS procedure of ranking the importance of tasks to be attacked and the rating of the difficulty of solving each problem was accomplished to provide participants a basis for deciding which of the issues should be tackled first. The comparing of the ranking and rating of the issues was designed to produce the problems that are more important and easier to solve. Working on these problems before the more difficult and less important problems are tackled is recommended by Spanjer. (Spanjer, 1968: 4)

Participants at the April 26 meeting determined, after ranking and rating the six issues, that all issues should be worked on by task groups. Participants reasoned that three of the six issues would require long-range work and that three problems could be solved in a shorter time, and enthusiasm generated in the project this year might be lost if problems people were interested in solving were shelved as others were worked on. A decision was made to name six
task groups. Volunteers were called for to work in task groups, and seven to thirteen people volunteered for each of the six areas. At the April 26 meeting a meeting date was set for each of the task groups. A task group of faculty members and board members was expected to be formed to work on maintaining a good staff when school began in the fall of 1971. In May and June each of the task groups had met at least twice to begin their work. Appendix C, page 272, describes the agenda, handouts, and evaluation of the April 26 meeting, and page 291 of Appendix C, describes the agenda and handouts of the first meeting of the task groups. Each task group was given information on guidelines for successful task groups.

Phase V created problem solving task groups to act under the direction of the advisory group and superintendent to help to begin the improvement or renewal of the school as an organization. This Phase brought about the initiation of a decentralized decision-making process in the school system.

Phase VI: Evaluation and Preparation for Continuation of the Self-Renewal Process. At the April 26 community meeting project participants who attended the meeting were given the post-test of attitudes toward the school as in Appendix A, page 163. In early May the post-test was sent to community members who participated in the project, but who did not happen to attend the last community-wide meeting. The post-test was also sent by the project evaluator to non-participant community members. The questionnaires were coded to
allow the evaluator or project director to call for the return of late questionnaires. Students and faculty members completed the post-test during an afternoon while school was still in session. During June of 1971 the results of the attitude-toward-school questionnaires were analyzed and a report of the project's achievement of stated objectives was made. An application for continuation of Title III ESEA funding of the project was sent to the Supervisor of Title III ESEA projects on June 28 of 1971. Evaluation of the application of the plan to initiate organizational self-renewal in the Three Forks Schools is summarized in Chapter V of this paper.

The initiation of the plan described above took approximately one year, from the preparation of the project to the development of functioning task groups. Community meetings of the project required no more than a total of thirty-six hours of any participant's time; however, the time spent by members of the advisory group, some of which were members of task groups also, was approximately ninety hours through the year. Each community meeting lasted approximately two and one-half to four hours. A roll sheet (see Appendix C, page 172) was used to determine attendance.

While including the handouts used in project meetings would be convenient for researchers wishing to replicate this project, it was not feasible to include more than a description of these materials in this paper. The writer will keep on file for at least five years handout materials, news releases, visual materials used in meetings.
of this project. Most of the problem solving and interpersonal communication skill development handouts used in this project can also be obtained from the NWREL in Portland, Oregon. A complete set of needs assessment materials and evaluative comments made of project meetings by participants will also be kept on file by the writer.

A summary of Three Forks project meetings is given below:

January 28 - Preliminary - community volunteers only - high school cafeteria. Dr. Lassey, MSU, talked; Jack Dobush talked about random sampling. Things that you are concerned about.

February 8 - Community wide meeting in elementary gym. Filled out questionnaires on the project and what you want and don't want in an ideal school.

February 15 - Community only - high school cafeteria. Studied ideal school and don't wants and made additions.

February 18 - Faculty and students - high school cafeteria. Studied ideal school and don't wants and made additions.

March 1 - Community wide meeting - elementary gym. Administrators speeches and categorizing and labeling of issues.

March 4 - Advisory Committee Meeting - Title III office. Constructed a chart of labeled issues clarifying and labeling 15 major issues.

March 8 - Community wide meeting - elementary gym. Showed film on Innovated Teaching in Montana and Philosophy of Education.

March 10 - Advisory Committee Meeting - Title III office. Planned for obtaining speakers on subject of most concern.

March 15 - Community wide meeting - elementary gym. Dr. Lair spoke on "Meaning of Discipline" and Dr. Palmer on "Vo-Tech."
March 16  - Advisory Committee Meeting - Title III office. Discussed ways of getting better attendance at project meetings.

March 22  - Community wide meeting - elementary gym. Individualized Instruction slides and panel.

April 2   - Problem Development Workshop - community wide. Elementary gym. How to write goal statements and ranking of prestige of occupations.

April 3   - Problem Development Workshop - community wide. Saturday morning. Develop problem statements.


April 3   - Problem Development Workshop - community wide. Saturday night. General goal of schools.

April 13  - Advisory Committee Meeting, Title III office. Discussed reasons for mill levy failure; method of naming a task group.

April 15  - Advisory Committee Meeting, Title III office. Wrote statement of the purpose or general goal for the schools.

April 20  - Advisory Committee Meeting, Title III office. Worked on writing a statement on when the student is aware of his potentials, etc. "The Development as Measured by ..." statement.

April 28  - Vocational-Educational Task Group, Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.

April 30  - Adult Education Task Group, Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.

May 3    - Relationships & Student Freedom with Responsibility Task Group, Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.

May 3    - Expanded Curriculum Task Group, Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.
May 4  - Better Financing Task Group, Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.

May 5  - Adult Education Task Group - Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.

May 6  - Expanded Curriculum Task Group, Title III office. Planned trip for one group to go to Salt Lake to visit schools and one group to visit Ennis school.

May 7  - Vocational-Educational Task Group, Title III office. Mr. Dale Storey's report.

May 10 - Relationships - Student Freedom with Responsibility Task Group, Title III office.

May 11 - Better Financing Task Group, Title III office. Mr. Earl Felbaum spoke on "How the Three Forks Schools are Financed."

May 18 - Adult Education Task Group, Title III office. Present gathered information - Force-Field Analysis.

May 19 - Primary Grades Task Group, Title III office. First meeting - getting acquainted with functions of a task group.

May 20 - Expanded Curriculum Task Group, Title III office. Reported on Salt Lake and Ennis trips.

May 24 - Primary Grades Task Group, Title III office. Listed main objectives for a future kindergarten program.

May 25 - Expanded Curriculum Task Group, Title III office.

June 3  - Primary Grades Task Group, Title III office.

June 4  - Adult Education Task Group, Title III office. Mr. Brent Polton, State of Montana, spoke.

June 7  - Relationships - Student Freedom with Responsibility Task Group, Home Economics Room.

June 10 - Adult Education Task Group, Title III office. Information meeting.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Chapters one through four outlined the problem to be studied, reviewed some of the pertinent literature related to the study, explained the procedures used in developing the study, and presented an outline of the plan developed to initiate organizational self-renewal in a school system. Chapter V reports the results of the study and the application of the developed plan. The first section of this chapter reports the plan’s success in achieving performance objectives as anticipated. Features of organizational self-renewal are reviewed, and the existence or non-existence of these features in the Three Forks School system is discussed. The organizational goals developed during the study by school community members are also evaluated in this first section. In the next section special attention is given to the plan’s ability to achieve one of the written objectives, the change of school community members’ attitudes toward the school as an organization. A summary of the evaluation of school organization questionnaire results is presented in this second section. In the third section of Chapter V a summary of the project participants’ evaluations of project phases and meetings is presented.

Achievement of Performance Objectives

Objective 1: Develop an Eclectic Plan. In Chapter I the first stated objective of this study was to develop from the literature on
behavioral sciences and organizational change an eclectic and creative plan for initiating organizational self-renewal in a school system. This objective was accomplished, and the resultant plan is presented in Chapter IV. The plan draws upon models of organizational development constructed by Hansen, Buchanan, the Cooperative Project for Educational Development, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, and others previously mentioned. The developed plan was based on the cooperative subgroup decision-making efforts of the Three Forks school community members, and the plan emphasized the development of learned processes of problem-solving and interpersonal communications skills, as proposed.

Objective 2: Apply the Plan. The second objective of the study was to apply the plan in the Three Forks Schools. This objective was completed during the months of January through June in 1971. The plan was applied and completed as planned. Chapter IV includes the outline of the phases and meetings of the project and when each planned activity was completed.

Objective 3: Did the Plan Produce Features of Organizational Self-Renewal? The third objective of the study was to determine the degree to which the developed plan did or did not produce desired organization self-renewal features constituted by the organization's responding to its environment by its creating new goals, new channels of communication, and new decision-making subgroups. A discussion of the plan's achievement of the parts of this third objective follows in three parts: 1) goals, problem statements, and philosophy of education, 2) new communications
channels, and 3) modified organization through shared responsibility for organizational development.

Goals, Problem Statements, and Philosophy of Education: Participants in the project continued to cooperate through the project phases of gathering of opinions, categorizing of these issues, retrieval of new information, and developing of problem statements and school goals. The Three Forks Schools were able to develop a democratically-derived statement of the 1971 purpose of the schools and a statement of the community's expectations of the Schools. The development of a democratically-derived statement of the purpose of the organization (which unified the efforts of the members of the organization) has been described in Chapter II of this study as one of the first prerequisites of organizational self-renewal. The "Statement of the Purpose of the Three Forks Schools 1971," as developed during the project, is included in Appendix C, page 275. This statement is concluded with definitions of a teacher, student, the curriculum, and the best method of learning as seen by Three Forks school community members. This latter statement may be viewed as a philosophy of education as structured by Van Cleve Morris. (Morris, 1961) The philosophy would be described as pragmatic, which is a philosophy which might be expected to result from a cooperative effort of groups of people with different opinions. Appendix C, page 280, also includes problem statements or goals of the Three Forks Schools entitled "Planning Project Areas of Interest Written into Problem Statements." New written goals
were derived through use of the processes of the plan of this study. An organization, as defined by Schmuck in Chapter II of this paper, may be said to be beginning to be self-renewing if the members of the organization share their expectations about the organization and develop written goals for that organization. The Three Forks Schools did create a sharing of expectations of the members of the several subgroups of the organization.

New Communications Channels: Before the project was conducted in the Three Forks Schools, the superintendent and school board had not met with community members, students, or faculty members to develop critical school evaluations in community meetings. The development of communications channels among students, teachers, administrators, and community members had not been the focus of attention of the school organization. During and after the initiation of the plan of this study, formal and informal communications channels were developed during meetings and group activities which brought members of all school community or organizational groups together to discuss issues. The creation of communication channels among the members of the school organization became the focus of attention of the school administration and board. Mrs. Loretta Tribble, Mrs. Ad Russell, Mrs. Jennie Andriolo, Mr. Ray Tocci, Mr. Ted Stollfus, and Dr. E. E. Bertagnolli are names of only a few of the project participants who stated that the school had not before directly asked their opinions on school issues. These school community members
said that they would not have become involved with the school had the project not encouraged their involvement. The project created new communications channels and made it possible for the school organization to identify new supporters who could be potential new "variety pool" resources. Schmuck wrote that for a school to be effectively adaptive, the system must see, support, and facilitate the emergence of whatever resources exist for maximizing its educative functions. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969:1) The Three Forks Schools created new communications channels with new people who had potential to be valuable new human resources for supporting the school. The Three Forks Schools now possess one criteria of organizational self-renewal in the communications channels developed.

Modified Organization through Shared Responsibility for Organizational Development: Schmuck wrote that organizational self-renewal often is brought about through the formation of problem-solving groups that did not exist before in the formal structure of the school before self-renewal activities began. Schmuck also maintained that if a school organization is to be truly adaptive, it must be able to form new subsystems, change them, or dispose of them as needed. (Schmuck and Blumberg, 1969:6) One of the major objectives of this study was to develop in the Three Forks school organization new problem-solving task groups to share the responsibility for developing the organization by helping the school better meet the expressed needs of the community. The plan of this study was successful in creating a modified organization through the development of task groups which began to act to solve organizational problems. Seven task
groups were named, and each task group was composed of at least seven members who volunteered to work. Each group was formed to accomplish a written goal, and six of the seven groups had already begun their work by June of 1971. The seventh task group, which was to establish a program for maintaining a good school staff, was expected to form in September of 1971 after faculty members returned from summer vacation. Appendix C, pages 280 through 287, includes the written problem statements which were the focus of the task groups. Each of the six task groups had met twice or more at the time of the writing of this paper. Dates of the meetings of task groups are included in Chapter IV, page 102 and Appendix C, page 291 includes the agenda of the first task group meetings. At the time of the writing of this paper a task group working to expand the curriculum to better meet the needs of individual students had viewed films on individualized instruction, visited innovative schools in Idaho and Utah, and prepared a pilot program of individualized instruction to begin in September in the first grade at Three Forks. A task group working to develop a kindergarten program and to improve primary level instruction had met several times to do a force-field analysis of the problem of establishing a public kindergarten, to discuss results of surveys taken of community members' attitudes toward the development of a public kindergarten, and to visit directors of nearby kindergarten programs. Another task group working to develop a program of adult education or a community school concept had requested assistance from the Montana Supervisor of Adult Basic Education and had met
with him in Three Forks to view films and to hear guest speakers. Members of this task group went to Northern Montana College at Havre, Montana, in July to be trained in processes for bringing about the implementation of adult education programs. A fourth task group functioning to improve relationships between the members of the school community and to define student freedom and responsibility had met to gather different opinions on student freedom from adults and students, and this group proceeded to develop policies on student attendance which were written in a student handbook for distribution in September of 1971. These four task groups actively applied force-field analysis procedures to their problems and immediately brought action. The groups were integrated around their common task and the future seemed bright for their accomplishing their goals. A fifth task group formed to study ways of better financing the schools, and a sixth group formed to bring about the development of a vocational education program in the Three Forks Schools. These two groups met twice before July 1 to consider through force-field analysis what might best be accomplished before July 1 to encourage community members to support the schools and a previously conceived vocational education program. A school mill levy election which included funds for a vocational education program had been scheduled by the school board. The two task groups did not have time before the school election to inform the community of the task groups' interests, and the two task groups also did not have time before the election to fully
study action alternatives for their problems. The community voted against the mill levy which included a vocational education program. However, at a later election, which did not include a vocational education program provision, a reduced mill levy was passed. The task groups working on financing and vocational education did not meet again after the failed levy, but the leaders of both groups stated that in September of 1971 they would attempt to begin the task group work anew.

In addition to the development of task groups which were to function only as long as they had a problem yet to solve, an advisory group of people representing the subgroups of the school organization was formed to coordinate the activities of the task groups and to see that organizational self-renewal remained a part of the Three Forks school organization. This group, composed of students, board members, teachers, and community members, helped to plan agendas of community meetings during the project; and this group had the potential of being a valuable new community resource for the school administrators and board. Opinions of a wider variety of people than the community members on the school board could be reflected in advisory group meetings. While the advisory group is not an official decision-making body, it could be very valuable in providing the school feedback on the attitudes of the community on the
consequences of school policy. Lucio and McNeil have supported the idea that wide participation should take place not in the formulating or deciding of policy but in judging the consequences of that policy. (Lucio and McNeil, 1969:86)

The Three Forks Schools did develop new subsystems for sharing the responsibility of organizational development through problem-solving. By building functioning task groups the plan developed in this study was successful in creating the potential for organizational development through self-renewal.

Objective 4: Evaluation of the Goals or Problem Statements. The fourth objective of this study was to determine whether or not the goals or problem statements developed by community members participating in the project could meet the criteria of behavioral objectives or problem statements as set by Robert F. Mager and/or the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory RUPS materials. The plan of this study attempted to teach project participants to write goals in measurable terms so people could tell when and if they had reached their goals. Handout 6 in the NWREL Research Utilization in Problem Solving materials included the following criteria for problem statements:

A problem statement answers each of these guideline questions:

1. Who is affected?
2. Who is causing it?
3. What kind of problem is it?
4. What is the goal for improvement? Specifically how will things look when the goal has been achieved?

Robert F. Mager included the following criteria for instructional

1. An instructional objective is a statement that describes an intended outcome of instruction.
2. An objective is meaningful to the extent it communicates an instructional intent to its reader, and does so to the degree that it describes or defines the terminal behavior expected of the learner.
3. Terminal behavior is defined by:
   a. Identifying and naming the observable act that will be accepted as evidence that the learner has achieved the objective.
   b. Describing the conditions (givens, restrictions) necessary to exclude acts that will not be accepted as evidence that the learner has achieved the objective.

Mager emphasized that if people feel that teaching deals with things that can't be measured or evaluated, then the school is in an awkward position of being unable to demonstrate that it is teaching anything at all. If an organization cannot determine how well it is meeting its objectives, the organization has little ability to unify the efforts of its human resources. Mager maintained that while it is true in general that the more important or encompassing an objective or goal is, the more difficult it is to state, people could do a good deal better in attempting to specify what behavior change they want the school to achieve. (Mager, 1962: 47)

Goals for the schools were a topic of consideration early in the project when people were asked what they thought an ideal school should have. One goal for the school that some people mentioned was to produce moral and good citizens. This goal possesses none of the qualities of the NWREL guidelines for problem statements or Mager's instructional ob-
jectives. No specific details are given about expected behavior of the learner. The opinions given by people taking part in the early part of the project were often non-specific, and the opinions on goals were often not stated in terms of learner behavior.

During the problem-solving workshop of Phase IV of the project, participants in the study were acquainted with NWREL and Mager guidelines. Appendix C, page 262, presents general goals written by school community member groups after they had been exposed to the guidelines. An example of the kind of goal statement that participants produced after being presented guidelines for goal or problem statements is presented below:

A student in our school should be taught to:
   Be self-reliant
   Have a sense of responsibility
   Be independent
   Be prepared for an occupation (or further education)
Under conditions such as:
   Our changing and cooperative society demands
Measured in such ways as:
   Personal pride
   Communication and cooperation with fellow man
   Being able to be happy and enjoy life

While the above statement is more detailed than "the school should produce moral and good citizens," and while movement toward specifying desired behavior, conditions, and measurement had been made, the above statement is still not specific. The meaning of self-reliant and responsible is not clear. The conditions are vague, and the means of measurement is not clear. How does one measure personal pride or happiness?
As more time was spent on refining goals so that more people were clear on exactly what loaded words implied, the rather lengthy goal statement or purpose statement of the schools was developed by the advisory group which combined the work of project participants attending the problem solving workshop. This statement is presented in Appendix C, page 275. Following is a section of the purpose statement:

**Actions.** The purpose of the schools is to provide each student with the opportunity and encouragement to develop an awareness and growth of his own potentials socially, emotionally, academically, physically, and professionally.

Each student should be able to make and write his own goals, long range and immediate, in his life while he is in school and after he graduates. Education is a never-ending process of presenting people with many different ways of adjusting to and producing in a changing society. Each student should become aware of possible choices and he should become skilled in making choices suitable to his abilities.

Each student should have an opportunity to recognize and practice thought skills, physical skills, and social skills. He should be helped to know how to learn new concepts. He should have an opportunity to grow in self-acceptance and independence from others. As much as possible, students should be responsible for what they learn.

**Conditions.** In the school there should be an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance among all persons in the school and community. The student should be satisfied that he has an opportunity to develop himself. The school system should be based on a structure of defined responsibilities for students, teachers, administrators, community members, and board members; these responsibilities should be periodically revised through the cooperative efforts of students, faculty, board, and community.

**Measure.** A comprehensive testing program should be part of the school system to help the student and teacher measure the student's point and rate of development in areas of skill. Subjective evaluation should be available to students to measure their social and emotional development. Questionnaires should be used frequently to measure such things as satisfaction, level of respect, and self-acceptance. Ability to make productive choices should be measured by the student's successful
One statement is written in terms of desired terminal student behaviors, the instructional intent of the school, the conditions of the school, and the measurement expected to provide a means of determining the achievement of the goals. The writer felt that the final goal statement appeared to reasonably meet desired criteria as best as a general goal statement might. It can be observed that the problem statements produced in the project (see Appendix C, page 275) each include reference to who is affected by the problem; who seems to be causing the problem; whether or not the problem is related to individuals, groups, the organization, or society; and the goal for improvement written in terms of student or community behavior desired. Participants in the project were able to learn to write goals and problem statements in terms of the criteria of Mager and the NWREL.

Questionnaire Results

Objective 5: Attitude Change. The fifth objective of this study was to evaluate pre-test and post-test questionnaire results to determine any changes in the attitudes of project participants (experimental groups) and non-participants (control groups) toward the school as an organization. The questionnaire for measuring attitude change was administered as described in Chapter III of this paper. The questionnaire
A detailed evaluation of the results of the questionnaire pre-test and post-test was made, and the evaluation report is available. (DoBush, 1971: 108-124). The evaluation report also includes progress evaluation results. A summary of the results of the questionnaire will be given in this section of Chapter V.

The first null hypothesis of this study was that there would be no change in the attitudes of the school community members toward the school. To test this hypothesis an analysis of questionnaire results from each selected group of the sampling was made using the non-parametric Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test. Results of the total number of questions were considered together in one analysis to determine if selected participant and non-participant groups changed their attitude on the questions in general. The following table summarizes findings related to null hypothesis one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Students</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating Students</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Community</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating Community</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Community</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value of \( z, \alpha = .05 \), two tailed test is 1.96.
This table indicates that participating sample groups, except for the volunteer community groups, showed a significant change in their attitudes on the organizational questions included in the questionnaire. The volunteer community members, the non-participating students, and the non-participating community members did not show a significant change in their attitudes toward the school organization. Non-participating students showed the least change. More detail is shown in the evaluator's report. (DoBush, 1971: 108-116) Early in the 1970-71 school year the junior and senior high school student bodies were told by the high school principal-superintendent that students were to have the responsibility to completely re-write the policies and rules for the school. Students appeared to be very interested in this opportunity, and the writer felt that it was possible that some students may have had rather unrealistic ideas about how much they could change their school. When students not participating in this study (but who were involved in writing student policies for the school) were acquainted with the plan of this study—which involved teachers, community members, and board members, as well as students—it is very possible that some of these students who had great hopes for change were somewhat discouraged with the slower pace of change when more people were involved. These students responded to the pre-test with rather positive attitudes toward the school, and it is possible that they would not show a significant change in their attitudes.
if they were impatient with a process of involving many people with
different opinions. Non-participant groups also may not have changed
their attitudes because there may not have been much communication
between participants and non-participants about the activities of the
project. Salter has suggested that people learn only through experience
(Salter, 1961), and this may be the reason that a smaller change was
obtained in each of the non-participating groups.

Perhaps volunteering community members who began their involve­
ment in the project with rather positive attitudes toward the school
would have less margin for showing significant positive change in their
attitudes. Another explanation might also be possible. Volunteers
could be people who would get involved because they expected to readily
bring about the accomplishment of their wishes. These people who
could have been accustomed to being opinion leaders who got what they
wanted might have become discouraged, as may the non-participating
students, when their expectations were not met immediately. Randomly-
selected participants who were not accustomed to volunteering could
have had less optimistic hopes for cooperative planning efforts than
might volunteers, and when cooperation did produce results, the
randomly-selected people may have been more impressed than were
volunteers.
Since the first null hypothesis was rejected in the cases of the staff and participating students and community members, but retained in the cases of volunteers and non-participating students and community members, the plan of this study was partially successful in changing the attitudes of community members toward their school.

The second null hypothesis was that there would be no change in the attitudes of participants or non-participants as a result of the project regardless of whether the sample participated in the project or not. The Mann-Whitney U Test was applied to the two randomly-selected student groups and the two randomly-selected community member groups. The test made it possible to check to see if randomly-selected comparable groups had the same distribution and to measure whether groups changed regardless of their participation in the project. Participating and non-participating student groups were combined and compared first on the pre-test (DoBush, 1971: 119) and then on the post-test (DoBush, 1971: 121). Then the participating and the non-participating community member groups were combined and compared on the pre-test (DoBush, 1971: 123) and then on the post-test. (DoBush, 1971: 124)

Below is a table summarizing the compared participating and non-participating samples to see if attitudes changed regardless of
participation in the group activities of the project.

### TABLE II - COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE CHANGES OF PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test of P &amp; NP Students</td>
<td>.4336</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test of P &amp; NP Students</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test of P &amp; NP Community Members</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test of P &amp; NP Community Members</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value of $z$, $\alpha = .05$, two tailed test is 1.96.

The two student samples compared on the pre-test yielded a $z$ of .4336, which indicates no significant difference between the participants and non-participants before their involvement in the project. This shows that there is no reason to believe that the randomly-selected participant and non-participant groups of students were not from the same population. Similarly, the $z$ of .779 yielded by the results of pre-testing participant and non-participant community members is not significant (of 1.96 or above), and it appears that the two samples were taken from the same population. In both cases of students and community members taking the post-test, there is an evident larger difference in $z$.
scores than on the pre-test, but the difference was not large enough to be significant and to warrant the rejection of the second null hypothesis. Participation in the project did not significantly change the attitudes of participant groups more than non-participant groups.

The Mann-Whitney U Test was applied to matched experimental and control groups of students and community members. Participant volunteer community members and staff members did not have matched non-participating control groups. A possible reason for the lack of achievement of significant attitude change of participant groups over non-participant groups may have been the lack of time community members and students had during the project to explain project activities and outcomes to non-participants. The post-test was administered shortly after task groups began their meetings. The impact of the project may not have been fully felt in the community by the time the post-test was given. The positive movement toward a significant difference between participant and non-participant groups may suggest that at a later time, possibly in 1972, the administration of another questionnaire might show significant differences between participant and non-participant groups. However, an additional possibility is that the project may not influence the attitudes of participating community members as much as desired.

While the consideration of attitude changes on the questionnaire items taken collectively shows a general trend, it may be just as
meaningful to consider how sample groups did or did not show significant change in their attitudes on individual items in the questionnaire. The following table summarizes how sample groups responded to individual items on the pre-test and post-test included in Appendix A, page 156. The table reports which groups showed significant change in their attitudes toward individual questionnaire items.

**TABLE III - SUMMARY OF SUBGROUP ATTITUDE CHANGES ON INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Significant Change (+)</th>
<th>Negative Significant Change (-)</th>
<th>No Significant Change (Blank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity for individual expression</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1a)</strong></td>
<td>+ + + 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How well informed about school</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3b)</strong></td>
<td>+ + + 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of cooperative planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4c)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation among subgroups = how well faculty &amp; students cooperate</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5d)</strong></td>
<td>+ - 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How well faculty and community cooperate</strong></td>
<td><strong>(6d)</strong></td>
<td>+ + 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How well students and community cooperate</strong></td>
<td><strong>(7d)</strong></td>
<td>+ + 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with personal influence</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2e)</strong></td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with schools meeting all needs</strong></td>
<td><strong>(8f)</strong></td>
<td>- - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much public discussion of problems</strong></td>
<td><strong>(10g)</strong></td>
<td>+ + + + 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Participating Students</th>
<th>Non-Participating Students</th>
<th>Participating Community</th>
<th>Non-Participating Community</th>
<th>Group Total</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How active community is in goal-making</td>
<td>(9h)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much school needs improvement</td>
<td>(11i)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect among subgroups: respect among faculty &amp; students</td>
<td>(12j)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect among administration and faculty</td>
<td>(13j)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect among students and community</td>
<td>(14j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect among students and administration</td>
<td>(15j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect among community and faculty</td>
<td>(16j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect among administration and community</td>
<td>(17j)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective use of staff and community resources</td>
<td>(18k)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with quality of instruction</td>
<td>(19l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with school facilities</td>
<td>(20m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well school board serves students</td>
<td>(21n)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.05 Significance level determined with critical value of \( z = 1.96 \) for two tailed test. (See Appendix C, page through for more detailed information.)
This table shows which issues were most influenced by the project. The table also shows which groups significantly changed their attitudes on issues included in the questionnaire. Plus and minus signs were placed on the table when a group significantly changed in attitude on an individual question. The significance of change in attitude was determined through the use of the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Ranks Test with the .05 level of significance, two tailed test. Detailed analysis of the data from which this table was developed is included in the evaluator's report of the results of this study. (DoBush, 1971)

In Table III, some issues seemed to be more influenced by the project than others. Those issues most influenced in a positive manner during the project included: 1a) how much opportunity people thought they were provided for expressing their opinions; 3b) how much people felt they were informed about school programs; 10g) how much people felt that the school system recognized, clarified, and offered for public discussion the important problems of the school; and 9h) how active people felt that community members had been in developing school goals. It is reasonable that these issues would be most influenced by the project—which did attempt to involve many people in learning about the school, discussing all problems, and setting new goals.

The project may have potential for improving the working relationship among students, community members, and faculty.
as seen by faculty and participating community groups. Significant change may be observed in staff and participating community groups in questions 6d and 7d, both dealing with how well subgroups work together. It is interesting to note that staff and students gained a more positive attitude toward how well the school board served the best interests of the students.

Several times during the project, participating students complained that they did not have an opportunity in project meetings to voice their opinions. Table III seems to indicate that participating students felt that faculty and student cooperation was poor (question 5d). Faculty members felt the opposite was true. It could be that since student participation in school problem discussions was not a usual practice in this school system, adults may have been dominant in early project small group discussions. Students who may have had high hopes that they would be heard and that they would be able to immediately influence the policies of the school may have become disillusioned with adult domination. Student attendance at meetings dropped to a very low level during the project (see Appendix E, page 306). Students may have felt that there was little use in their efforts to be heard by teachers; teachers may have felt that they were doing a good job of giving students an opportunity to participate.

Significant negative attitude change was noted on question 8f—how well the school satisfied the educational needs and interests of all of
the people they have served. Participating students may have felt that since they had difficulty being heard, the school system was not really interested in satisfying their needs. Non-participating community members may have felt that since the school was airing so many problems for public discussion, there must be a large group of people who were not getting what they wanted out of the school.

The project evidently did not bring about the development of an atmosphere of respect among people who came to know each other better. In fact, any significant changes in questions 12j-17j were negative. Subgroups appeared to feel that respect among administration, faculty, and community members decreased. Since the superintendent was in his first year as superintendent of Three Forks, it may be that some people did not have enough opportunity to get to know him and his worth to the school during the project. Also, faculty members who had not been exposed to a community involvement project before and who had not had the responsibility to evaluate and improve the school system may have resented the encouragement of the administration to participate in the project.

Table III indicates that the project did not significantly change the attitudes of subgroups on how much the community should be involved in cooperative planning (question 4c). Perhaps people were not ready to decide how effective cooperative planning was until more results were shown. Also, perhaps to the pre-test who marked cooperative plan-
ning as desirable did not fully understand the difficulty of producing goals through consensus processes. No significant change may also be observed in questions 191, how satisfied people were with the quality of instruction of a school are not influenced by association with faculty members in small group discussions, or negative ideas may have been reinforced.

Evaluation of the Phases of the Project

Objective 6: Phase and Meeting Evaluations. Participants in community-wide meetings were given an evaluation sheet to complete at the end of each meeting and each phase of the project. The evaluations were considered by the writer to be a very valuable asset in helping plan meetings and activities. When appropriate, evaluative questions were asked with a five-point scale from very little agreement to very much agreement provided for responses. Open-ended questions were also asked. Appendix C, pages 171 through 291, includes the evaluations of meetings and phases of the project. Percentages of participants marking response alternatives are given on each evaluation sheet included after each meeting agenda in Appendix C, and a sample of responses to open-ended questions is given in Appendix C, page 171. A summary of responses to questions on the general effectiveness of phases and meetings of the project is presented below.

The following table summarizes the evaluation participants in the project gave on the general effectiveness of project large-group meetings:
TABLE IV - SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION OF
THE GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT MEETINGS

Question asked at each project meeting: How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Percentages of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Little to Very Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I - Gathering Opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>0.0 4.0 20.2 36.3 39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>3.2 0.0 22.2 39.7 34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18</td>
<td>6.2 2.1 29.2 37.5 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II - Categorizing Opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>6.1 10.5 30.7 34.2 18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III - Get Needed Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>5.4 10.9 19.6 36.9 27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 13.3 25.5 59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>3.4 12.5 23.7 38.6 21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV - Convert Needs into Problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2 - Friday night</td>
<td>0.0 1.2 25.0 35.7 38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3 - Sat. morning</td>
<td>0.0 6.2 23.4 25.0 45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3 - Sat. afternoon</td>
<td>1.8 0.0 20.4 37.0 40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3 - Sat. evening</td>
<td>3.2 7.9 30.1 27.0 31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase V - Develop Task Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>1.9 13.5 26.9 38.5 19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants in the project were consistent in their evaluation of the project meetings. Meetings were generally evaluated positively with the largest responses in the highest two categories. Table IV, page 129, shows that participants appeared to be rather satisfied that project meetings were worthwhile. The March 1 meeting of Phase II was evaluated somewhat lower than previous meetings. Participants accomplished the difficult goal of grouping, categorizing, and labeling the many opinions that had been gathered in the project, but seemed frustrated with the task. It may also be noted that the evaluations of the March 8 and March 22 meetings of Phase III were a bit more scattered than some of the other meeting evaluations. Participants in these meetings in which new information was presented may have evaluated the meetings in terms of how much the presented material appealed to the participants. Project participants indicated a high level of satisfaction with the March 15 meeting. This reaction was most likely a positive response to clarification of issues related to vo-tech and student freedom, both areas of immediate interest in the community. Participants seem to have responded positively to the problem solving workshop, even though the workshop was quite demanding on participants' time. More information on the evaluations of project meetings is included throughout the evaluator's report of the results of this study. (Dobush, 1971)
The following table presents a summary of the evaluation of the general effectiveness of the phases of the project in which school community members participated.

**TABLE V - EVALUATION OF THE GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT PHASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases and Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I - How effective do you feel that Phase I (the gathering of opinions) has been?</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II - How effective was this categorizing and labeling phase?</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III - How effective do you feel Phase III (Search for Needed Information) was?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV - How effective was Phase IV (Converting Needs into Problems to Solve)?</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase V - How satisfied were you in general with this meeting (the development of task groups)?</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V shows how participants in the project evaluated the effectiveness of project phases. Phase III, the search for needed information to clarify issues, received a scattered and rather negative evaluation. Perhaps people who may have become discouraged with ideas presented in the meetings of Phase III began to believe that there was not enough of both sides of issues presented in this phase. More time for Phase III to clarify and discuss issues might be indicated. However, participants in the project appeared to polarize on each presentation of new information. The writer felt that too much time spent in Phase III might jeopardize the development of task groups if participants became rigidly divided on issues and the conflict was intensified by the presentation of more cognitive material. In general, Table V shows that the phases of the project were evaluated more positively than negatively. Participants did not appear to feel that any of the meetings or phases of the project were totally ineffective.

At the last community-wide meeting of the project, participants were asked evaluative questions about the project in general. Participants were asked how much they felt that the developed statement of the purpose of the Three Forks Schools 1971 was one that they could support. On the five-point scale with 1 as very little and 5 as very much, 3.6 percent of the participants marked 1, 12.4 percent marked 2, 24.1 percent marked 3, 25.5 percent marked 4, 31.4 percent marked 5, and 2.9 percent did not respond. A division of the responses by groups is
The scattered responses may be attributed to the fact that some participants who had attended meetings irregularly may not have been well-acquainted enough with the process of building the statement of purpose to understand it fully. Participants were also asked how successful they thought the project had been during its first year. On the five-point scale none marked 1, 15.7 percent marked 2, 27.4 percent marked 3, 45.1 percent marked 4, and 11.8 percent marked 5. Participants evidently felt that the project had been reasonably successful. Participants were encouraged to comment on this question. Comments on the success of the project ranged from "Previously unstated problems are now clear and can be given attention" to "When people continued month after month to attend meetings regularly, one knows something concrete and constructive is being offered and people felt their own progress toward a good and definite goal" to "Too much talking—no real action" and "It's still all talk."

Participants were asked what the most valuable outcome of the total project was. The following is a sample of the responses to this question:

Awareness of school needs
Actually getting task forces on the job
Learning to communicate with people
It stirs people up and makes them aware of their school problems and activities
Better understanding between school people including students and community
Starting to get community involved
School community members seemed to understand that the project was the initiation of a process to be carried on.

Participants were asked if as a result of the project, they had noticed any changes in the community, school, or individuals. Seventy-three percent of the participants felt there had been changes in the community. Seventy-two percent felt that the school had changed some as a result of the project, and seventy percent felt there had been changes in individuals as a result of the project. Comments on these changes included the following:

- People are more aware than ever before
- More understanding of the school
- More community interest
- Increased feelings for all
- More positive attitudes toward the school

In answer to a question about the parts of the project participants liked best, the following comments are a sample of responses:

- Sextet discussions
- Interchange of thoughts
- Problem solving
- Development of communications skills
- All of it
- The beginning—issues and ideas brought out

Participants responded to a question on how the project could be improved. Some of the responses included the following comments:

- Have the administration tell us what they want in the beginning instead of playing the game of asking us what we want, ignoring us, and doing what they wanted anyway
- More people participating in it
- Get the true meaning of the project before the people start in the fall of the year
There was concern from participants during the project that all the community did not understand the value or meaning of the project. News articles and television coverage of the project did not seem to dispel some misinterpretation of the project. Participants were reminded occasionally by the project director that some misinterpretation could probably not be avoided. Watson wrote that resistance would be reduced if it was recognized that any changes are likely to be misunderstood and misinterpreted. (Watson, 1969: 23)

Appendix E, page 306, includes a summary of the attendance of participants in the project. Attendance in the project might be considered as one criteria of evaluating the project's success. Approximately one-half of the number of people who came to the first community-wide meeting on February 8 attended the last community-wide meeting on April 26. It appeared that most people were very interested in giving their opinions in the first few meetings, but some of the participants did not wish to be part of completing the task of identifying issues and problems within the collected data. Another reason for the decreasing attendance might also be related to the fact that the later meetings of the project were held in the spring when people were beginning to be interested in outdoor activities. The fact that the project meetings were attended by at least sixty people was an indication that the project was supported by a sizable group of people. Randomly-selected community members and students were not regular attenders, however. Faculty
members, board members, volunteer community members, and volunteer students were the most regular in their attendance. Some randomly-selected individuals did attend very faithfully. Some of these people stated that if they had not been selected and asked to attend, they would never have volunteered. One of the most significant indicators of the success of the project in getting people to attend may be in the fact that a large group of interested people continued to attend project meetings and to take an interest in task groups. It might be speculated that if rural schools could count on the involvement of at least sixty interested people to help share the responsibility of organizational development, these schools could probably succeed in better meeting the needs of their students.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In this study a plan to initiate organizational self-renewal in a school system was developed and applied in the rural school district of Three Forks, Montana. The plan was based on a self-study approach with data feedback, the intent being to develop more open, cooperative, and systematic problem solving and to deepen the school community members' motivation to improve their own system. The focus of the plan was to give members of the student, faculty, community, and board subgroups of the organization an opportunity in small group discussions to experience a genuine change in the climate of the school system, as people came to share their expectations. Problem-solving and data feedback efforts were expected to be extended downwards and upwards in the system. The system was expected to experience climate change—to be measured through assessment of attitude change—and to initiate the development of task groups (structural change) to support comprehensive self-renewal efforts.

The self-renewal or self-study aspect of the plan was based on the concept of involving members of the school system themselves in examining the way their own organization—with its groups, roles, and relationships—actually functioned. By providing the parts of the organization with feedback of the opinions of school community members, the approach was to enable self-correction to take place, rather than reliance on
solutions offered by outsiders—these solutions being easy to reject or distort. Looking at data from the school system was to show discrepancies between hoped-for goals and actual achievements, and to acknowledge that the system was not meeting its aspirations. Collected data on attitudes was expected to show differences among subgroups of the organization and to build motivation for clarification and development. Sharing expectations of the school was expected to create groups of people with shared commitment to finding solutions to problems. The problemsolving focus was expected to require the development of communications and problem solving skills in members of the system. Having learned new skills, members of the organization could continue to tackle new problems in the future. The project, then, was not committed to the creation of a particular kind of program or “good” school, but rather to a process of collaborative inquiry. As people participated in the process-oriented plan in which equal status was given to them, it was expected that people would be more inclined to be open and direct and to trust the problem solving process. New norms could form a climate for continued change and improvement. As new norms developed, the good intentions of members of the system were expected to be acted upon by task groups of interested people.

In this study volunteer and randomly-selected members of student, faculty, school board, and community subgroups of the Three Forks school organization were involved in a process of building communications and
problem solving skills to help the school organization produce new goals, new channels of communication, and task groups for acting to meet the expressed expectations of the school community members. The general problem of the study was to determine if the developed plan could accomplish these goals, and a second general problem was to determine if the plan could improve the attitude of the school community toward the school. Plans for organizational self-renewal, while common in the literature, had not been field-tested in Montana. This study was an effort to apply theory and to observe whether anticipated results would occur as a result of a particular plan for initiating organizational self-renewal.

Summary of Findings.

The plan, implemented between January and June of 1971, did produce new statements of the purpose of the schools, goal or problem statements to guide the improvement of the system, and task groups of subgroup members who began work on solving problems. The plan was successful in achieving these stated objectives. The plan was completed without a preliminary sociological study of the community.

Two null hypotheses were formulated for testing attitude change of school community members. The first null hypothesis, that there would be no change of attitudes of school community members toward the school, was tested with a twenty-one item questionnaire administered as a pre-test in January, 1971, and as a post-test in May, 1971, to
members of the subgroups of the school organization, including faculty, students, and community members. Sample groups included a control group of non-participating community members and a control group of non-participating students. The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test was applied to results of pre-tests and post-tests of each group in the sample. Collective and individual item responses to the questionnaire were analyzed. A calculated $z$ of 1.96 was required to show significant attitude change at the .05 level of significance and to reject the first null hypothesis. On the questionnaire items considered collectively, significant positive change was obtained between the pre-test and post-test in faculty, participating students, and participating community members. For these groups the first null hypothesis was rejected. For non-participating students, non-participating community members, and volunteer community members, no significant attitude change, positive or negative, was obtained. For these groups the first null hypothesis was retained. The plan did not succeed in its first year of implementation in changing the attitudes of school community members who did not participate in the project.

The second null hypothesis, that there would be no change in non-participants as a group because of their possible association with participants who had been involved in the project, was also tested with the twenty-one item questionnaire administered as a pre-test and post-test to randomly-selected participant community members and students and
to randomly-selected non-participant community members and students. The Mann-Whitney U Test was applied to the two randomly-selected groups in the student and community member samples to determine significant change in attitudes of participant and non-participant groups between the administration of the pre-test and the post-test. A calculated $z$ of 1.96 was required to achieve a significance level of .05, and thereby reject the second null hypothesis. No significant difference was found on the pre-test of participating and non-participating student or community member groups. Similarly, no significant difference was found on the post-test of participating and non-participating student or community member groups. The second null hypothesis was retained indicating that student and community member participants in the project did not, during the first year of the implementation of the plan, influence the attitudes of non-participants.

Issues in the questionnaire that appeared to be most subject to participant attitudinal change included how much people felt that they had an opportunity to voice their opinions, how much they were informed about the school's programs, how much the school system offered the public an opportunity to discuss important educational problems, and how active community members were in attempting to make guidelines or goals for the school to follow. The plan did not seem to influence attitudes regarding satisfaction with the quality of instruction; the value of cooperative community planning; and respect among community,
students, and faculty. As anticipated, the plan did appear to influence attitudes toward how well the school system met the needs and interests of all of the people it served. Hoped-for goals were found to be discrepant with actual achievement of these goals.

Participants in the project seemed to be moderately acceptant of a new purpose and new goals for the school. The goals and purpose indicate that some participants learned how to write problem statements and purposes in terms of the guidelines of Mager and the NWREL. Functioning task groups used problem solving skills and interpersonal communications skills frequently during their meetings, indicating that some learning of these skills occurred. Evaluation of the meetings and phases of the project was generally favorable. Advisory group members and task group members were actively working to improve the educational system as the initiation of the project was completed.

Conclusions

Since the developed and applied plan to initiate organizational self-renewal in the Three Forks Schools did develop new goals, channels of communication, problem solving and task groups, general attitude change of climate change among participants in the project, the first
major conclusion of this study is that the plan did accomplish most of its goals, the normative-reeducative organizational self-renewal plan of theory was reasonably able to produce anticipated changes, and the Three Forks Schools gained self-renewing characteristics and a strong potential for improvement through the initiation of the plan.

The design of the plan encouraged community members, students, faculty members, and board members to participate in small group interaction to share expectations of the organization. Participants, except for volunteer community members, changed in their attitudes toward the school. Control group members did not change in their attitudes. A second major conclusion of this study is that to change school community members' attitudes toward the school, these people need to be participants in the actual group meetings of the plan. A secondary aspect of this conclusion is that the plan may not change the attitudes of volunteer project participants who may begin their involvement with rather positive attitudes toward the school.

Attendance levels of participants in the project dropped considerably during the meetings of the project, and randomly-selected students and community members did not participate as much as expected. A conclusion of this study is that most people who take an interest in the project at the start will not attend all of the meetings; randomly-selected participants will not attend all project meetings, even if these people are given special invitations to attend. However, some
participants—randomly-selected and volunteering—will attend all project meetings and take an active part in task groups.

Student, faculty, and community member subgroups were tested for attitude changes during the project. A major conclusion of this study is that school community members’ attitudes toward the school organization can be changed in a positive direction. A conclusion of this study is that all subgroups of the school organization will not be influenced in the same way by participation in the project. Some subgroups will change their attitudes on some issues, while other subgroups will not. A conclusion is also that changing the respect members of subgroups have for each other may be the more difficult task of the project. A conclusion of the study is that students who are given freedom to change the policies of the school before community members are involved in the effort may not develop a positive attitude toward cooperating at a later time with community members and staff. It is a significant conclusion also that attitude change is not easily obtained and changing a school system is a complex task.

The products of the study provoke the conclusion that community members, students, faculty members, and board members can learn to use problem solving skills and can cooperate together to build new goals and organizational structures for improving the school system. Modified Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory materials—including those of Higher Level Thinking Abilities, Interpersonal Communications, and
Research Utilization and Problem Solving—can be used with students and community members working with educators. The method of practical intelligence can work; average people can discuss, digest, and begin to resolve complex problems as they learn problem solving and interpersonal communications skills.

Many participants in the project indicated that they would never have become involved in efforts to improve the school had the project not encouraged them to participate through the random sampling procedure. A conclusion of this study is that the plan was successful in discovering for the school organization new human resources for helping to maximize its educative functions. While the random sampling procedure was not successful in obtaining a random sample of community and student participants to represent the student and community member populations, the random sampling procedure, nevertheless, was successful in expanding the participant group to include members who would not have volunteered to participate. A conclusion of the study is that a random sampling procedure can be an effective means of broadening the base of participants in an organizational self-renewal project.

Each of the phases and meetings of the project produced desired outcomes. It is a conclusion of this study that the design of the plan of this study was effective.

Participants shared their expectations during the project, and extreme ideas were compromised through consensus activities. It is a
major conclusion of this study that while a climate for change may be created by this plan, immediate and major change will not be induced since all participants have a voice in determining the school's purposes and goals. Change will be methodical and gradual as task groups carefully identify and diagnose problems before beginning to test action alternatives.

A final conclusion of this study is that the initiation of this plan in a school system is not without some risks. Administrators and board members who offer members of the school community an opportunity to judge the consequences of the practices of the school must recognize and accept the conclusions of the participants in the project. Behaviors of leaders in the school system may need to be changed as participants identify problems. School system personnel must be prepared to receive criticism and they must be prepared to modify their behavior to better meet the expressed expectations of the people that they serve. School leaders must be prepared for the project and individuals within the school to be misinterpreted and misunderstood. Some people will become very discouraged with either the slow or fast rate of change, which every way the people view the movement of the school toward meeting its newly formed goals. Participants working in an organizational self-renewal project will experience much resistance to change. This self-renewal plan was implemented successfully without a preliminary sociological study to help project leaders anticipate resistance.
The implementation of the plan of this study seemed to indicate that the following statement by Watson may be accurate:

During the life cycle of a typical innovation or change enterprise, perceived resistance moves through a cycle. In the early stage, when only a few pioneer thinkers take the reform seriously, resistance appears massive... In the second state, when the movement for change has begun to grow, the forces pro and con become identifiable. The opposition can be defined by its position in the social system, and its power can be appraised. Direct conflict and a showdown mark the third stage, as resistance becomes mobilized to crush the upstart proposal... The fourth stage, after the decisive battles, finds supporters of the change in power. The persisting resistance is, at this stage, seen as a stubborn, hidebound, cantankerous nuisance. Strategy in this fourth stage demands wisdom in dealing, not only with the overt opponents, but with the still dissonant elements within the majority which appears, on the whole, to have accepted the innovation... In a fifth stage, the old adversaries are as few, and as alienated, as were the advocates in the first stage. At each stage of the innovation, from its inception to its defense as status quo, wise strategy required perceptive analysis of the nature of the resistance. (Watson, 1969:11-12)

In Phase I of this study, people seemed to be rather entertained by the sharing of opinions and the first few meetings appeared to have a very casual climate. In Phase II when opinions and data were grouped, categorized, and labeled, main issues and conflicts began to appear. Opposing forces began to appear. In Phase III, there was direct conflict over the kind of instruction that should be part of the school system. Many people who had given their opinions earlier in the project dropped out of community meetings and may have been attempting to resist change by not attending the meetings. In Phase IV, a strong effort was made to encourage all participants to continue to support the project and to take part in the problem solving workshop. Advisory group members
who had emerged as leaders in the organizational self-renewal project considered ways of keeping the project moving and of dealing with the resistance of some people. In Phase V, the resistant people had dropped out or decided to work with other people in task groups. The members of the task groups began their move toward changing and improving the school system. (The evaluator's conclusions are included in the project evaluation report.) (DoBush, 1971: 159)

Recommendations

This study was supported by federal funds under Title III ESEA. The project was not funded until December of 1970, almost four months after the beginning of the 1970-1971 school year. The project did not begin until January of 1971, and this late start did not allow the completion of the project until the end of the school year. School board and mill levy elections were held before the project was completed. The project had not been in operation long enough before the mill levy election to be a significant influence on what issues were included in the mill levy or to influence the support of the mill levy. Recommendation: Any similar study should be started in the fall of the school year to allow completion of the project before mill levy elections are held and before school community members begin to become actively involved in spring and summer plans.

This study was conducted in a school system in which the superintendent was in his first year of the position. The superintendent did
not have an adequate opportunity to let community members become ac-
quainted with him and his plans before the organizational self-renewal project was initiated. Respect among administration, faculty, and community decreased. **Recommendation:** A replication of this project should not be conducted in a school system in which the superintendent is in his first year of the position. A superintendent who was well-known by a school community might better play a non-threatening and encouraging role. Too much change at one time should be avoided.

The plan of this study was implemented over a six-month period; post-testing was administered as task groups began their work. **Recommendation:** At least one year should be allotted for implementing and evaluating the first year of the initiation of the plan. The effort required to plan meetings and to collect, tabulate, and evaluate data to give back to groups to study is very time consuming, and at least six months should be allotted for the meetings themselves, and another six months for preliminary and post activities.

In the Three Forks Schools in the fall of 1970, students were actively involved in changing school policies before the community self-renewal project got underway. **Recommendation:** No school subgroup should plan school system changes without involving members of other subgroups in discussions of proposed changes. Students should cooperate with community members and faculty members in developing new school policies; if students are to be expected to take an active part in other self-renewal
activities of community meetings. No subgroup should be involved in self-renewal activities before other subgroups have the opportunity.

In this study, there was not significant change in the attitudes of non-participants as a result of their possible association with participants in the project. **Recommendation:** A careful study of the design of this study should be made to determine how modifications could be made, if at all, to better disseminate project information to non-participating community members so that attitude change in these groups might occur.

While random-sampling procedures used in this study did succeed in broadening the base of participants in the project, the random-sampling procedure was not successful in obtaining a random sample of participants who regularly attended meetings. **Recommendation:** More study of the procedure of random selection to increase participation of people in the project should be made.

The plan for initiating organizational self-renewal in a school system was reasonably successful in the Three Forks Schools. **Recommendation:** This study should be replicated in other schools of the same size as Three Forks, and then in schools of different sizes.

The evaluation of the success of the plan initiated in the Three Forks Schools was done during the first year of the use of the plan. Evaluation of a school system at a later time could show even more conclusive evidence on the value of an organizational self-renewal project.
Recommendation: A follow-up study should be conducted on the project in the Three Forks Schools during the second and third years of the application of the self-renewal process to determine longer term results; the Three Forks School Board should continue to endorse the project so that task groups may continually be formed to solve problems and improve the school system.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES AND SURVEY USED IN THIS STUDY
TO: All members of the community of the Three Forks School District  
RE: A Survey Beginning a Community Involvement Educational Project

Your school system would like your help. You can do your community a service by taking a few minutes to answer this important survey. As your new superintendent, I am very interested in improving the service the schools offer the total community. Your schools need to know how all people in the district feel about educational issues. Please mark this survey so that your school system may benefit from learning your opinions. A self-addressed and stamped envelope is provided for returning the completed survey. Community members, board members, faculty members, and students in grades seven through twelve will be asked to fill out the survey. No names are required at all. Please return the survey to the office of the school superintendent in the next two weeks. More information on this community involvement project may be found at the end of this survey. Thank you very much for participating.

Jack Kreitinger, Superintendent
EDUCATIONAL SURVEY CONCERNING YOU AND YOUR SCHOOLS IN THE PAST FEW YEARS

After reading each question, please place a CHECK MARK (√) on the line under the category that you think best indicates how you feel about the question. A space for comments on questions is provided at the end of this survey if you wish to make comments.

1. How much of an opportunity has the school system provided you to express your opinions and feelings on school issues and decisions in the past?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How satisfied have you been in the past with the amount of influence you have personally had in evaluating school programs, policies, and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How well do you know about the total program your school has offered in the past few years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In the future would you like to see more people in the community involved in evaluating school programs, policies, and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In the past how well do you feel the faculty, students, and people in the community worked together to improve their educational system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How well do you think the schools have satisfied the educational needs and interests of all of the people they have served?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How active do you feel that community members have been in developing goals that they felt the school should try to follow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In the past how much has the school system recognized, clarified, and offered for public discussion the important educational problems the school faced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How much do you feel that your school system is in need of improvement? (If you think change is needed, you may want to offer suggestions at the bottom of this page.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In the past how much do you feel there has been an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance among students, faculty members, community members, and administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How well do you feel that your school system has used the resources of its staff and community in the past to provide the school's educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. How satisfied have you been with the quality of instruction in your schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How well do you feel that the school's facilities and equipment have provided for the school's educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How well do you feel that your school board has served the best interests of the student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Would you be personally interested in spending about two hours each month during this winter discussing educational issues with other community members? (Meeting times and group membership would be determined by members of the groups.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO VOLUNTEER to be a group member, the school administration would like to be able to call you. Please write your name and phone number on the enclosed post card and mail it to the school separately. Please list below any educational issues that you think should have immediate attention:
PLEASE CHECK THE BLANKS BELOW BEFORE THE DESCRIPTION THAT APPLIES TO YOU:

Sex:
(1) ______ Male
(2) ______ Female

No. of years education you have completed:
(1) ______ 1-8
(2) ______ 9-10
(3) ______ 11-12
(4) ______ 13-16
(5) _____ More than 16

No. of years you have resided in this district:
(1) ______ Less than one year
(2) ______ 1-3
(3) ______ 4-10
(4) ______ 11 or more
(5) ______ 11 or more
(6) ______ 11 or more
(7) ______ 11 or more
(8) ______ 11 or more
(9) ______ 11 or more
(10) ______ 11 or more

Please feel free to make any additional comments here:

Thank you again for participating.

DATE __________________________

NAME __________________________

ADDRESS __________________________

INTERVIEWER:
The following is an example of the card returned to the school containing signatures of individuals interested in participating in the project:

(I) (We) would like to volunteer to be a group member to take part in discussions concerning educational issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phone
Read carefully each question. Decide how you feel about the question and choose an answer that best indicates your feeling. Answer all questions. Add comments if you wish to make any.

1 a. How much of an opportunity has the school system provided YOU to express YOUR opinions and feelings on school issues and decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 e. How satisfied have YOU been in the past with the amount of influence YOU have personally had in evaluating school programs, policies, and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Satis-</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Dis-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satis-</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>satis-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fied</td>
<td>Satis.</td>
<td>fied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 b. How much do YOU know about the total program YOUR school has offered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 c. How much should the people in the community be involved in evaluating and formulating school programs, policies, and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 d. How well do YOU feel the faculty and students in the community work together to improve their educational system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 d. How well do YOU feel the faculty and people in the community work together to improve their educational system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 d. How well do YOU feel the students and the people in the community work together to improve their educational system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 f. How well do YOU think YOUR schools have satisfied the educational needs and interests of all of the people they have served?

Very

Well

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

9 h. How active do YOU feel community members have been in developing goals that they felt the school should try to follow?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

10 g. How much has the school system recognized, clarified, and offered for public discussion the important educational problems the school faced?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

11 i. How much do YOU feel that YOUR school system is in need of improvement?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

12 j. How much of an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance is there among faculty members and students?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

13 j. How much of an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance is there among administration and faculty?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

14 j. How much of an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance is there among students and community?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little

15 j. How much of an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance is there among students and administration?

Very

Much

Moder-

Some-

Very

What

Little
16 j. How much of an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance is there among community members and faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 j. How much of an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance is there among administration and community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 k. How much do YOU feel that YOUR school system has used the resources of its staff and community in the past to provide the school's educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 l. How satisfied have YOU been with the quality of instruction in YOUR schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Dis-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Satis-</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 m. How much do YOU feel that the school's facilities and equipment have provided for the school's educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 n. How much do YOU feel that YOUR school board has served the best interests of the student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moder-</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>ately</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE CHECK THE BLANKS BELOW BEFORE THE DESCRIPTION THAT APPLY TO YOU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>31-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>41-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>61-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>71-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sex | Male | Female |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years education you have completed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years you have resided in this district:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please feel free to make any additional comments here:

Thank you again for participating.

DATE ____________________________

NAME ____________________________

ADDRESS _________________________

INTERVIEWER: ____________________
APPENDIX B

EVALUATOR'S CHECK OF THE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

OF THE PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE
The Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this study was a revision of a questionnaire written by the project director and was aimed at measuring changes of attitudes on the fourteen statements in Objective B in the description of the project, page 11. The questionnaire (Appendix A, page to ) was expanded to twenty-one questions covering all aspects of the statement (a) through (m).

Validation of Questionnaire

To validate the questionnaire, copies were given to five education doctoral students and a committee of five experts, all staff members, at Montana State University. The suggestions, corrections and recommendations were incorporated and the revised copies were then given to a graduate class of seventeen students for further refinement. The resulting and improved questionnaire was then reproduced for reliability testing.

Test of Questionnaire for Reliability

A graduate class responded to the questionnaire on January 7, and again on January 11. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was calculated using the raw score formula and found to be .85. The question of whether this was a sufficiently high reliability coefficient was researched.

Reliability coefficients determined by test-retest method are sometimes referred to as coefficients of stability according to Collins,
Johansen and Johnson. "Standardized achievement and intelligence tests frequently have reliability coefficients of .85 or higher, yet personality and interest inventories may have coefficients of less than .70." (Collins, Johansen and Johnson, 1969; p. 38) Thorndike confirms this when he says "a high school math test with a reliability coefficient of .80 would look unattractive — — — on the other hand a procedure for judging leadership that had a reliability of .60 might look very attractive." (Thorndike & Hagen, 1961; p. 186). Fox says, "if we move to the area of attitudes and interests, we know the data is more flexible and changeable, and so expectations for reliability must be adjusted down to where correlations in the .70's are accepted." (Fox, 1969; p. 362)

A review was made of comparable instruments in "scales for measurement of attitudes," by Shaw and Wright (1967). Reliability was listed as low as .54 (p. 80) and .6 (p. 70). Thorndike adds that, "a test with relatively low reliability will permit us to make useful studies of and draw accurate conclusions about groups, but relatively high reliability is required if we are to have precise information about individuals" (Thorndike & Hagen, 1961; p. 190).

The other question as Fox puts it, "How long is long enough for forgetting, but not so long for change?" (Fox, 1969; p. 354). It was found (in examples) that the time for test-retest varied from collecting one set of papers and handing out another test, to one year. It depends!
Shaw and Wright illustrate a variety. "The greater the time lapse the greater the possibility of lower stability coefficient," (Collins, Johansen & Johnson, 1969; p. 34).

Since the sample in the study included teaching staff, students, and community members, it was deemed advisable to check the reliability on a two-week time interval with groups resembling those in the sample. Accordingly, another graduate class composed mostly of educators was tested and retested within two weeks yielding an $r$ of .915, from an $N = 22$. Similarly, a high school group of students at White Sulphur Springs was tested and retested within two weeks yielding an $r$ of .826 from an $N = 21$. Locating an adult group proved more of a challenge. An extension class was located through a county agent. Thirty-five to forty rural people were anticipated with two meetings scheduled one week apart. It was decided to use them. Twenty-five out of thirty-two tested returns were useable. On the retest, only thirteen of the twenty-five were useable. With an $N = 13$, $r$ was calculated to .99.

It should be noted that the last group had one under age 40 and one over age 60. If we compare the three groups, high school students $r = .826$, graduate students (teachers) $r = .915$, and the extension class (community members ages 40 to 60) $r = .99$, it tends to confirm the theory that as we age we become more rigid and less flexible in our attitudes. (Gardner, 1965; p. 3) In any case, the reliability testing indicated that the questionnaire was in a suitable range of reliability.
APPENDIX C

PHASE MEETING AGENDAS WITH HANDOUTS AND EVALUATIONS
ATTENDANCE SHEET

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING PROJECT

Please let us know who attended this meeting.

Name _______________________

Please check the appropriate blank below:

1. _____ Volunteer Community Member
2. _____ Randomly Selected Community Member
3. _____ Volunteer Student
4. _____ Randomly Selected Student
5. _____ School Board Member
6. _____ Faculty Member
7. _____ Visitor (Thank you for attending. We would like to know who our visitors are.)

Check here if you are a visitor who would like to be a regular participant. __________

Thank you for coming.

Jack Kreitinger, Superintendent
JoAnn Finn, Project Secretary

Larry K. Bright, Project Director
Jack DoBush, Project Evaluator
VOLUNTEER COMMUNITY MEMBER MEETING AGENDA
January 28, 1971

1. 15 Minutes
   Introduction to the Need for the General Educational Questionnaire
   Administer General Educational Questionnaire

2. 5 Minutes
   Introductions by Jack Kreitinger, Superintendent
   Superintendent's Expectations of the Project
   Introduce Jack DoBush, Project Evaluator; JoAnn Finn, Project Secretary; Dr. Wm. Lassey, Guest Speaker; and Lindon Durham, School Board Chairman
   Lindon Durham, School Board Chairman, Comments on the Meaning of the Project

3. 10 Minutes
   Dr. William Lassey, Community Development Specialist, Montana State University
   Presentation: The Nature of Community Involvement and the Need for Including a Complete Cross-Section of People in the Project

4. 15 Minutes
   Larry Bright, Project Director
   Presentation: Results of the First General Educational Questionnaire Input—The meaning of organizational development. Mention the rationale for asking each question on the organizational development questionnaire

   Present sample pages from comments written on first questionnaire and present a sample of the treatment used on the breakdown of questionnaire results by groups

   Present comments on how the results of questionnaires and group meetings will be typed and shared in small group activities

   Present Outline of Project Phases
5. 10 Minutes
Jack DoBush and Larry Bright
Presentation: Method of Increasing Involvement of a Cross-
Section of People in the Project
Construction of Community Member List
Random Numbers Chart and How to Use It
Distributions of Different People in the Selected
Groups
Difficulties Encountered in Asking People Sampled to
Fill Out Questionnaire

6. 15 Minutes
Jack DoBush and Larry Bright
Present List of Community Members Randomly Selected to
Participate in Discussion Groups
Ask for community members at the meeting to go to see
individuals that they know who are on the lists.
During next week volunteers should try to enlist
the support of the people selected at random
Give people who volunteer to do this work a handout
describing the project and requesting that randomly
selected people participate in the project.

7. 35 Minutes
Small group activities as a sample of project process and to
help people get acquainted and begin to communicate

A. 3 Minutes
Introduction to the need for small group, rather than large
group, activities
Emphasis on the need to build communications channels

B. 10 Minutes
Get Acquainted Exercise. Comments on the Need for Positive
Feedback
Ask people to find two others that they don't already know well
and that they think they'd like to get acquainted with
People in trios facing each other TELL SOMETHING GOOD THAT
HAPPENED TO YOU IN SCHOOL. Trios share information

C. 10 Minutes
Building Trust
Trios continue telling SOMETHING THAT STANDS OUT IN YOUR MIND
AS SIGNIFICANT THAT HAPPENED TO YOU WHEN YOU WERE 7-15.
Trios share.
D. 10 Minutes
Share Feelings about Each Other
Trios write on index cards the names of the other two people in the group and WRITE WHAT YOU FEEL YOU SEE AS THE OTHER TWO PEOPLE'S STRENGTHS. Comment on how many positive things are never said.

E. 2 Minutes
Input—What happens in groups when there isn't closeness or trust. (Dr. Lassey)

8. 30 Minutes
Opportunity to Begin Education Needs Assessment
(Demonstrate the Use of Index Cards, NCR Paper, Newsprint, Brainstorming, and Sextets to Aid Discussions.)

A. 12 Minutes
Satisfactions with Educational System Now
On an index card individuals LIST FIVE THINGS ABOUT YOUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM THAT YOU ARE SATISFIED WITH NOW
Trios keep cards and find another sextet. Two trios (sextet) share ideas and combine them by writing them on NCR paper. Each sextet gives a copy of the list to the Title III secretary to include in a report on the outcome of the meeting.

B. 12 Minutes
Concerns about the Educational System Now
On an index card individuals LIST FIVE THINGS THAT YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT OR THAT YOU THINK YOUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM NEEDS
Sextets share information, record it combined on NCR paper and give secretary a copy, and then record the combined output of the sextet on newsprint
Sextets also put on one-half of the same piece of newsprint the "satisfactions" they produced in the previous discussion.
Sextets display the newsprint around the room by attaching the sheets to the walls with masking tape

C. 6 Minutes
General group members go around the room to read other sextet's outputs.

9. 5 Minutes
Setting Next Meeting Date
General Group Discussion of the best date and time for the next meeting. (Faculty felt that Monday, February 8, would be the best date.)
10. 5 Minutes
    Handout for community members to sign if they think they can be
    a regular participant in the project.

11. Refreshments
    Coffee
    Cookies
THREE FORKS SCHOOL DISTRICTS COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROJECT

Information You Might Like About Your Community Involvement Educational Project

Schools frequently suffer from a lack of community involvement in discussions about decisions to be made and evaluations of the school programs. Often only a small number of people make themselves heard. If an educational system is to be flexible and able to cope with a changing environment, it must have an open channel of communication with the people it serves. A school needs to be able to satisfy a maximum amount of the needs of its community. To do so, the school must know what all of the people want from the school and whether or not individuals feel they are getting what they want year by year. The school needs to know all of the opinions of the community members it serves, whether these opinions are in support or rejection of programs and policies. If the schools are to remain a local responsibility, they must have more involvement from the people they serve.

This year your School District, board and superintendent want very much for all members of the community to be part of what might be considered an educational "constitutional convention" for this school district. A strong effort will be made to involve all interested people in the district in discussions of what they expect of their school today, what they like and dislike about present education, and what changes, if any, they would like to see investigated. PEOPLE WHO DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL ARE ESPECIALLY URGED TO PARTICIPATE. THE SCHOOLS BELONG TO THE PEOPLE, AND THIS INCLUDES CITIZENS WHO AREN'T PARENTS. Community meetings for discussions of educational issues are planned soon. Mr. Larry Bright, who has been trained as an educational specialist, has been hired by your school board to conduct small group discussions about education over the next few months. In a community meeting to be announced soon you will be given an opportunity to volunteer to participate in group discussions of educational issues. A sequence of small and large group discussions is planned.

This community project is expected to develop the following things: (1) a democratically derived statement of community expectations of the school from which the staff may decide to make subject matter curriculum changes; (2) a brief philosophy of instruction for the school; (3) a recognition and clarification of educational problems facing the school; (4) a knowledge of community and school resources which can be used to help to alleviate problems; (5) a unification of
the community and school on general objectives all people have helped to develop; (6) an ongoing process of evaluation and development of the school; (7) a general atmosphere of free exchange of ideas and feelings among people who come to know and respect each other.

THE PROJECT HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO INCLUDE A VERY SPECIAL GROUP OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS WHO WERE SELECTED RANDOMLY FROM A COMPUTERIZED TABLE OF RANDOM NUMBERS. The names of all community members living in Three Forks, Logan, and Trident areas were put on a list in alphabetical order and then the names were numbered from one to 1058—the number of adults in the school districts. Thirty-six people were selected as a representative group of the school districts. These people are being respectfully asked to participate in the community-wide project to insure that the total community is represented. Volunteer community members who were not selected at random are also urged to participate if they want to.

IF YOU WERE SELECTED AT RANDOM TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROJECT, THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, SCHOOL BOARD, STUDENT BODY, FACULTY, AND ADMINISTRATION WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE YOU TO TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BECOME INVOLVED IN A MOST WORTHWHILE PROJECT—THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN. A meeting to begin the project should be held in the next week or so. The education-minded community member calling on randomly selected community members to ask their cooperation should be able to tell the date and time of the first meeting.

Thank you,

Larry Bright
Title III Project Director
1. Welcome

2. 5 Minutes
   Questionnaire Introductions
   Superintendent Jack Kreitinger speech
   School Board Chairman Lindon Durham speech

3. 10 Minutes
   Jack Kreitinger introduce Harold Rehmer, State Supervisor of
   Title III; Dr. Wm. Lassey; and participants by groups
   Harold Rehmer short speech

4. 15 Minutes
   Distribute participant name lists and project’s meaning
   A. 10 Minutes
      Horse Analogy Transparency step-by-step. Legs (school board),
      Body (students), head, eyes, neck (faculty and student body),
      missing element (rider – sense of direction).
   B. 5 Minutes
      Pass out steps of project – Goals of project and possible good
      as outcome.

5. 1 Hour 45 Minutes
   Getting acquainted. Ask people to find two others that they
don't already know well and that they think they'd like to
get acquainted with.

1a. 10 Minutes
   List three good things that you have heard recently about your
   school, youth, education, or people in general. After listing,
   share your list with other trio members.

1b. 12 Minutes
   Imagine a perfect day. Share with members of your trio where
   you would be, what the scenery would be like, what you would
   be doing, and what would be making you most happy.
1c. 8 Minutes
People have strengths that we pretty well take for granted. List for each person in your trio two things that you found as his or her strengths — assets that make him interesting, individual worth getting to know. Base comments on what you have learned in the last two discussions. Communication is best between people who try to find some good in others.

2a. 10 Minutes
List five good things that you would like to see come out of this community educational planning project drawing upon the ideas of faculty members, students, community members, and board members.

2b. 8 Minutes
List five risks a person (or a school) takes in getting involved in a community action project.

3a. 20 Minutes
If you were to plan an ideal school, what are ten most important necessities that you would have to have in your school?

3b. 15 Minutes
What are five or more things that you would definitely not want in your ideal school?

3c. 12 Minutes
What are five things that you think this school (or schools in general) need today, but don't have?

4a. 10 Minutes
List three or more things about education, instruction, this school, or other educational issues that you would like during this project to be better informed about.

After each sextet records on cards what they don't want, one individual of each group then records all comments of their group on newsprint. When completed, tape newsprint on the wall for others to read.

6. 15 Minutes
Planning for next meeting. Community members and school board at one end of the room with Larry Bright and Students and Faculty at the other end with Jack Kreitinger to set up next meeting date for each separate group. Meeting with the community to be Monday, February 15, 1971 at 7:00 PM in the High School cafeteria. Faculty and students to be one afternoon during the week of the 15th.
7. 5 Minutes
   Handout roll slips and evaluation sheets

8. Refreshments
   Coffee
   Cookies
Inherent in the philosophy of this broad goal-development project are the following assumptions on citizen rights:

**EACH CITIZEN SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO**

1. Influence Decision-Making  
2. Be Able to Contribute  
3. Be Different  
4. Be Wrong  
5. Be Heard  
6. His Own Dignity  
7. Share in Society's Burdens and Benefits

---

**PROPOSED STEPS IN THE PROJECT**

**Phase I: Identification and Clarification of Problems**

Administer questionnaires at the beginning of school and again just before the project starts. Give all people connected with the school a chance to write their concerns on questionnaires, even if these people may not participate in the action part of the project.

Conduct small group meetings for specific identification of areas to be developed and improved. Create communication lines among students, community members, faculty members, and school board members—some group meetings including all of these groups, and some meetings for single groups (except faculty alone) to allow time for groups to develop more specific and meaningful needs assessment.

Phase III: Listen to Outside Speakers ("Experts") Selected by Three Forks Educational Planning Committee Members — Members will have an opportunity during this part of the project to choose to hear speakers chosen to speak on issues the members feel they would like to be better informed about.


Phase V: Distribute Group Work Results to Community at Large for Criticism and Suggestions — Revise Work Where Feasible — Determine Time Sequences for Attacking and Solving Problems that can be Solved.

Phase VI: Determine the Influence of the Project on Improving Community-School Relations — Evaluate the Phases of the Project — Prepare a Brief Statement of the School's Educational Philosophy — Prepare Final Report Recommending the Direction that the Schools in this District Might Take in the Next Few Years to Better Satisfy the Expressed Needs of the School Community — Determine a Community Group that Could be Responsible for Initiating the Project Again in a Few Years.
Each meeting held as part of this project will be concluded with a request for suggestions from you for future meetings. Please feel free to make comments that could help make our community meetings more of a success.

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%) 1</td>
<td>(4.0%) 2</td>
<td>(20.2%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36.3%) 4</td>
<td>(39.5%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions:

2. How effective was Larry Bright as Director?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%) 1</td>
<td>(2.4%) 2</td>
<td>(16.9%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32.2%) 4</td>
<td>(48.4%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions:

3. How much did you enjoy the small group activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.6%) 1</td>
<td>(3.2%) 2</td>
<td>(20.2%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.4%) 4</td>
<td>(47.6%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

4. How well did your group work together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.8%) 1</td>
<td>(0.0%) 2</td>
<td>(12.1%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36.3%) 4</td>
<td>(50.8%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How much difficulty do you feel members of your group had in communicating?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(50.8%) 1</td>
<td>(21.0%) 2</td>
<td>(11.3%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.7%) 4</td>
<td>(3.2%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
6. How much do you feel that you had an opportunity to express your opinions during the meeting tonight?

Very Little (0.0%) 1  Very Much (58.9%) 5
Very Little (1.6%) 2  Very Much (25.8%) 4
Very Little (13.7%) 3

Any additional comments:

What was most helpful or interesting to you during this meeting? Is there anything you would especially like to do or see at our next meeting?

(No comments given)
ON-GOING PLANNING OF DESIGN SESSION

TITLE III ESEA PROJECT

DATE February 11, 1971
TIME 9:30 A.M. - 11:00 A.M.
PLACE Dr. Wm. Lassey's home
PRESENT Dr. Lassey, Larry Bright, Jack Kreitinger
Jack DoBush, absent

Items Discussed:

Community people to pass out things and pick them up.

Caution that project director should get help from others for administrative details. Pay students to set up chairs and make coffee.

Collate 24 pages of First Survey Community Questionnaire. Pass out toward end of meeting.

Ideal School and Don't Wants - Begin (Total 2½ hrs. - 20 minutes look - 10 minutes discuss and brainstorm.)

Cautioned to keep in proper respective rational and empirical and normative re-educative methods of bringing about organizational development. Unify before build.

Selected or Elected Planning Group (Election 2 per group). Planning committee to function in 2nd and 3rd years even if project director is gone. (Board selecting planning committee?)

Review of possible outcome of project:
First Year - Unification of school, community and establishment of priorities of investigation.
Second Year - Study of identified areas of concern and pilot projects.
Third Year - Implementation of broader ideas.

Few activities - no rush

Administrators concerns: Anxious to see development (in priority)
1) Consolidation with Willow Creek
2) Cooperative Education Program
3) Individualized Instruction
4) Improvement of Instruction

Communication training relevant to planning (educational philosophy exercise) Billings - rolls of group members (Win as much as you can for later meeting, also NASA)

Watch too much talk

Over-sample ten - telephone non-attenders. Use Board Chairman Lindon Durham to administer questionnaire.

Wives come and get involved as feedback device.

Administer questionnaires in office or at home.

Send cards to volunteers and selected reminding of meeting.

Involve participants in busy work - calling, passing out things, etc.

Call thesis chairman - anticipated schedule through August.

**Phase I - Needs assessment sharing**

**Meeting 1** February 8th  
Brainstorming - Ideal School

**Meeting 2** February 15th  
Sharing needs assessment - brainstorming communication building

**Meeting 3** Week of February 22nd thru 28th  
Share brainstorming on Ideal's from Meeting #2. Identify topics for more investigation (more communications training).

Clarification of problems

**Phase II**

**Meeting 4** Week of March 1st thru 5th  
Establish priorities for getting more information; Establish information gathering committees.

Systematic Analysis of problems

Taba higher level thought process.
Phase III

Meeting 5  Week of  March 8th thru 28th (3 weeks)
Information gathering groups planned in Phase II gather information.
Separate groups share information.
A community announced film or speaker selected by one of our group as information gathering proceeds.
Volunteer attendance.

Meeting 6  Weekend of March 27th
All four groups meet for general meeting for sharing gathered information (charette).

Phase IV

Meeting 7  March 29th thru April 9th
Total group - Modified RUPS workshop writing educational objectives input.

Meeting 8  Week of April 12th thru 16th
Total group - Educational Needs Assessment into goals - put into priorities. Write needs as educational objective.

Meeting 9  Week of April 19th thru 23rd
Force-field analysis of major goals or objectives.

Meeting 10  Week of April 26th thru 30th
Further force-field analysis and time chart for attacking goals.

Phase V

No meeting  Week of May 3rd thru 7th
Distribution of Planning Committee's work. Ask for any revisions.

Phase VI

Meeting 11  Week of May 3rd thru 7th
General meeting - Evaluation and plans for summer and fall on-going process. Revision and final report studied.
Phase VI - Continued

May 10th thru 21st

Gather information together. Submit project for re-funding.
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING PROJECT AGENDA
2/15/71 - Community Members - 7:00 P.M.
2/18/71 - Students--Faculty - 1:00 P.M.

1. 3 Minutes
   Welcome - Introductory topic: Study and Deepen Needs Assessment
   Introductions
   - Dr. Robert J. Thibeault, Department of Educational Services,
     Montana State University
   - Visitors and New Randomly-Selected Participants - Stand

2. 7 Minutes
   Preliminary Small Group Construction
   Transparency for Directions
   a. Get into a group of six people that you would like to get
      better acquainted with - preferably not with spouses or
      close friends.
   b. Send one of your sextet to the front table to pick up the
      following things for your group:
      1. 6 attendance sheets
      2. 6 addendums for names of project participants
      3. 6 pairs of NCR paper
      4. 6 ballpoint pens if you need them
      5. 2 sets of six note cards
      6. 1 masonite writing board for the NCR paper
      7. 1 set of six sets of material on Ideal School, Don't
         Wants, and Satisfactions and Concerns
         (VISITORS SHOULD PICK UP A SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT AND A
         LIST OF THE NAMES OF THE PARTICIPANTS DURING A CONVENIENT
         TIME LATER.)

   While attendance sheet is being completed, call for opinionnaires
   from participants who have them to turn in.

3. 45 Minutes
   Small Group Work
   Transparency for Directions
   a. Sextets take several minutes to study handout material
      on one topic included in comments made at previous
      meetings.
   b. As you read the comments, check or underline issues that
      you would like to discuss further.
   c. THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE ISSUES TONIGHT IS TO TRY TO
      UNDERSTAND WHAT EVERYONE IN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY THINKS
      AND TO ADD CLARIFICATION TO STATEMENTS. THE IMPORTANCE
      OF ISSUES ON A TOPIC WILL BE CONSIDERED AT LATER MEETINGS.
d. Give members of your sextet plenty of time to study comments.

e. DISCUSS THE COMMENTS BY ASKING:
   1. ARE THE IMPORTANT ISSUES INCLUDED? Add any satisfactions or concerns that are not included. Write additions on NCR paper.
   2. Have the needs of the school for the next several years been considered? Make additions on the NCR paper.
   3. TRY TO KEEP AWAY FROM DEBATING ISSUES. CONCENTRATE EFFORT ON LISTING ALL ISSUES THAT ARE NOT TO BE INCLUDED. LET THE COMMENTS ON THE PAPERS BE STIMULATION FOR COOPERATIVE THINKING.
   4. Make any additional comments on the NCR paper that you think should be included as results of this meeting and that should be included in information to be read by project participants.
   5. When your sextet feels that it has finished discussing a topic send a member of your group to the front table for another set of comments on a different topic.
   6. You probably won't finish all topics tonight. We will stop in about 45 minutes for a change of activity.

4. Remind people to get coffee when they want to, after 45 minutes.

5. 15 Minutes
   Paraphrasing Communications—Channels—Building Activity
   Have one member of each sextet get a set of six of the two paraphrasing handouts
   a. Read "Paraphrasing" to the group.
   b. Demonstrate the use of paraphrasing. Ask a volunteer to play the "Your tie is Terrible routine"
   c. Have participants read "Handling Misunderstandings"
      1. In trios — show transparency
         a. Practice paraphrasing with What Goals Could Come Out of This Project
         b. Risks an Individual or School Takes in a Project of This Type
      2. Refill on coffee and cookies

6. 45 Minutes
   More work on small group discussions as in 3.
7. **20 Minutes**  
Norms in Social Groups Activity  
Have one member of each sextet get handout sets on "Norms"  
Read the handout to participants as they follow along.  
Small groups of six should then discuss the answers to questions in the handout. (Transparency)  
  
How Does Discussion Get Started?  
What Does Your Group Do With Boredom?  
What Norms Are At Work in Your Group?  
Does Your Group Have a Norm of Involvement?  

8. **40 Minutes**  
Have a member of each sextet get a set of the remaining comments.  
Divide participants into discussion groups based on interest in particular topics. Show group a transparency of the topics.  

9. **5 Minutes**  
Plan Next Meeting Date  
Instruct participants to look over the remaining pages of comments before the next meeting and write additional comments in the margins.  
The next meeting will draw all the needs assessment and clarification of problems to a climax, and begin Phase III, looking at resources for explaining and helping to solve problems.
The following comments are samples of what project participants expressed as being their "Don't Wants;" "Ideal School;" and "Satisfactions and Concerns" in a school system. These comments have been broken down into seven categories as follows:

**DON'T WANTS**

**School Personnel**
- Lack of good administration
- Lack of full time counselors
- Tenure for teachers
- Administration-teacher conflicts
- Unqualified teachers

**Instructional Method & Evaluation**
- Inadequate teaching
- Courses chosen or eliminated without students opinions
- Students being pushed beyond their ability
- Too much academic competition
- Too much emphasis on grades

**The School's Educational Program**
- A school afraid to innovate or adopt to good new ideas & methods
- No abolishment of rating system, but perhaps modification
- An old outdated system
- Over-emphasize any phase of education
- Unflexible curriculum and policies

**School Policies, Rules, Student Behavior:**
- Dress code
- Inconsistency in enforcing of rules
- A student body, faculty, administration and community that lacks pride in their school and themselves
- Unbalanced discipline
- Drugs or narcotics
Don't Wants - Continued

Community, Administration, Faculty and Student Relationship

Lack of communication among teachers concerning homework
Poor communications between faculty, students, administration and community
 Favoritism shown to special students
A school that is not responsive to wants of communities
Don't want parents left out

Subject Matter Suggestions

Forced subject matter
Large classes and small choice of subjects
Uncontrolled sex education
Religion and politics
Hate to see concentration on science and technology, to the exclusion of humanities

Physical Education

Athletics at the expense of people's feeling. Boys who don't measure up as "heroes" shouldn't be hurt
Lack of athletic activities
Don't want too much pressure in sports
Less emphasis on sports
Over-emphasis in athletics

School Facilities & Services

Under-emphasis on hot lunch program
Poor equipment or buildings
Unsafe ground and equipment
Unkept or unclean school and grounds
Over-populated classrooms
IDEAL SCHOOL

School Personnel

Well qualified teachers, carefully screened and chosen
Full time counselor
Progressive school board – familiar with school situations, well-qualified better oriented
Guidance counselors at all levels
Supervisors for playground, P.E., Music, Art

Instructional Method & Evaluation

On-the-job training
Special education in lower grades
Educational specialist for each learning level
More thorough guidance program
More individual instruction

The School's Educational Program

Adult education
Larger college bound curriculum
Developed mental reading program
Testing program for child interests
Student work-study program

School Policies, Rules, Student Behavior

Student able to pursue their particular interest
Good discipline
Lack of respect (need more respect)
   a. Between teachers
   b. Between students
Student rules with guidance
Better cooperation concerning dress (grooming) of students between school and parents

Community, Faculty, Administration and Student Relationship

Some sort of parents organization – community interest
Teachers who really care about the students
Cooperation at all levels (students, faculty and community, families and home)
Student involvement
Improved relations with other schools
Subject Matter Suggestions

General

Complete program of skills & trade
Field trips and scientific excursions
Choices of curriculum to include more social, vocational training opportunities
Public speaking in High School
Trade or vocational schools after eighth grade

Languages

More teachers needed to teach languages
Languages in intermediate level
More foreign languages
Foreign language especially in lower grades

Art & Music

Complete program of music & art
Good band program & uniforms
Creative learning in music, art, drama
Arts and crafts
Better fine art program in all grades (including art, music and foreign language)

Physical Education

Better athletic program - more sports - more involvement
Good physical education program - varied both boys and girls
Wider field of sports for boys and girls (skiing, golf, swimming, tennis)
Good equipment for P.E. and playground
P.E. teachers for all grades

School Facilities & Services

Adequate equipment for teaching each subject or skill
New grade school with adequate heating and ventilating
Good lunch program - also free lunch
Good Library, lab., textbooks (more complete and up-to-date)
Excellent transportation
## SATISFACTIONS & CONCERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactions</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Improving teacher quality in some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board and superintendent</td>
<td>Up-date teachers to new changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved superintendent</td>
<td>Full time counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board progress last three years</td>
<td>Proper instructors (qualified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Method &amp; Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ideas of superintendent</td>
<td>Proper counseling to aid student in choosing curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive program for students</td>
<td>Better teaching of the total individual child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial reading program</td>
<td>More student help from teacher after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need full time counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aid for slow learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The School's Educational Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not over-crowded classrooms</td>
<td>Expanded Vo-Tech training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarged curriculum</td>
<td>Balanced activity for more students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New code book</td>
<td>Expanded courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory grading system</td>
<td>Stressing academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapy and majority of subjects</td>
<td>More money for state for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Policies, Rules, Student Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of students to speak to superintendent</td>
<td>Unsupervised study halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New policy (student freedom and responsibility)</td>
<td>More classroom discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good student council</td>
<td>Too much freedom during school hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student study area</td>
<td>No obscene language by any teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appearance of students showing no need of dress code</td>
<td>Teach manners and courtesy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfactions & Concerns - Continued

### Satisfactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, Administration, Faculty &amp; Student Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm community shows for school support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in new project being undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious striving for real mutual respect from teachers to students and students to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-teacher conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and student relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Concerns:

| More personal contact with grade school teachers         |
| Better correlated school activities                       |
| Closer co-ordination of student teachers with what is taught by regular teachers |
| Better communication between teachers and parents        |
| More school community related activities                  |

### Subject Matter Suggestions

#### General

| Satisfactory Vo-Ag. department                              |
|Science department                                          |
|Remedial reading and math classes                           |
|Driver's Ed course                                          |
|Good math program                                          |

| Early start of special-aid programs                       |
|Sex education                                              |
|More science lab equipment                                 |

#### Language

| Foreign languages and speech department - grades given - not just "pass" or "fail" |

| Bigger foreign language department                        |
|More foreign languages                                     |

#### Art & Music

| Developing interest in music department                    |
|Satisfactory music department                               |
|Good music program                                         |

| Better art program                                        |
|Need band uniforms                                         |
|Bring music down to lower grades                           |
|Need for more music equipment                              |
Satisfactions & Concerns - Continued

Satisfactions

Subject Matter Suggestions - Continued

Physical Education

Excellent sports program
Improvements in physical plant
Variety of sports encouraged
Drill team

Concerns

Closer sports supervision in
intramural sports
Better physical fitness pro-
gram, more equipment for
Tumbling, etc.
Better PE program and equip-
ment for all, especially
girls
Better PE program in lower
grades

School Facilities & Services

Books and equipment in good
condition
Good hot lunch program
Nice new building
Good janitorial service
Visual aid and library
system

Playground equipment (giant
strikes)
New grade school
Public kindergarten
Not enough food served to
students in lunch program
Each meeting held as part of this project will be concluded with a request for suggestions from you for future meetings. Please feel free to make comments that could help make our community meetings more of a success.

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (6.2%)</td>
<td>4 (25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>5 (34.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What could be done to make the meetings more effective? Sample of comments attached

3. How effective was the director of the meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>4 (35.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>5 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What could the director do (not do) to be more effective? Sample of comments attached

5. How well did your group work together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (4.7%)</td>
<td>4 (45.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>5 (68.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What (if any) problems did your group have? Sample of comments attached

7. How much do you feel that you had an opportunity to express your opinions during the meeting tonight?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>4 (54.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>5 (65.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
8. What was most helpful or interesting to you during this meeting?
   Sample of comments attached

9. Is there anything you would especially like to do or see at our next meeting?
   Sample of comments attached

Additional Comments:

Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

2/15/71

Question 2
   Limit meetings to three hours
   More time
   Very well run
   Smaller number of subjects to discuss at one time

Question 4
   Doing well
   More discussion time — less interruptions
   Start on time
   Shorten meetings

Question 6
   One person talk too much
   Not enough time to discuss
   Our group of six worked out quite well
   Everyone wanted to talk at once — not enough listening

Question 8
   Interchange of ideas
   The way people work together
   Opinions were expressed quite freely
   Opportunity to exchange and add ideas, learn new points of view

Question 9
   More people
   More of the same
   Less Management and more time
   Start weeding out some of the junk

Additional Comments
   It would help if all of the sheets of each topic were stapled together
   Not enough discussion time
Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

2/18/71

Question 2
Tried to cover too much
A whole discussion group
Have more different ages in groups
A one-hour general group discussion on conflicting items
Too many problems to discuss and not enough time to do a good job

Question 4
Basically outstanding - Quite a lot of paperwork
I thought he was very effective
Do not read in detail
Explain a little better
The director can't do it - the "audience" has to i.e., listen when being spoken to.

Question 6
Too much material to cover at once
Got off on tangents because of unsure objectives
Stayed too long on subjects
Varied on opinions or some statements
Arriving at specifics - time element

Question 8
Attitudes of others toward policies
Pointing out communication problems people have
Seeing how other people, especially other faculty members, felt about certain subjects
Chance to express opinions
Information gained on the project

Question 9
Shorter sessions
More ideas
More discussion
Let it be shorter. If you have to, have them more often, but shorter please.
A one-hour general group discussion on conflicting items

Additional Comments
It's easier to have a meeting if you can do it less concentrated - hours is too much at a time and everyone gets exhausted
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING MEETING AGENDA
March 1, 1971

1. 5 Minutes
   Transparency - Review steps of project
   Emphasize where we are at this meeting - end of Phase I
   Gathering of Information; Phase II Categorizing and
   Labeling (Hilda Taba Process). Emphasize Phase IV and
   NWREL involvement.

2. 5 Minutes
   Show slides of past meetings.
   Emphasize up-coming television coverage.

3. 2 Minutes
   Introduce section of program dealing with administrative
   speeches.
   Introduce Mr. Chester Schendel, Principal of the Elementary
   School.

4. 12 Minutes
   Address by Mr. Schendel on his point of view on educational
   planning.

5. 20 Minutes
   Address by Mr. Jack Kreitinger, Superintendent of Schools.
   Immediate and Long-Range Concerns of the Superintendent.

6. 5 Minutes
   Divide community group into seven sections. People closest
   to seven sets of newsprint will be asked to make semi-
   circles around one teacher per group.

7. 5 Minutes
   Have one member from each of the seven groups go to a front
   table and get the following sets of material: (Runner
   should count how many of each item he needs for his group.)
   1. Roll Sheets
   2. Additions to Needs Assessment
      Made by students, faculty, community members,
      and board members during the last two weeks
   3. Administrative Addresses - Summary of Concerns
   4. Report of School Board Comments
Agenda - Continued 2
March 1, 1971

5. Sets of materials already distributed. Runners should check to see how many people need materials already out:
   Ideal School
   Don't Wants
   Satisfactions and Concerns
   Survey Comments
6. Runners should check to see if anyone needs a ballpoint pen.

8. 10 Minutes
   Coffee - Girls serve trays of coffee to each of the seven groups. Remind people to get coffee when it is convenient throughout the rest of the meeting.

9. 5 Minutes
   Transparency - Give directions for CATEGORIZING AND LABELING (See outline prepared to give to seven faculty leaders.)
   Start with Ideal School
   Number comments
   Which go together?
   Put a capital letter in front of related comments
   Label comments - What can the grouped comments be called?
   Box labels in black
   Finish Ideal School, and move on to Don't Wants, Satisfactions and Concerns, Administrative Concerns, Board Report, and Survey Comments last. Number the lists as before by page. This time for each set of opinions after the IDEAL SCHOOL, only make checks before single comments to insure that all comments are combined in the identified issues. Make new groups and labels where necessary.
   Check for possible cross-labeling
   Identify Main Conflicts
   Identify Immediate Concerns by Boxing these issues in GREEN
   Identify Problem-Solving Issues by boxing them in RED
   Wait for other groups to finish

10. 90 Minutes
    Individual comments listed individually under the seven topics of gathered opinions should be categorized and labeled.
    Conflicts should be identified.
    Immediate and long-range issues should be identified.
    TOWARD THE END OF THIS ACTIVITY, PASS OUT A NOTE CARD TO EACH PERSON
11. 30 Minutes
   Individuals take a note card with them and go to view the
   issues identified by other six groups that they were not in.

12. 25 Minutes
   Individuals get into sextets to Discuss - WHAT DO WE NEED TO
   BE BETTER INFORMED ABOUT?
   Each sextet should be given a set of three notecards for re­
   cording sextet output to turn in.

13. 20 Minutes
   Advisory Committee Election - Individuals divide into faculty,
   students, community members and board groups and elect two
   people to an educational planning committee to help plan
   next meetings on information gathering, and to plan how to
   implement project plans during the next two years.

15. 10 Minutes
   Discuss next meeting date.
   Emphasize the film on Innovations in Montana. Education
   Evaluation of Meeting
Phase II - Categorizing and Labeling Data

The purpose of Phase II of the project is to categorize and label data obtained in the Phase I part of the project (Opinion-Gathering). A secondary purpose of Phase II is to begin drawing thoughts on educational issues away from the "evaluative judgment" stage to a serious "problem-solving" orientation. Issues of concern labeled in Phase II of the project will be divided into two groups as a whole - those that can be solved by immediate administrative action, and those that need to be developed through thorough study as problems to solve. In Phase III of the project, issues identified as needing careful study and discussion will be investigated (Phase III - Search for Additional Information). Long range problems will be studied and attacked in Phase IV (Problem-Solving Workshop). Someone from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland will assist us in Phase IV. In Phase V of the project we will begin the implementation of task force groups of people who work on specific problems. Individuals and groups will be asked to deal with aspects of identified problems, and these people will decide how long they expect to work on a problem before making a report to the community. In Phase VI of the project we will evaluate the effect of this year's work on community opinions about the school.

Implementation of developed ideas will proceed during the second and third years of the project when pilot programs or projects are tried. Of course, some of the recommendations developed this year in the project can be carried out immediately if they do not require long range planning.
Educational Planning Project - Continued 2

Faculty Leaders

School Personnel: Jack Heebner
Instructional Method & Evaluation: Bill Kober
School's Educational Program: Harriet Mjelde
School Policies, Rules, Student Behavior: May McLees
Community, Administration, Faculty & Student Relationship: John Chor
Subject Matter Suggestions: Dennis Hamilton
School Facilities & Services: Adolf Baluski

Categorizing & Labeling Issues - Steps for Each Group

1. Planning body will be divided into seven groups after Jack Kreitinger finishes speaking.

2. People will be divided so that some members of each of the four groups in the project will go into each of the seven work groups tonight.

3. People in your individual groups will need copies of the needs assessment (gathered opinions) given out to date. (Ideal School, Don't Wants, Satisfactions and Concerns, Survey Comments.)

4. One member of each of the seven groups will be asked to get copies of the latest reports to also include in group work tonight. (Additions to Opinions, Administrative Concerns, School Board Report.)

5. Each person will need a pen or pencil.

6. Each of you should have the following:
   2-black felt markers
   1-green felt marker
   1-red felt marker
   Several sheets of newsprint taped on the wall
   1-ballpoint pen
   1-set of gathered opinions
Categorizing & Labeling Issues - Steps for Each Group - Continued

7. Each faculty member should have his group get into a tight semicircle in front of the newsprint and himself.

8. Ask the group to turn to the IDEAL SCHOOL section of comments, and then tell them to find the appropriate page in the Ideal School that refers to your individual topic.

9. Ask the group to number in order the comments under your topic on the Ideal School pages.

10. Ask group to review the comments on this one page.

After the group has had a minute or two to look again at this set of comments, ask the following question:

11. WHICH OF THE COMMENTS SEEM TO GO TOGETHER? (Wait for someone to volunteer an answer)

12. When someone answers, let the group look for a minute at this combination and then write on the newsprint THE NUMBERS OF THE COMMENTS AND THE TOPICS OF THE COMMENTS.

13. Let the group check to see that these all fit. See if others fit. Seek consensus - that everyone understands the reason for the grouping and that everyone will support the decision. (Not all will agree sometimes, even if they will understand and support a decision.)

14. ABOVE THE CATEGORY, WRITE A LETTER, (A), (B), (C), ETC., TO IDENTIFY THE GROUP.

15. TELL THE GROUP TO PLACE AN "A" OR OTHER LETTER IN FRONT OF THE COMMENTS THAT SEEM TO GO TOGETHER ON THEIR OWN SHEETS. This is the way that the individuals can keep track of what comments are left to be categorized.

16. ASK THE GROUP TO GIVE THE CATEGORY A MEANINGFUL LABEL. WHAT CAN WE CALL THE CATEGORY TO IDENTIFY IT?

17. Write the labels after the letters above the list of grouped comments. USE THE BLACK FELT MARKER TO MAKE A BOX AROUND THE LABEL.
Categorizing & Labeling Issues - Steps for Each Group - Continued

18. Continue grouping and labeling all of the issues in the IDEAL SCHOOL list - ONLY.

19. Have group turn to DON'T WANTS, SATISFACTIONS AND CONCERNS, ADDITIONS, ADMINISTRATOR CONCERNS, BOARD CONCERNS, AND SURVEY COMMENTS next, and probably in this order. (Leave the survey comments until last.) Number the comments and THIS TIME ONLY MAKE CHECKS BEFORE COMMENTS TO INSURE THAT THEY ARE INCLUDED IN PREVIOUS GROUPS. MAKE NEW GROUPS AND LABELS WHERE NECESSARY.

20. CHECK OCCASIONALLY TO SEE IF SOME ITEMS SHOULD BE CROSS-LABELED. Some comments may need to be grouped in several categories. Some categories may need to be grouped together. Cross-out freely.

21. When labeling is finished, ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE SET OF NEWSPRINT WRITE "MAIN CONFLICTS OF INTEREST." Ask group to decide WHICH ISSUES SEEM TO HAVE MOST DISAGREEMENT SURROUNDING THEM? Which issues do people seem not to agree on?

In this project, the presence of conflict is expected to be viewed as a need for more communication, rather than a symptom of communication breakdown. We will try to discuss issues of conflict during Phase III of the project to allow people a chance to better understand various aspects of issues. Consensus doesn't imply agreement as much as it implies support because of understanding.

22. END LABELING PROCESS BY ASKING GROUP TO CONSIDER WHICH ISSUES FALL INTO IMMEDIATE MATTERS THAT CAN BE SOLVED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OR A RAISE IN FUNDS, AND WHICH ISSUES NEED TO BE CONSIDERED AS A PROBLEM TO BE STUDIED, ANALYZED, AND TACKLED OVER A PERIOD OF TIME.

Around the black boxes already put around labels, MAKE A GREEN BOX FOR ISSUES THAT CAN BE SOLVED IMMEDIATELY OR WITH ADMINISTRATIVE OR FINANCIAL ACTION.

MAKE A RED BOX AROUND ISSUES THAT REQUIRE A PROBLEM-SOLVING APPROACH.
If your group finishes before other groups, tell the group to stay because we need to determine an eight-member committee to act in an advisory capacity to insure that information desired is presented and to see that the project outcomes are carried through.

Tell group to get coffee and to sit in on other working groups until everyone is finished. People will probably want to read through some of the comments on topics that your work group has not covered.

Summary of Steps

Start with Ideal School
Number comments
Ask which go together
Use letters to categorize related comments
Label comments, checking for cross-labeling; Box labels in Black
List issues of conflict of interest
Box issues of Immediate Action in GREEN
Box issues of Problem-Solving Nature in RED
Wait for other groups to finish
FIFTEEN ISSUES

1. Better Financing
2. Need for Vo-Tech Education
3. Expanded Progress to Meet Individual Learning Needs & Interests
4. Improved School-Community-Board Relationship
5. Up-To-Date buildings, facilities & equipment
6. Emphasis on Primary Grades – Good Start at Kindergarten
7. Adult Education Needs
8. Student Freedom & Responsibility
9. Decide Who Teaches Values
10. Broader P.E. Program
11. Maintain a Good Staff
12. Clarify Teacher Duties, Prerogatives & Respect
14. Investigate Usefulness of Tenure
15. Investigate Consolidation
Following are samples of comments made by the Administration:

CONCERNS (IMMEDIATE)

School Personnel

Need for a High School Principal in the High School
Need for a full time guidance counselor — grades 1-12
Need for more secretarial service in High School and
Elementary
Need for more janitors — better maintenance service
Need for teachers to be receptive and perceptive of
childrens feelings and not so problem oriented

Instructional Method & Evaluation

Concern for individuality of students and teachers
Does punishment motivate
How meaningful are grades as a measure of skill
Concerns about lock step vs: non-graded school "Issue"
Factors:
  Facilities needed
  Personnel needed
  Attitudes involved
  Can a small school have a good individualized
  program
  What does research say on non-graded schools
We need an information specialist on the topic
How much is frustration related to learning

School's Educational Program

Need for a coop-education program for the Three Forks
High School
Education should be for all — is it today
Do we teach for college bound only, or for preparation
for life
What is our philosophy? What should it be?

(Continued on next page)
Concerns (Immediate) - Continued

School Policies, Rules, Student Behavior

State Department regulations
Accrediting Association problems

Community, Administration, Faculty & Student Relationship

Lack of time to involve people in budget planning for next year

School Facilities & Services

Need for more janitors - better maintenance service
Need for public support and involvement to insure that the project is successfully completed

CONCERNS (LONG RANGE) - NEEDING PROBLEM-SOLVING APPROACH

Instructional Method & Evaluation

Need for a comprehensive study and plan for the implementation of a non-graded individualized continuous progress elementary school
Need for comprehensive study and plans for the implementation of an individualized program for the High School
Pass-Fail: When to - Should We - All subjects if fail one
Concern for individuality of students and teachers
How meaningful are grades as a measure of skill

School's Educational Program

Do we teach for college bound only, or for preparation for life
What is our philosophy? What should it be?
Concern for individuality of students and teachers
Need for a comprehensive study and plan for the implementation of a non-graded individualized continuous progress elementary school
Need for comprehensive study and plan for the implementation of an individualized program for the high school

(Continued on next page)
Concerns (Long Range) - Continued

Community, Administration, Faculty & Student Relationship

Consolidation - Financial censor

Subject Matter Suggestions

Four year English requirement

School Facilities & Services

Need for a community formed Philosophy of Education to guide the administration and faculty
Need for a comprehensive study and plan leading to consolidation of school districts to provide the size and financial base to make implementation of ideas possible
Need for a continuous planning group to help keep the public involved and informed
Need to be sure that our project needs assessment covers all topics of concern in our educational system
ADDENDUM COMMENTS

Following is a sample of comments included in an Addendum made by the community, faculty, students and school board broken down into Don't Wants and Wants.

DON'T WANTS

WANTS

School Personnel

Dismissal of teacher without stated reason
Lack of communication of educational and school policies and goals
Discourtesy to school personnel
Discouraged teachers due to lack of adequate salaries
Teachers who play favorites & ignoring some students

Progressive school board familiar with the total school program
Guidance counselor who is involved with students at regular intervals (at least twice a year)
Should have outstanding teachers in every grade
Trained supervisors (hired) for playground and PE - not teachers for playground supervisions - PE teachers for lower elementary classes
Better relationships with the school board - don't even know who is on it and what they do (student representatives to the school board)

Instructional Method & Evaluation

No "only passing or failing graded system"
Inadequate learning situations
Teachers as supreme beings
Should not be academic competition
Don't want the lack of the following: Discipline, Teacher authority, Grade competition, Challenging students to their ability, central authority

Group classes by ability's level
No interruptions during classes
Teachers know activities in advance
Teaching aids to provide additional help to teachers and students both
More individualized instruction for "fast" students and for slower learners
Addendum Comments – Continued

**DON'T WANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The School's Educational Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four years of English required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-emphasis on 6 weeks and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semester tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't eliminate present grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system until come up with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No speech therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No code book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis on phonics and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education during summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects that will help you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More subjects to choose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Policies, Rules, Student Behavior**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not over-crowded classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't need dress code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want supervised study halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule saying teacher must live in town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency in enforcing of rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want town children to be able to eat hot lunch at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher available during study hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Kindergarten Report cards for grades one through nine every six weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community, Administration, Faculty & Student Relationship**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No church and school related activities (unconstitutional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninformed parents taking part in school policy making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much favoritism to special students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want parents left out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against consolidating smaller schools into one - transportation problem - Communication, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want a PTA meeting but make sure students are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community should respect the student body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better correlation between student teachers &amp; regular teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication among teachers about homework (lots some nights, none the next)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved relations with other schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addendum Comments - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T WANTS</th>
<th>WANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Matter Suggestions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some courses should not be forced upon some kids that aren't planning in that field</td>
<td>Sex education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want high school a 5-yr. course</td>
<td>Classes taught in small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 4-yr. of English</td>
<td>More field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion or politics in school</td>
<td>Better speech &amp; drama classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More student-community-teacher programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Languages</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More foreign language</td>
<td>Develop interest in music department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 3 foreign languages</td>
<td>Need art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language in lower grades</td>
<td>Need better organized place for band class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More art and maybe photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-emphasized athletic department (in wrong areas)</td>
<td>Need more variety of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective PE program</td>
<td>More PE and gym equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No grading in PE</td>
<td>Wrestling in Jr. &amp; Sr. high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So much basketball</td>
<td>We would like to see a broader athletic program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entry requirement for drill team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Facilities &amp; Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclean school grounds</td>
<td>Manage quantity of helpings in lunchroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate janitorial services in elementary school</td>
<td>Need landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up-to-date fire safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffed complete central library in elementary school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL BOARD COMMENTS

Following are samples of comments made by School Board members:

DON'T WANTS       WANTS

School Personnel

Lack of dedication among some teachers and the attitude that teaching is just another job
I'm concerned about wage scale and about teacher's unions
Superintendent that they can't come in to and discuss plans and problems in school

Strong administrators
Good Faculty
Trustees with consideration for what's best for kids, education-wise
Superintendent that demands and gets from his students
Good school board

Instructional Method and Evaluation

Too much emphasis placed on college degrees when children are not capable
Not enough individual instruction in the school
Not enough guidance
Lack of concern for pupils to be able to progress as individuals
There is not enough creative freedom in our classrooms

Excellent learning methods, especially in reading
Latest teaching devices, visual aids, etc.
Modern methods
Small number of students in each room
A program that will prevent the labeling of students as failures

The Educational Program

Experimenting on new methods; I'm afraid of sex education
Not enough individual instruction in our school
All children not made able to assume an adult role in the future

Good balance among subjects, music, art and athletics
Curriculum which gives required courses for college
Money to operate on
Program that keeps abreast of the times
School Board Comments - Continued

DON'T WANTS   WANTS

The Educational Program - Continued

Students not being made able to progress at Students are prepared for college or vocation
their own rates
Too many compulsory courses which are not meant for everyone. This may hinder pupil's intellectual growth

School Policies, Rules and Student Behavior

Concerned about discipline; some parents do not want their kids to be strictly disciplined in school
Concerned that children who do not want to attend school are forced to do so
Concerned about how students will react with freedom that is given them. We need good guidance with students in all their work in high school
Supervision at all times, including playground
Good discipline
The privilege of the student to voice his opinion
Impartiality among students, no preference to student because of athletic ability
Cleanliness and orderliness

Community, Faculty, Student Relationships

Concerned that so many parents don't have respect for teachers therefore, how can the children respect the teachers
We don't want the superintendent to rarely meet with the teachers
Too many school disorders given too much publicity
Concerned about parent-teacher relationships
Good relationship between students and teachers
Association among parents, faculty, and students
Cooperation of community
Good board and administration relationship
Good public relations with board, teachers, and administration
School Board Comments - Continued

DON'T WANTS                          WANTS

Subject Matter Suggestions

Concerned why we can’t
have more than one
foreign language taught
in our school. It is
my understanding that
this is essential for
college entrance

Concerned that typing
isn’t offered to
freshmen and sophomore
students

Concerned about the contro­
versy on sex education

Concerned that each child
receives the best train­
ing in reading— the
basis of all school work

School Facilities and Services

( None listed in this category) Comfortable classrooms, making
ideal working conditions
Central library
Good media center and physical
plant
Good hot lunch program
Gleaming windows
Nice clean facilities
COMMUNITY MEETING EVALUATION
March 1, 1971

N = 114

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

Very Little \hspace{1cm} Very Much
(6.1\%) 1 \hspace{0.5cm} (10.5\%) 2 \hspace{0.5cm} (30.7\%) 3 \hspace{0.5cm} (34.2\%) 4 \hspace{0.5cm} (18.4\%) 5

2. What could have been done to make the meeting more effective?

Sample of comments attached

3. How effective was the director of the meeting?

Very Little \hspace{1cm} Very Much
(4.4\%) 1 \hspace{0.5cm} (6.2\%) 2 \hspace{0.5cm} (30.1\%) 3 \hspace{0.5cm} (32.7\%) 4 \hspace{0.5cm} (26.5\%) 5

4. What could the director have done (or not done) to be more effective?

Sample of comments attached

5. How serious did the groups that you were in seem to be in trying to do a good job of accomplishing suggested tasks?

Very Little \hspace{1cm} Very Much
(0.0\%) 1 \hspace{0.5cm} (9.7\%) 2 \hspace{0.5cm} (15.9\%) 3 \hspace{0.5cm} (29.2\%) 4 \hspace{0.5cm} (45.1\%) 5

6. What (if any) problems did groups you were in have?

Sample of comments attached

PHASE I OF THIS PROJECT WAS AIMED AT GATHERING AS MANY OPINIONS OF SCHOOL COMMUNITY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE. Surveys and meetings to date have all been part of Phase I.

7. How effective do you feel that Phase I (Gathering of Opinions) has been?

Very Little \hspace{1cm} Very Much
(1.8\%) 1 \hspace{0.5cm} (4.5\%) 2 \hspace{0.5cm} (2.0\%) 3 \hspace{0.5cm} (36.0\%) 4 \hspace{0.5cm} (36.9\%) 5

(Continued on next page)
8. How could the opinion-gathering of Phase I have been more effective? 

Sample of comments attached

9. How much do you feel that you have had during Phase I, an opportunity to register your opinions for the school community to recognize? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3.6%) 1</td>
<td>(7.3%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.8%) 3</td>
<td>(29.1%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.2%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How much do you feel that the opinions gathered in Phase I of the project do represent those of the people in the Three Forks Districts? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.9%) 1</td>
<td>(6.7%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.2%) 3</td>
<td>(43.3%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.9%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHASE II OF THE PROJECT WAS TO CATEGORIZE AND LABEL GATHERED OPINIONS SO THAT MAIN ISSUES AND CONFLICTS COULD BE IDENTIFIED.

11. How effective was this categorizing and labeling phase? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5.5%) 1</td>
<td>(11.0%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36.7%) 3</td>
<td>(20.0%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.0%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

Question 2
Clearer understanding of purpose
Group may be too large
Know a little more what to do
Less cramming of all categories into too little time

Question 4
Been more directive
A little slower and clearer instructions
Could have given more ideas on labeling, etc.
Could have spoken louder
My group was too large - difficult to hear
Sample of responses – continued

Question 6
  The hardest was in arriving at a suitable topic lead
  Trying to list subject in such a broad way
  Too much debate, some didn't participate
  Getting total involvement
  Agreeing where to categorize a few of the subjects

Question 8
  Review of things possible missed
  I think it has been very good
  More grouping of subjects to start with
  Consolidate opinions sooner
  More time for discussion
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING MEETING AGENDA
March 8, 1971

1. 5 Minutes
   Introductory Comments
   Refer to Newsprint Display
   Make point that advisory committee will present results of
   last Thursday's meeting, and that the large community
   meetings supplied the basic issues for the committee to
   work with. The committee drew together the community's
   work.

2. 7 Minutes
   Miss Kathy Tribble, student
   Distribute three-page handout of results of March 1 community
   meeting
   Kathy will explain the organization of the sheets. She will
   COMMENT ON HER CONCERN ABOUT THE LACK OF STUDENT INVOLVE­
   MENT IN THE PROJECT

3. 12 Minutes
   Mrs. Loretta Tribble, Community Member
   Distribute Advisory Group Combination of Phase II Labels
   Mrs. Tribble will discuss meaning of main issues and what
   generally the advisory group meeting of last Thursday in­
   volved.
   Transparency on division of labels.

4. 3 Minutes
   Mr. George Ballard, Community Member
   Present to group the idea that the committee will seek unbiased
   speakers who are down-to-earth. Mr. Ballard will stress
   the fact that we do need good outside speakers and that
   community members should tell the advisory committee of
   speakers they wish to hear.

5. 105 Minutes
   PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION ACTIVITY
   Introduction: Stress the need for creating mutual understand­
   ing among people by building understanding of points of
   view governing peoples' statements and actions.

   25 Minutes - Distribute philosophy questionnaire and give di­
   rections. Have people get into sextets and then into 12's.
   Send a runner for twelve questionnaires.
Educational Planning Meeting Agenda - Continued
March 8, 1971

10 Minutes - Distribute key to philosophy test and explain its use. Distribute tally sheets for recording results of test. (Have Title III secretary tally total results.)

15 Minutes - Distribute note cards (two each) and have people write answers to four questions: 1) Purpose of Education; 2) Teacher's job; 3) Best way to teach; 4) Most important subjects.

30 Minutes - Presentation of Philosophy of Education chart. 
Distribute chart to group.
In sextets discuss material presented on transparency.

20 Minutes - Discuss how the statements on your notecards (made before) reflect different philosophies.
Discuss what individuals with each of the five philosophies would consider THE MOST IMPORTANT OUTCOME OF EDUCATION.
Discuss the influence people with the different points-of-view would have on educational planning.

5 Minutes - Large Group - Present tally of philosophy test results and discuss briefly.

6. 30 Minutes
Colored Film: "Innovative Teaching in Montana"

7. 20 Minutes
Sextet Discussion of Film: From transparency
Discuss what you saw in the film that was unusual
Discuss how ideas presented in the film might be used to help us meet some of our needs

8. 15 Minutes
When you have finished, list on one of your notecards anything on which you would like more information presented.
When each member of your sextet is finished, combine your lists on one card to give to the advisory committee.

9. 10 Minutes
Distribute evaluation of meeting sheets.

10. 5 Minutes
Determine if next Monday, March 15, at 7:00 P.M. is a good meeting time for the next information presentation meeting.

11. Ask Advisory Committee to meet to plan agenda for next meeting.
FUNCTIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Help the project director see that community interests are taken into consideration in the planning of agendas at community meetings. Help decide when meetings should be held.

2. Help to see that plans developed in community meetings are carried out by work groups of community members.

3. Function as a committee to draw together information, plans, and materials prepared by community effort.

4. Help to give to the community at large the results of planning efforts.

5. Keep a balance in the presentations made by speakers during parts of the project which require outside or local speakers. See that all sides of issues are presented.

6. Coordinate activities of the project to be able to bring all planning work together.

7. Become very familiar with processes and materials of the project so that the group can be responsible for directing the project again, when the need arises in five or six years.

8. Be responsible for helping task groups of community people get a good opportunity to get their work done as scheduled.

9. Be a sounding board for community members who wish to make suggestions about project management.

IN NO WAY IS THE ADVISORY GROUP A DECISION-MAKING BODY. IT IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF COORDINATING WORK AND SHARING LEADERSHIP OF THE PROJECT. IT IS TO SEE THAT THE PROJECT IS PRODUCTIVE AND MEANINGFUL.

The advisory committee members should be contacted by community members wishing to suggest items for meeting agendas.

ALL COMMUNITY MEMBERS MUST TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR COOPERATIVE DECISION-MAKING.
Advisory Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Members</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Loretta Tribble</td>
<td>Neal Sorenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. George Ballard</td>
<td>Lynn Emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Ad Russell</td>
<td>Lester Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Charles Heath</td>
<td>Kathy Tribble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa Ballard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. JoAnne Oliver</td>
<td>Mrs. Dai Lukkason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Kober</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN OPINIONS GATHERED IN THE PROJECT
LABELS OF CATEGORIES – PHASE II

The following issues for action were produced by school community members on March 1. Groups categorized opinions obtained in the project. Then categories were labeled to identify the issues in the collected material. Groups identified some issues as being ready for action without further study, (Ready for Action). Other issues were identified as needing a studied, problem-solving approach, (Need Problem-Solving Approach) since these issues need clarification and more understanding before decisions can be made. Some issues were also identified as being the center of differences of opinion, (Main Conflicts of Interest) and also needing further clarification and discussion. Problem-solving issues and conflict issues will be studied and discussed Phase III of the Project. In Phase IV, the problem-solving stage, issues that required more study will be attacked for action in a problem-solving process developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland. This educational laboratory will help us begin a plan of action in Phase IV.

School Personnel

Ready for Action

1. Qualified Superintendent
2. Teachers – excellent
3. Adequate teachers salary
4. Full-time Professional Counselor
5. Hired Non-Professional help aides & Supervisor

Need Problem-Solving Approach

6. Dedicated School Board
7. Student-Teacher Ratio
8. Tenure

Main Conflicts of Interest

9. More personal contact with teachers
10. Teacher-student relationship
11. Teacher-parent relationship
12. Consolidation
13. Parent-Administration relationship
14. Administration-teacher relationship
Issues Identified in Opinions - Continued 2

Instructional Methods & Evaluation

Ready for Action

15. Teacher ability
16. Greater use of special resources and aids
17. Great emphasis on proper start in first grade
18. Adequate counseling

Need Problem-Solving Approach

19. Grading evaluation
20. More attention to individual needs and abilities
21. Parliamentary procedure (recognition of every student)

Main Conflicts of Interest

22. Individualized instruction
23. Student voice in subject material
24. Student freedom (define)

The School's Educational Program

Ready for Action

25. More funding
26. Vocationally oriented program
27. Expanded curriculum
28. Adult Education
29. Total individual student involvement in the educational program
30. Graded or non-graded
31. Special services to aid in the student growth
32. Effective scheduling
33. Well planned physical plant
34. Improved teaching methods

Need Problem-Solving Approach

35. Funds available for department needs
36. Unlimited Vo-tech facilities
37. Student work-study program
38. Unlimited vocational opportunities
Issues Identified in Opinions – Continued

The School's Educational Program – Continued

Need Problem-Solving Approach – Continued

39. More technical type programming – elementary and secondary
40. Individualized program
41. Adult education
42. Adult education (involve local talents)

Main Conflicts of Interest

43. No segregated classes
44. Graded or non-graded (levels of ability)
45. Required courses
46. Who teaches values – parents or teachers? Scapegoating

School Policies, Rules & Student Behavior

Ready for Action

47. Government and personal integrity
48. Teacher duties and prerogatives
49. Classroom issues

Need Problem-Solving Approach

50. Achieving student individual goals

Main Conflicts of Interest

51. Adequate finances
52. Student freedom vs discipline
53. Motivation of students

Subject Matter Suggestions

Ready for Action

54. Broader vocational training in school and distributive
55. More foreign languages – at all levels of school
56. Complete program arts & crafts – 1 thru 12
57. Better equipment – broader music program 1-12
Subject Matter Suggestions - Continued

Ready for Action - Continued

58. Broader PE program and more teachers - all grades
59. Wide range of individual sports - both competitive and non-competitive
60. No large classes
61. Need for remedial maths and reading program - all grades

Need Problem-Solving Approach

62. Health and sex education
63. Full physical science program
64. No religion and politics in school
65. No exclusion of humanities
66. Don't want 4-years required English
67. Fewer compulsory courses - Jr. & Sr.

Main Conflicts of Interest

None

Community, Administration, Faculty & Student Relationship

Ready for Action

68. Community interest
69. Good faculty, administration relationship

Need Problem-Solving Approach

70. Sharing resources - consolidation and make one good school for all
71. More emphasis on grade school
72. More specialized instruction

Main Conflicts of Interest

73. More personal contact with grade school teachers
74. Closer coordination of student teachers by regular teachers
75. Better correlated school activities with church activities
Community, Administration, Faculty & Student Relationship - Continued

Main Conflicts of Interest - Continued

76. Lack of communication among teachers concerning homework
77. Familiarity between students and faculty

School Facilities & Services

Ready for Action

78. Safe transportation
79. Lounge facilities
80. Cafeteria
81. Landscaping

Need Problem-Solving Approach

82. Better up-to-date facilities
83. All inclusive PE program
84. Modern teaching and learning equipment
85. Public school kindergarten

Main Conflicts of Interest

86. Investigate the use of teaching aids
### PHASE II - LABELS COMBINED INTO PROBLEM-SOLVING ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R - Ready for Action</th>
<th>P - Need Problem Solving Approach</th>
<th>C - Conflicts</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong> - The Educational Method &amp; Personnel Evaluation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-22 - More Funding</td>
<td>R-33 - Well planned Phys. Plnt.</td>
<td>P-35 - Funds for Dept. needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Better Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase II - Labels Combined Into Problem-Solving Issues - Continued 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Personnel</th>
<th>Instructional Method &amp; Evaluation</th>
<th>The Educational Program</th>
<th>School Policies, Rules &amp; Student Behavior</th>
<th>Community-Faculty &amp; Student Relationships</th>
<th>Subject Matter Suggestions &amp; Services</th>
<th>School Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-49-Class room Iss. P-50-Indv. student goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-49-Class room Iss. R-51-Graded or non-graded levels

R-49-Class room Iss. R-49-Class room Iss. R-49-Class room Iss.

R-55-More room Iss. foreign languages R-55-More room Iss. foreign languages R-55-More room Iss. foreign languages

R-50-Indv. student goals R-50-Indv. student goals R-50-Indv. student goals


P-82-Better up-to-date facilities P-82-Better up-to-date facilities P-82-Better up-to-date facilities

P-83-All incl. PE Program P-83-All incl. PE Program P-83-All incl. PE Program

P-84-Modrn Teach. & learning equip. P-84-Modrn Teach. & learning equip. P-84-Modrn Teach. & learning equip.

R-59-Wide Freedom R-59-Wide Freedom R-59-Wide Freedom

R-60-Graded range of indiv. levels R-60-Graded range of indiv. levels R-60-Graded range of indiv. levels

R-61-Need for remedial math & reading R-61-Need for remedial math & reading R-61-Need for remedial math & reading


R-57-Expanded Program to meet Individ. learning needs & interests R-57-Expanded Program to meet Individ. learning needs & interests R-57-Expanded Program to meet Individ. learning needs & interests

R-56-Comp. Prog. Arts & Crafts 1-12 R-56-Comp. Prog. Arts & Crafts 1-12 R-56-Comp. Prog. Arts & Crafts 1-12


R-43-Contact R-9-Contact R-43-Contact R-9-Contact R-43-Contact R-9-Contact R-43-Contact R-9-Contact


R-38-Contact R-28-Contact C-28-Contact R-38-Contact R-28-Contact C-28-Contact R-38-Contact R-28-Contact C-28-Contact


R-34-Contact R-24-Contact C-24-Contact R-34-Contact R-24-Contact C-24-Contact R-34-Contact R-24-Contact C-24-Contact


R-30-Contact R-20-Contact C-20-Contact R-30-Contact R-20-Contact C-20-Contact R-30-Contact R-20-Contact C-20-Contact


R-26-Contact R-16-Contact C-16-Contact R-26-Contact R-16-Contact C-16-Contact R-26-Contact R-16-Contact C-16-Contact


R-22-Contact R-12-Contact C-12-Contact R-22-Contact R-12-Contact C-12-Contact R-22-Contact R-12-Contact C-12-Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Personnel</th>
<th>Instructional Method &amp; Evaluation</th>
<th>The Educational Program</th>
<th>School Policies, Rules &amp; Student Rules</th>
<th>Community Faculty &amp; Student Relationships</th>
<th>Subject Matter Suggestions</th>
<th>School Facilities &amp; Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Up-to-date Buildings Facilities &amp; Equip.</td>
<td>R-33-Well planned physical plant</td>
<td>*17 *18 *19</td>
<td>R-79-lounge facilities R-80-Cafet. R-81-Lanscaping P-82-Better up-to-date facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel</td>
<td>Instructional Method &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>The Educational Program</td>
<td>Faculty Rules &amp; Student Behavior</td>
<td>Community Policies, Faculty &amp; Student Relationships</td>
<td>Subject Matter Suggestions</td>
<td>School Facilities &amp; Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Emphasis on Primary Grades</strong></td>
<td><em>R-5-Hired non-prof. help aids &amp; supv.</em></td>
<td><em>C-16-Great use #4 of spec resrcs &amp; aids</em></td>
<td><em>C-17-Great emphasis on proper start in 1st grade</em></td>
<td><em>R-34-Improved teaching methods</em></td>
<td><em>R-57-Better Equipment Broader Music Program 1-12</em></td>
<td><em>P-85-Public School Kindergarten P-86-Investigate use of teaching aids</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Good start at Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Adult Education Needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>P-41-Adult Education</em></td>
<td><em>P-42-Adult Education (involve local talents)</em></td>
<td><em>R-47-Gov't &amp; personal integ.</em></td>
<td><em>C-52-Stud. Freedom</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Student Freedom &amp; Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>C-24-Stud. Freedom</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II - Labels Combined Into Problem-Solving Issues - Continued 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instructional Method &amp; Evaluation Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Policies, Rules &amp; Student Rules &amp; Student Relations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subject Matter</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Decide Who Teaches Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Broader P.E. Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Maintain A Good Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Clarify Teacher Duties, Prerogatives &amp; Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Policies, Rules &amp; Student Rules &amp; Student Relations</th>
<th>Community Faculty</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>School Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-46-Who teaches values - parents or teachers?</td>
<td>R-59-Wide range of indiv. sports</td>
<td>R-53-Broader PE Program</td>
<td>P-83-Inclusive PE Prog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-Qualified administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2-Excellent teachers</td>
<td>R-15-Teacher ability</td>
<td>R-48-Teacher duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-74-Close coordin. of stud. teacher by reg. teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel</td>
<td>Instruction-The Educational Method &amp; Evaluation Program</td>
<td>School Policies, Rules &amp; Student Behavior</td>
<td>Community-Faculty &amp; Student Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Need Counselor - Elem-Sec</td>
<td>R-4-Full time Professional Counselor, H.S. principal-More Sec'y help</td>
<td>R-18-Adequate Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Investigate Usefulness of tenure</td>
<td>R-3-Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Investigate Consolidation</td>
<td>C-12-Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM

At our community meeting March 1, we didn't get a chance to go through all the rest of the pages of opinions that we collected. The Project Director studied the remainder of the material to see if the results of the March 1st, meeting were complete in covering material that was not discussed at the meeting March 1st. Some issues were not directly mentioned in our labeling and categorizing. These issues are included below with numbers in front of them. Starred numbers corresponding with these numbers are written on our neats chart to include these items:

SCHOOL PERSONNEL

13. *1 Supervisor for music and art

INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD & EVALUATION

3. *2 Computerized grading
6. *4 Testing program in first grade
5. *5 Maturation tests

THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

2. *6 Cooperative education
3. *7 Skiing and golf
8. *8 Speech therapy
9. *9 More periods in a day
7. *10 Parent drug education

SCHOOL POLICIES, RULES & STUDENT BEHAVIOR

3. *11 More art
4. *12 Community voice in hiring teachers
13. *13 Students on school board advisory group
8. *14 New code book
15. *15 Improve student council
11. *16 Teacher evaluation system

COMMUNITY-FACULTY & STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

5. *17 Media center
18. *18 Educational TV
19. *19 Who eats hot lunch - clarify

SCHOOL FACILITIES & SERVICES

5. *20 New band room
21. *21 New grade school
COMMUNITY MEETING EVALUATION

N = 92  March 8, 1971

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.
   
   Very Little  Very Much
   (5.4%)  1  (10.9%)  2  (19.6%)  3  (36.9%)  4  (27.3%)  5

2. What could have been done to make the meeting more effective?
   Sample of comments attached

3. How effective was the director of the meeting?
   
   Very Little  Very Much
   (2.2%)  1  (5.5%)  2  (27.8%)  3  (37.8%)  4  (26.7%)  5

4. What could the director have done (or not done) to be more effective?
   Sample of comments attached

5. How satisfied are you with the advisory committee's drawing main issues together into labeled categories?
   
   Very Little  Very Much
   (2.3%)  1  (5.7%)  2  (18.2%)  3  (48.7%)  4  (25%)  5

6. Are the functions of the advisory committee clear to you?
   Yes  _______  No  _______
   Comment:  
   Sample of comments attached

PHASE III OF THE PROJECT IS TO PRESENT NEEDED INFORMATION. EACH PRESENTATION SHOULD BE EVALUATED.

7. How valuable was the philosophy of education activity as a means of creating understanding of why peoples expectations of the school differ?
   
   Very Little  Very Much
   (6.6%)  1  (14.3%)  2  (28.6%)  3  (34.1%)  4  (16.5%)  5

(Continued on next page)
8. What could have been done to make the philosophy activity more effective?

Sample of comments attached

9. How valuable was the film in providing insight into some of the issues mentioned by community members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.1%) 1</td>
<td>(6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.6%) 2</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.3%) 4</td>
<td>(51.1%) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

Question 2
- Participate a little more
- Made it a little shorter
- More communication - gap
- Keep up the good work
- More time for discussion

Question 4
- Keep things moving faster
- Explain better
- To have several people give their ideas
- Let the students give their thoughts more

Question 6
- No - do they just plan the dates
- No - please explain it more in easier terms
- Yes - Very good
- No - not clear enough

Question 8
- Thought it was brought out very well
- Simplified language used
- Explained more
- Perhaps a film

Additional Comments
- How can two people of the same area relate the feelings of the whole community?
- I thought the meeting was meaningful. Was encouraged by the better turnout of students.
- Would like more of this type.
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
March 15, 1971

(Meeting to be run and directed by Community Advisory Committee Members.)

1. 25 Minutes
   (Divide group into sextets, pass out roll sheet and Functions of the Advisory Committee)
   Mrs. JoAnne Oliver, teacher - THE FUNCTION OF PHASE III OF THE PROJECT
   a. Review of last two meetings (which of the 15 issues need defining)
   b. Where we are now in Phase III (Second of three meetings)
   c. Providing GENERAL information to define or clarify some of the issues identified so far in the project
   d. Tonight's meeting as it fits into Phase III
   e. Advisory committee's effort to find individualized instruction material for the next community meeting
   f. Need to elect two more advisory committee members from the community at the end of this meeting
   g. Introduction to Phase IV of the project, the problem-solving phase.
      1. Two experts recommended by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland
      2. Brief statement on the NWREL
      3. Need for about 12 hours to develop problem-solving workshop.
         a. Investigate resources for dealing with various problems
         b. Develop priorities for 15 issues identified
         c. Determine a general philosophy of instruction for the school
         d. Develop good understanding of research done on problem-solving
         e. Begin developing community member task forces to attack problems
   h. Set a meeting date for the problem-solving development of Phase IV
   i. Comment for community members to be thinking about best date for next community meeting for presentation of general information on individualized instruction
Educational Planning Committee Meeting Agenda - Continued 2
March 15, 1971

j. Reference to speakers tonight on discipline and freedom, and then vo-tech education programs

2. 10 Minutes
   (Introduction by Mrs. JoAnne Oliver, teacher)
   Mr. Robert Lane (Vice Chairman of the School Board) - HOW SOME OF THE IDENTIFIED SCHOOL NEEDS HAVE ALREADY BEEN ACTED UPON BY THE BOARD AND PUT ON THE APRIL 3 SCHOOL ELECTION BALLOT

3. 30 Minutes
   (Introduction by Mr. Bill Kober, Teacher, advisory committee member)
   Dr. Jess Lair, Guest Speaker, Montana State University - THE MEANING OF DISCIPLINE AND STUDENT FREEDOM

   Circulate Coffee and Cookies

4. 20 Minutes
   Small group activity - individuals write answers to three questions on notecards.
   Transparency to guide sextet discussions:
   IN Sextets DISCUSS THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
   1) What seemed to be Dr. Lair's main points?
   2) What was usual or unusual in what he said?
   3) Are there important issues that Dr. Lair did not mention?
   (Sextets combine on one card any questions they would like to ask Dr. Lair.)

5. 10 Minutes
   Questions developed in sextets for Dr. Lair are collected and given to Dr. Lair to answer briefly.

6. 30 Minutes
   (Introduction by Mr. Bill Kober, advisory committee member)
   Dr. Dean Palmer, Guest Speaker, Montana State University - VO-TECH PROGRAMS

7. 20 Minutes
   Small group activity - individuals write answers to three questions on notecards
   Transparency to guide sextet discussions:
Educational Planning Committee Meeting Agenda – Continued 3  
March 15, 1971

7. Continued
   FIRST, INDIVIDUALLY JOT DOWN SOME ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
   1) What seemed to be the main points of the presentation?
   2) What was usual or unusual in what was said?
   3) Are there important issues that have not been mentioned or that are not clear?

   Then in your sextets discuss what you have written. Combine your questions to give to the speaker to answer.

8. 10 Minutes
   Questions developed in sextets for Dr. Palmer are collected and given to Dr. Palmer to answer briefly.

9. 5 Minutes
   Distribute evaluation sheets to be completed

10. 5 Minutes
   Determine meeting date for individualized instruction information presentation.
COMMUNITY MEETING EVALUATION
N = 98 March 15, 1971

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>5 (59.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>4 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What could have been done to make the meeting more effective?

Sample of comments attached

3. Getting all people informed about meetings is difficult. What for you has been the best source for learning about meeting times and dates?

Check if you learned of meetings on: Radio 7.5%, Television 8.7%, Newspaper 5.3%, Word of Mouth 11.2%, Meetings 7.5%, Telephone 11.2%

Additional suggestions:

4. How much do you feel that people you know are informed about the purpose and progress of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>5 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (21.9%)</td>
<td>4 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (36.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What could be done to get more people informed about and involved in the project?

Sample of comments attached

6. How much do you feel that you understand the purpose of Phase III of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
<td>5 (26.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (27.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE III OF THE PROJECT IS TO PRESENT NEEDED GENERAL INFORMATION TO DEFINE OR CLARIFY SOME OF THE ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE PROJECT. (Detailed information about issues needing problem-solving will be obtained by groups of people who chose to work on particular problems.) EACH PRESENTATION IN PHASE III SHOULD BE EVALUATED.

7. How effective was Dr. Jess Lair in presenting his point of view on discipline and freedom?

Very Little
(1.0%) 1  (4.1%) 2  (8.2%) 3  (24.5%) 4  (62.2%) 5

8. How could Dr. Lair have been more effective?

Sample of comments attached

9. How valuable was Dr. Lair's presentation in defining or clarifying issues related to discipline and freedom?

Very Little
(2.0%) 1  (6.1%) 2  (17.3%) 3  (31.6%) 4  (42.8%) 5

10. How effective was Dr. Dean Palmer in speaking on vo-tech education?

Very Little
(1.0%) 1  (0.0%) 2  (8.3%) 3  (32.3%) 4  (58.3%) 5

11. How could he have been more effective?

Sample of comments attached

12. How valuable was Dr. Palmer's presentation in defining or clarifying issues related to vo-tech education?

Very Little
(1.0%) 1  (0.0%) 2  (6.1%) 3  (32.6%) 4  (60.2%) 5
Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

Question 2
I was very disappointed in the talk on discipline. It did not help with the approaches in our school at all
Had some discussion
More picture slides

Question 5
Have the people that attend the meeting tell others about it
Person-to-person
Cards sent out to arrive on the day before we have the meeting
Have it on TV
Calling them

Question 8
More on his schools where he lives
If he'd had more time
He was very good
More group discussion
More questions from people

Question 11
He was very good and applied his talk to Three Forks school
If he'd had more time
More broad experiences cited
Did a good job

Additional comments
Am very pleased with speakers brought to this project so far
I enjoyed the program very much
Good meeting
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING MEETING AGENDA
March 22, 1971

Before Meeting:

Transparency: Get into groups with the following members:
No more than two students
No more than two faculty members
No more than one board member
Please don't sit with spouses

Roll Sheets: Distribute as people get into sextets
(Please fill out roll sheets and give to one member of the
sextet to take to the front table.)

Note Cards: Give each sextet (2) sets of six

1. 6 Minutes
   Rev. Charles Heath
   a. The purpose of this meeting:
      Individualized instruction was identified as a
      topic that the community wished to have defined.
   b. Where we are in the Project:
      At the end of Phase III, the presentation of
      general information to define or clarify issues
      that aren't clear before priorities are placed
      on the 15 issues.
   c. The agenda of this meeting:
      TRANSPARENCY: "The Nature and Effects of Individu­
      alized Instruction" and "Some Problems and
      Solutions" slide-tape presentations obtained
      from Oregon—small group discussions after each
      presentation - panel of experts to answer questions
      written in sextet discussions.
   d. The Origin and Purpose of the Presentations:
      We are showing the slides to present GENERAL
      information - NOT TO CONVINCE PEOPLE THAT OUR
      SCHOOL SHOULD BE LIKE THOSE IN THE PRESENTATIONS.
      Materials present results of national research
      on Individualized Instruction. The United States
      Office of Education had the individualized pro­
      grams in the U.S. studied, and then the report
Educational Planning Meeting Agenda - Continued 2
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d. Continued

of this study was made in the form of slides and tapes. The purpose of the slides is to give information about what is being done across the country in this area.

e. Introduction of Dr. Willis Vandiver, Head of Elementary Education at Montana State University, and Specialist in Reading Instruction, to give some general information on definitions of individualized instruction.

2. 10 Minutes
Dr. Willis Vandiver - Four General Types of Individualized Instruction.
Handout on Four Types
(Dr. Vandiver's presentation partly based on Oregon Individualized Instruction study.)

3. 30 Minutes
Slide Tape Presentation #1
"The Nature and Effects of Individualized Instruction"
Oregon System of Higher Education, Sponsored by the USOE
(Definitions of various types of individualized instruction.)

BEGIN CIRCULATING COFFEE, PUNCH, AND COOKIES

4. 25 Minutes
Sextet Discussions of Slides and Tape
Handout paper on "Ways People Can Act to Help Groups Get Work Done"
Transparency - Group Discussion Guide
Before discussing your reactions to the presentation, please do the following:

1. On a notecard, write what you think stood out as the main points of the presentation.

2. On the back of the card, write any questions that you would like answered.
3. Please read the handout on "Ways People Can Act to Help Groups Get Work Done"

In your sextet, share your notes. Use the handout that goes with the slides to guide discussion, if you like.

COMBINE YOUR QUESTIONS ON ONE CARD TO BE GIVEN TO A PANEL OF EXPERTS AFTER THE PRESENTATIONS.

5. 20 Minutes
Slide Tape Presentation #2
"Some Problems and Solutions"
Oregon System of Higher Education, Sponsored by USOE

6. 20 Minutes
Handout to go with slides
Transparency (as before in 4 above)

7. 5 Minutes
Collect cards combining questions. Give to Rev. Heath to combine by topic before he gives them to the panel.
Give the cards to Dr. Vandiver, as panel leader.

8. 8 Minutes
Mrs. Lukkason, Community Member
Rev. Heath introduce Mrs. Lukkason as Advisory Committee Member
Introduction of Panel Members by Dr. Vandiver

Dr. Vandiver, MSU
Mr. Mikesell, MSU
Mr. James Burk, State Department, Helena
Mrs. Zwicker, Manhattan (former individualized instruction teacher)

9. 40 Minutes
Panel of experts read questions developed in sextets, and the panel attempts to answer as many questions as possible.
Questions written on cards should be answered, if possible, before asking for questions from the floor.
Educational Planning Meeting Agenda - Continued 4
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10. 10 Minutes
   Mrs. Lukkason's presentation on:
   a. Review of the philosophy of the project in general
      Get people involved
      Give people a real voice
      Establish a process for trying to build a better
      system before a crisis situation
   b. Importance of Involvement
   c. New members of the advisory committee elected at
      school last Friday
      Lester Williams
      Neil Sorenson
      (Show again the members of the committee)
   d. Statement about the Workshop on April 2 and 3.
      (Use typed sheet)
   e. Plea for attendance at the Workshop (if not all of
      the time, at least part of it - especially Saturday evening)

11. 5 Minutes
    Distribute Meeting Evaluation Sheets

12. Ask Advisory Committee to meet for a few minutes after the
    meeting.

13. Allow people to talk to panel for a while, if they like.
COMMUNITY MEETING EVALUATION
March 22, 1971

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? (Circle one number).

   Very Little                           Very Much
   (3.4%) 1     (12.5%) 2     (23.7%) 3     (38.6%) 4     (21.6%) 5

2. What could have been done to make the meeting more effective?

   Sample of comments attached

3. (Check one). Did you read the article in the Herald about this evenings' meeting?

   Yes (42.5%)  No (57.3%)

4. How much do you feel that people you know are informed about the purpose and progress of the project?

   Very Little                           Very Much
   (6.8%) 1     (9.1%) 2     (45.4%) 3     (31.8%) 4     (6.8%) 5

5. What could be done to get more people informed about and involved in the project?

   Sample of comments attached

PHASE III OF THE PROJECT IS TO PRESENT NEEDED GENERAL INFORMATION TO DEFINE OR CLARIFY SOME OF THE ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE PROJECT. (Detailed information about issues needing problem-solving will be obtained by groups of people who choose to work on particular problems.) EACH PRESENTATION IN PHASE III SHOULD BE EVALUATED.

6. How valuable was the presentation on "The Nature and Effects of Individualized Instruction" in defining types of this kind of teaching?

   Very Little                           Very Much
   (3.4%) 1     (4.5%) 2     (25.0%) 3     (23.7%) 4     (20.4%) 5

(Continued on next page)
7. How valuable was the presentation "Some Problems and Solutions?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1%) 1</td>
<td>(8.0%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.7%) 3</td>
<td>(26.1%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.2%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How valuable were the sextet discussions in giving you an opportunity to discuss your opinions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.5%) 1</td>
<td>(10.2%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.8%) 3</td>
<td>(29.5%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.7%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How valuable was the panel of experts in answering questions written by group members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.0%) 1</td>
<td>(9.1%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.7%) 3</td>
<td>(31.8%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.4%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHASE III EVALUATION: This meeting ends the presentation of general information on issues that the community felt needed to be explained before we are to decide which issues are more important than others.

10. How effective do you feel Phase III was?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.4%) 1</td>
<td>(12.5%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.4%) 3</td>
<td>(29.5%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.2%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What could the Advisory Committee do to make the project more successful?

Sample of comments attached

Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

Question 2
- Longer panel discussion
- Let the people discuss more
- Just fine
- Shorten it
- More open-mindedness from the audiences

Question 5
- Call them, talk to them, visit them
- Give more information on the meetings
- More surveys of opinions to be tabulated
- Door-to-door contact, neighbor-to-neighbor
Sample of responses – continued

Question 11

Keep up the good work
Define the purpose more definitely known.
Bring out the main parts of school.
Give the panel more time – less time in the sextets
Get a review of what has been done to those of us who have been unable to attend all meetings
Major Objectives of the Workshop:

A. Develop tentative goal statements of 15 expressed areas of interest and of a general goal for the school.

B. Identify and practice techniques for getting tasks completed in group work.

C. Identify and practice techniques for improving skills of interpersonal communications.

Design:

**Friday - 7:00 - 10:00 p.m.**

7:00 - Overview - discuss:

A. How this workshop relates to what we understand has happened in the project to date.

B. What we hope to accomplish in this workshop and general procedures we will follow.

C. How we perceive our role and how this workshop differs from normal meetings.

D. What will be expected of workshop participants

E. Relationship of process and task functions.

7:15 - Introduce communication skills

A. Review paraphrasing; distribute theory paper, "Paraphrasing as a Communication Skill."

B. Distribute and discuss paper "Communicating in Small Working Groups."
Three Forks, Montana - Workshop - Continued 2
April 2 & 3, 1971

7:45 - Convert 15 areas of interest to goal statements

A. Distribute and review sheet with 15 identified areas of interest.

B. Discuss meaning of writing goals in operational terms.

C. Specify rules for stating goals
   (1) state action you can see (demonstrable)
   (2) identify conditions for the performance
   (3) cite degree of performance desired

D. Give an example (student in home economics)

E. Assign one interest area (vocational-technical), have each participant write a goal statement about it, share in trios and compose a single statement; then have two trios share their statements.

F. Review rules for writing goal statements.

8:30 - Introduce group work technique for decision making - consensus

A. Conduct consensus exercise, "Ranking the Prestige of Occupations."

9:15 - Stating a general goal for Three Forks Schools

A. Individually on a 5 x 8 card, write one statement of a general goal. Think about it first.

B. As trios, share and combine three statements into one upon which all agree.

C. Two trios share statements and, as a sextet, develop and agree upon a single statement.

D. Write statement on newsprint and post on wall. Participants walk around and read all fifteen statements.

E. Reassemble as one large group, review and evaluate.
Three Forks, Montana - Workshop - Continued 3
April 2 & 3, 1971

Saturday - 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon

9:00 - Introduce Communication Skill - Nonverbal

A. Distribute theory paper "Communication Without Words." Read and discuss.

B. Short practice of skill in pairs.

C. Distribute, read and discuss paper entitled, "Watching Nonverbal Behavior."

9:25 - Continue working on converting 15 areas of interest to goal statements

A. Review rules for writing statements

B. Distribute, read and discuss theory paper, "Steps in Problem Solving."

C. Identify and brief an observer of nonverbal skills for each sextet.

D. Sextets begin working.

10:15 - Stop group work for observer feedback.

10:30 - Continue working

11:45 - Stop group work for observer feedback, general debriefing and evaluation

Saturday Afternoon

1:00 - Introduce communication skills - describing behavior and perception checking.

A. Distribute, read and discuss theory paper entitled, "Describing Another's Behavior."

B. Distribute, read and discuss theory paper entitled "Perception Checking Nonverbal Messages."
1:20 - Establish goal statement priorities.
   A. Working in sextets, write a goal statement for each of the 15 areas on 5 x 8 cards. Also, write on the cards reasons why each goal is important.
   B. Introduce and demonstrate "G-Sort" concept and procedure.
   C. Identify and brief an observer from each sextet.
   D. Begin working on "G-Sort" of goals. Include on the card why the goal is placed where it is.

2:00 - Stop work for observer feedback

2:15 - Continue working

2:45 - Stop for observer feedback, general debriefing and review

3:00 - Introduce Force-Field Analysis
   A. Distribute, read and discuss theory paper entitled, "Importance of Diagnosis."
   B. Demonstrate force-field technique.
   C. Individually, participants try to write a force-field on an assigned goal, then compare in trios.
   B. Working in sextets, participants will force-field an assigned goal statement.

3:30 - Stop working for observer feedback and explanation of rating, ranking, and clarifying forces identified in the fields. Demonstrate.

4:00 - Stop for observer feedback and evaluation.

Saturday Evening (7:00 - 10:00 p.m.)

7:00 - Conduct task-maintenance exercise

8:20 - Debrief the exercise
Saturday Evening - Continued

8:30 - Distribute, read and discuss the theory paper entitled, "Features of a Successful Group."

8:40 - Continue work on general goal statement for Three Forks schools.

A. Working from a reproduced copy of the various (15) general goal statements produced Friday evening and, working in trios, develop one statement members of trio will understand and support.

9:00 - Trios form sextets and develop one statement all will understand and support.

9:30 - Two sextets join, share statements, develop one which all understand and will support.

10:00 - Stop work, review, debrief, evaluate and close workshop.

Summary

1. Presented the following techniques for task accomplishment in group work:

   a. rules for writing behavioralized goal statements.
   b. card-sort technique for determining priorities.
   c. consensus technique for reaching group decision.
   d. force-field analysis for diagnosing problems.

2. Presented the following basic skills for interpersonal communication:

   a. paraphrasing (reviewed)
   b. nonverbal behavior
   c. describing communication
   d. perception checking
Summary - Continued

3. The following "products" were achieved on a tentative basis:
   a. a general goal of objective for Three Forks Schools.
   b. goal statements for each of the fifteen areas of interest earlier identified.
   c. Ranked the areas of interest in terms of which need to be investigated (accomplished) first.
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AREAS OF INTEREST

1. Need Counselor - Elementary & Secondary
2. Maintain a Good Staff
3. Expanded Program to Meet Individual Learning Needs and Interests
4. Need for Vo-Tech Education
5. Better Financing
6. Emphasis on Primary Grades - Good Start at Kindergarten
7. Improve School-Community-Board Relationship
8. Student Freedom and Responsibility
9. Broader P.E. Program
10. Clarify Teacher Duties, Prerogatives and Respect
11. Up-To-Date Buildings, Facilities, and Equipment
12. Decide Who Teaches Values
13. Investigate Consolidation
14. Investigate Usefulness of Tenure
15. Adult Education Needs
1. The student should know their limitations and abilities under conditions such as college, vocation, or marriage, to be gainfully employed and of use to the community. The college student fulfilling his college obligation: to be gainfully employed, to be a complementary spouse.

2. The Three Forks School should offer a maximum number of courses that resources permit so that upon receiving a diploma a student would be able to go directly to a job or on to higher education, depending on his abilities and interest.

3. Student should be able to:
   - Be self reliant
   - Have a sense of responsibility
   - Be independent
   - Be prepared for an occupation (or further education)

Conditions such as:
- Our changing and cooperative society demands

Measured in such ways as:
- Personal pride
- Communication and cooperation with fellow man
- Being able to be happy and enjoy life

4. After 12 years in the Three Forks School, the student should be prepared to determine his own goals, under conditions such as a normal adjustment to a changing society.

5. After 12 years in the Three Forks Schools the student should have mutual respect for his fellow man and be able to achieve a career as evidenced by his display of empathy and awareness of his fellow man. Also by actively pursuing his career goals.

6. After 12 years the student should be able to:
   - Either be prepared to gain a living without further education, or
   - Be prepared for further achievement in higher education.

Conditions such as:
- Offer a broader more diversified course to provide best possible education so that the student will be rounded socially, academically, physically and emotionally.

As a measure in:
- Ways such as ability to enter higher education and achieve or obtain gainful employment after high school.
7. After 12 years a student should be able to support himself and his family with the knowledge he has attained, under living conditions that he has accepted for himself - If in response to a question he said that he was happy with what he was doing. You could accept this as proof that the system was working.

8. After 12 years in school the student should have acquired the knowledge necessary to help him decide his areas of interest and eventually become a productive member of the society and a good citizen.

9. Should be able to satisfy the students educational and social needs under conditions such as those interesting to students as measured by future success of student.

10. After 12 years in Three Forks Schools the student should be able to be prepared physically, mentally and emotionally under the conditions that the school provide for student's individual needs through vocational training or college preparation, and with fair discipline and help with personal problems.

Measured by how well a student accepts responsibility in the adult society, specifically by success in his job and self-esteem.

11. After 12 years in Three Forks Schools the student should be able to meet life successfully under conditions such as socially and vocationally as measured in ways of self-esteem and proficiency in use of basic skills.

12. After 12 years:
   1) Continue on-the-job training
   2) Continue their higher education
   3) Become homemakers

Under such conditions as:
   1) Whether he can learn and hold a job
   2) Maintain 2.5 average in college
   3) Maintain a happy household

As measured in such ways:
   1) Advance in his job
   2) Graduating from college
   3) Continuing to maintain a happy household
General Goals - Continued

13. Should be able to:
   1) Make a living or be prepared to go on to more schooling
   2) Facing competition
   3) Getting along with fellow man
   4) Compassion, enjoy life

14. Should be able to become an active part of humanity that can go forth in any field with a degree of success and happiness.

   Under conditions such as:
   A stable society or in a time of crisis
   They would be responsible citizens and productive in their own chosen field
Each meeting held as part of this project will be concluded with a request for suggestions from you for future meetings. Please feel free to make comments that could help make our community meetings more of a success.

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>6 (0.6%)</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (37.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (38.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What could be done to make the meetings more effective?

Sample of comments attached

3. How effective were the directors of the meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (4.7%)</td>
<td>2 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (11.3%)</td>
<td>3 (39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (35.5%)</td>
<td>4 (47.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (48.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What could the director do (not do) to be more effective?

Sample of comments attached

5. How well did your group work together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (48.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (63.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What (if any) problems did your group have?

Sample of comments attached

7. How much do you feel that you had an opportunity to express your opinions during the meeting tonight?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (70.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
8. What was most helpful or interesting to you during this meeting?
   Sample of comments attached

9. Is there anything you would especially like to do or see at our next meeting?
   Sample of comments attached

Additional comments:

Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

Question 2
Friday Evening - April 2
  More people should join in, in the discussion
  The sound system could use improvement
  More help from professors
  Nothing, I thought this meeting was the most interesting one we've had
Saturday Morning - April 3
  More explicit directions
  Not so long of meetings
  Nothing - I enjoyed it very much
  More student involvement
Saturday Afternoon - April 3
  More people
  They're going fine
  Handled very well
  A little more cooperation
  Better participation by all

Question 4
Friday Evening - April 2
  Giving us more time to finish before going on to the next step
  Have a briefing on things we have already covered
  Nothing, he was real good
  Explain details more
Saturday Morning - April 3
  Director - clarify steps we are to work on
  Give specific steps to follow at first of meeting
  Was very helpful to have them come to small groups
  Check sextets more frequently
Sample of responses - continued

Question 4 - continued
Saturday Afternoon - April 3
Get attention of group - then start talking
Done a good job
Always use microphone
Explain the numbers on the chart more, as to how people categorized the data

Question 6
Friday Evening - April 2
Lack of participation by all members.
Didn't have enough time to discuss things
Trying to decide on different topics
Communication
Understanding what each other mean't

Saturday Morning - April 3
Reluctance to speak own minds
None
Not being able to get started
Getting off on different subjects
Frustration in understanding each other

Saturday Afternoon - April 3
None, we all agreed equally
Everyone was tired
Expressing ideas and thoughts into words
None that I noticed. No one was over (or under) bearing. If we got off the part (which was seldom) someone (not always the same one) always steered us back.

Question 8
Friday Evening - April 2
Having the feeling of accomplishment
Being able to voice my opinion
Communication skills
Hopefully, an understanding of how to formulate topics tomorrow
The care of each individual

Saturday Morning - April 3
The involvement of our group
The friendly and informative exchange
We had good verbal communication
Learning of others opinions
Group discussion

Saturday Evening - April 3
Everything OK
Excellent guidance from directors of meeting
Making people look at other less important problems
Diagrams of instructions
Sample of responses – continued

Question 9

Friday Evening – April 2
The same thing as tonight being able to say what we think
Keep up the good work
Most interesting meeting I've been to
As much good response as we've had tonight

Saturday Morning – April 3
Just fine
As much done as was done at this meeting
More participation
Get into more specific areas of our problems

Saturday Afternoon – April 3
Discuss problems still unstated
Ideas for solving some of the problems
Have more talking by the speakers
Just fine
Nothing
COMMUNITY MEETING EVALUATION
Saturday Evening – April 3
Problem-Solving Workshop PART IV

1. How satisfied were you with this evening's meeting in general?
   Very Little                         Very Much
   (3.2%) 1  (7.9%) 2  (30.1%) 3  (27.0%) 4  (31.7%) 5

2. How effective were the directors at this meeting?
   Very Little                         Very Much
   (1.6%) 1  (6.3%) 2  (23.8%) 3  (30.1%) 4  (38.1%) 5

3. What could they have done to be more effective?
   Sample of comments attached

PHASE IV of the project was to:

1. Change our 15 areas of interest into goals written in terms of rules for goals.
2. Decide which of the goals should be worked on first (put goals into priorities).
3. Make a general goal for the school.
4. Apply a method of studying problems (Force-Field Analysis).
5. Use a goal-development process that can be applied later by task groups.
6. Draw together interests of project participants so that a unified focus to improve the schools can be achieved.
7. Develop an awareness of basic communication skills for use in working groups.

4. How effective was Phase IV in general?
   Very Little                         Very Much
   (0.0%) 1  (4.8%) 2  (23.4%) 3  (50.8%) 4  (19.0%) 5

5. How satisfied are you that the fifteen areas of interest have been changed into goals written in terms of the three rules for goals?
   Very Little                         Very Much
   (1.6%) 1  (6.5%) 2  (22.9%) 3  (45.9%) 4  (22.9%) 5

(Continued on next page)
6. How much more work, if any, needs to be done on refining the fifteen goals statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14.3%) 1</td>
<td>(21.0%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35.4%) 3</td>
<td>(16.1%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.9%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How satisfied are you that the fifteen areas of interest (changed into goals) have been ranked according to which should be worked on first?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6.3%) 1</td>
<td>(12.7%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30.1%) 3</td>
<td>(33.3%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17.5%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How satisfied are you with what turned out to be the average order in which our total group ranked the issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.6%) 1</td>
<td>(6.3%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41.3%) 3</td>
<td>(33.3%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.8%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How satisfied are you with the making of the general goal for the schools? (The single statement of what we expect a student to get out of 12 years of school.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%) 1</td>
<td>(6.3%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22.2%) 3</td>
<td>(33.3%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37.2%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How much more work, if any, needs to be done to refine this general goal statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30.1%) 1</td>
<td>(22.2%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.6%) 3</td>
<td>(15.8%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.5%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How much do you feel that you are familiar with the rules for writing school goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.6%) 1</td>
<td>(7.9%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.1%) 3</td>
<td>(34.9%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.8%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How much do you feel that project participants' interests have been put into a unified focus to improve the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.6%) 1</td>
<td>(3.2%) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30.1%) 3</td>
<td>(57.3%) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.9%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
13. How much do you feel that you understand force-field analysis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(1.6%)</strong> 1</td>
<td>(9.5%) 2</td>
<td>(28.6%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(40.9%)</strong> 4</td>
<td>(9.5%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How much do you feel that the workshop has prepared you to work in a task group aimed at reaching a goal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(3.2%)</strong> 1</td>
<td>(4.8%) 2</td>
<td>(22.2%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(54.0%)</strong> 4</td>
<td>(12.7%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How much do you feel that you are aware of the basic communication skills (paraphrasing, perception-checking, behavior description, nonverbal behavior) as a result of the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(0.0%)</strong> 1</td>
<td>(6.3%) 2</td>
<td>(31.7%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(28.6%)</strong> 4</td>
<td>(30.1%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. In the project how valuable was having the two men from Washington come to direct the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(6.3%)</strong> 1</td>
<td>(3.2%) 2</td>
<td>(14.1%) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(25.4%)</strong> 4</td>
<td>(50.8%) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample of responses to open-ended question above:

**Question 3**

Tell the observers how to do it more effectively. Defined the objectives of the first thing we did
Used less amount of time
The statement of school policy should have been left to either task force or advisory committee and worked on goal solving
By Saturday evening many persons were past prime ability to communicate
Did a good job
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING MEETING AGENDA
April 26, 1971

1. 5 Minutes
   Larry Bright, Project Director (Preliminary Transparency on formation of sextets)
   a. The purpose of this meeting:
      1. Present results of project – Mrs. Loretta Tribble and Rev. Charles Heath, Community Members
      2. Decide which problems should have task groups now
      3. Name task groups
   b. The future of the project:
      1. Continue advisory committee to see that work goes on
      2. Get consultants where necessary to work on task development
      3. Continue to measure through opinionnaires the feelings of people about the school
      4. Evaluate success of programs
   c. The rest of this year's work:
      1. Task groups will meet at least once to do a force-field analysis of their problem and to make plans for action and reports to the community
      2. The advisory committee will decide when more community meetings need to be held for presentation of task group reports.
   d. The outstanding efforts of the advisory committee should be stressed.

2. 15 Minutes
   Rev. Charles Heath, Community Member
   Presentation of the cooperatively developed Statement of the Purpose of the Three Forks Schools 1971.
   Transparency on coordinated Goals and Objectives vs. non-coordinated Goals and Objectives.
   Handout copies of the general statement of Purpose.

3. 30 Minutes
   Sextet discussion of the general statement of purpose. (Discussion questions are provided on the handout.)
Educational Planning Meeting Agenda - Continued 2
April 26, 1971

4. 10 Minutes
Mrs. Loretta Tribble, Community Member
Presentation of the Combined Areas of Interest
Problem Statements and their Development for Task Group Action

Begin Serving Coffee

Handout copies of the problem statements and goals.

5. 15 Minutes
Larry Bright - Summarize how the 15 areas were combined - use a transparency
Individuals read through the problem statements as coffee and cookies are passed out
Handout 15 areas as ranked in workshop. People can see how issues were ranked before.

6. 5 Minutes
Neal Sorenson, Student, present briefly the issues that have been made into problem statements to be worked on in the high school.

7. 5 Minutes
Jack Kreitinger, Superintendent; Suggestion on how consultants might easily be obtained from the University to help next year to consider alternatives available to solve problems.
Larry Bright, comment briefly about Office of Superintendent’s interest in helping to develop a program of Adult Education.

8. 45 Minutes
Groups in sextets rank, rate, and choose among the six problems needing task groups. Rank importance of each; rate ease of getting problem solved - Choose problem you would be interested in working on first, second, third, etc. Give each individual a rank-rate sheet to mark first before sextet works. Sextets turn in ranking and rating on one sheet. Individuals turn in choice sheet separately with their names written on the sheet. (Problem you would be most interested in working on.)

Serve more coffee and cookies
Educational Planning Meeting Agenda - Continued 3
April 26, 1971

9.  5 Minutes
    Two sextets move together to reach consensus
    Collect rank, rate, choose sheets to tally

10. 30 Minutes
    Distribute three questionnaires for participants to complete as
        tallying is done:
        School Project Questionnaire
        Education VII Scale
        PHN Scale
    Collect Questionnaires as they are completed.

11. 10 Minutes
    Present results of averaged rank, rate, choose on Problem State-
        ments. Emphasize that we probably would do best to work on
        the problem with the highest rank (smallest number), lowest
        rate (smallest number), and the ones most frequently chosen
        of interest (smallest number).

12. 15 Minutes
    Divide total group by asking members to form large, on their
    basis of interest in one problem, groups in areas of the
    building. Then members interested in particular problems
    should summarize on newsprint the people willing to volunteer
    to be on a task group. Election of additional needed members
    to bring size of group to 6-15 members may be needed.

13. 10 Minutes
    Meet with formed task groups to determine when and where they
    will meet to begin force-field analysis of the problem and
    action on it.

14. 5 Minutes
    Elect from community an additional advisory committee member
    since George Ballard has become a board member.

15. 5 Minutes
    Evaluation of the meeting.
1971 STATEMENT OF WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THE THREE FORKS SCHOOLS SHOULD BE

Developed through Cooperative Planning by Community Members, Students, Faculty Members, and School Board Members Working in the Title III ESEA Educational Planning Project

Preface

Society has changed a lot in the past years. Our population has grown tremendously, and our country has changed because of scientific advances. The local schools now have the responsibility of preparing more students for many, many different kinds of lives. If schools are to keep up with the demands of their communities, the schools must have definite goals that can be clearly reached. When many people with different wants ask a school to provide a service to society, conflicts of interest become apparent. The school can try to be all things to all people, but unless conflicts of interest are heard and unless understanding rather than misunderstanding is brought about, the effort of the schools will be divided and misunderstanding about the purpose of the schools will develop. Misunderstanding leads to lack of community member support of the schools, and in turn lack of support makes the schools unable to meet the needs of students in the community. With our changing society where family members no longer stay at home together to work a farm or family business, the school must take on some of the responsibility of the family of the past to help the student develop socially and emotionally.

Community members working in the Three Forks project have stated many times that they want the school to help the student develop self-reliance, morality, independence, and responsibility. These general goals are related to areas of learning that have not been stressed in the past. A modern school's purpose should reflect modern needs. It is with this in mind that a 1971 statement of the purpose of the Three Forks Schools was made. Each local school needs occasionally to take stock of its general direction and to find out where its community can build understanding, agreement, and support.

If a statement of the purpose of the school is to have any value, the statement must be used as a guide to planning in courses, units, and daily lessons in the school. It is the hope of the Title III advisory committee that this statement will be studied by school community members and used in program development and evaluation.
STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE OF THE THREE FORKS SCHOOLS 1971

The purpose of the schools is to provide each student with the opportunity and encouragement to develop an awareness and growth of his own potentials socially, emotionally, academically, physically, and professionally.

Each student should be able to make and write his own goals, long range and immediate, in his life while he is in school and after he graduates. Education is a never-ending process of presenting people with many different ways of adjusting to and producing in a changing society. Each student should become aware of possible choices and he should become skilled in making choices suitable to his abilities.

Discussion questions are written on the right below:

1. Do we attempt to develop each student academically, socially, and emotionally? How can we tell?
2. Are students continually aware of their development? In all areas? How?
3. How do we know if a student is aware of growing? Do letter grades tell? Would grading each student on his own ability help give each one more opportunity and encouragement?
4. Do our students have goals? Are classroom goals clear to students? Do students know their abilities?
5. Do we teach students to be able to adjust to changes in society? How can we?
6. Does each student relate what he learns in every class to being a productive member of society?
Each student should have an opportunity to recognize and practice thought skills, physical skills, and social skills. He should be helped to know how to learn new concepts. He should have an opportunity to grow in self-acceptance and independence from others. As much as possible, students should be responsible for what they learn.

7. If we want to develop self-reliance, self-acceptance, and independence in students, should we have programs that directly deal with these areas? Should we assume that these areas are developed as a natural outcome of our schools? How can we tell?

8. Do we teach students how (as well as what) to learn?

9. Are students in our school responsible for what they learn?

10. How can mutual respect and acceptance be built? Many social scientists say that communication creates respect. How do we create more communication?

11. Do we have the energy to define "responsibilities?" Can we afford not to?

12. When should definitions be revised?

13. Can we learn to plan together? Can we keep everyone in the community represented?
A comprehensive testing program should be part of the school system to help the student and teacher measure the student's point and rate of development in areas of skill. Subjective evaluation should be available to students to measure their social and emotional development. Questionnaires should be used frequently to measure such things as satisfaction, level of respect, and self-acceptance. Ability to make productive choices should be measured by the student's successful completion of work he chooses to do. Other tests should be made available to students who want to measure their growth as compared to the growth of other students their own age.

Definition of a Teacher:

A teacher is a person who is able to communicate with many students to help them in their effort to develop knowledge and skills about themselves, others, and the world around them. The teacher is a knowledgeable guide who tries to help students develop a desire to learn. He is considered worthy of respect and trust by many people, although he cannot be all things to all people.

14. Does giving tests at the end of class units do what we are asking?

15. How could knowing how fast and how much you have learned help you learn better?

16. What kind of trust must a teacher have with a student to give personal judgement (subjective evaluation) to a student?

17. How do people develop trust with each other?

18. What should teacher training institutions need to do to better prepare teachers to evaluate student development?

19. How much counseling and guidance would need to be added to our program to meet these goals?

20. Do we allow teachers in our present school the time to communicate with students?

21. Can the teacher cover all the material and also provide each student some motivation?

22. How do we guide students who don't like school? How can we tell how many students are satisfied? Is this important?

23. Who is responsible for the dropout?
1971 Statement of the Purpose - Continued

Definition of a Student:

A student is a person seeking through many varied school programs, relationships, and experiences more knowledge of the world and people, more skills development, more self-understanding, and more meaning for life.

24. Do our students seem to have a seeking attitude? How can we tell? How can we develop it?

25. Are our students actively trying to learn, or are they passively waiting to be told?

26. Are our students finding more meaning in life? How can we tell?

Definition of the Curriculum:

The curriculum consists of all experiences that the student has in school. These are all areas of interest considered by cooperating school community members as needed and relevant to modern living.

27. How relevant is everything we teach to each student? Are there areas of need that our curriculum doesn't deal with? What?

The Best Method of Learning:

There are many humane methods of learning, and the best are those that will help each student develop as fast as he can.

28. How much can we use different methods with each student in our school?

If we can use our new purpose to improve our system and if we can prevent misunderstanding in our community, our time has been well spent.
PLANNING PROJECT AREAS OF INTEREST WRITTEN INTO PROBLEM STATEMENTS

Each of the fifteen areas of interest identified during this year's Title III ESEA Planning Project were developed into problem statements by participants in the April 2 and 3 Problem-Development Workshop. The Advisory Committee and Project Director then combined the work into 15 statements. The 15 goals were then combined into the six problems below that need task groups to work on them.

Each statement begins with a description of the problem situation. Then a general comment is made concerning who is affected by the problem, and who or what is causing it. At the end of each statement a possible goal for improvement is written in terms of what ACTION we should begin, what CONDITIONS we want to guide our action, and what MEASURE we might use to determine when we have finished the task.

A more studied analysis of each problem will be the first task of people, a task group, which is named to begin action on a problem. We will probably not be able to work on more than three or four tasks at once to do a good job of keeping everyone informed about work done.

PLEASE READ THE PROBLEM STATEMENTS ON THOSE AREAS IN WHICH YOU HAVE PARTICULAR INTEREST. WE WILL DECIDE WHICH AREAS OR PROBLEMS MIGHT BE SOLVED EASIEST. WE WILL ALSO ASK WHICH PROBLEMS YOU MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN WORKING ON AS A TASK GROUP MEMBER.

A. Combination - Better Financing - Investigate Consolidation - Up-Date Buildings, Facilities, and Equipment.

There seems to be concern that our school system, and others across the country, lack an adequate finance structure. This problem is basic to the entire school system and the community as well. The quality of education; the provision of modern buildings, facilities and equipment; the morale of members of the school community, and the future of locally supported education is at stake. The problem seems to be caused by many factors. It could be caused by lack of communication and interest among community members. If people don't understand or agree with school programs, school special levies can be expected to fail. People wishing to register a protest against higher taxes may do so by voting down school levies, the school elections being one of the last
Planning Project Areas of Interest – Continued 2

places where local people can be heard. The problem may be caused by a lack of satisfactory taxation methods. The problem might also be caused by a lack of available funds. At any rate, the problem is a complex community and social one.

Our Goal for Improvement is to develop a task group to thoroughly study means of improving the financing of our schools. The task group should use outside experts to present alternative types of financing and to suggest methods for better communicating to the community the problems related to financing. The task group may wish to act immediately to develop a process for determining community member’s attitudes about the recent failed school levy and thereby begin developing a list of reasons that the levy failed. The task group should bring together all issues related to financing problems. The task group should identify for the community the important taxation issues being evaluated in the State Legislature, seek and present information concerning alternatives to personal property tax increases for school support, present information on federal and state aids to schools, and the group should investigate consolidation with other local schools as a means of solving the problem. The group should write a methodical plan for approaching the many parts of the problem. The end goal is to provide the school with a program of financial support that can satisfy needs identified by cooperative community planning and to avoid the loss of time and morale caused by failed mill levies. We will know when our goals are met when a task group presents its various reports, when community members can on a questionnaire indicate that they can name the ways that the school is financially supported, and when needs identified through cooperative community planning can be presented to the community for support and get support.

B. Need for Vo-Tech Education

Many people feel that the schools don't always seem to aim toward providing all students with an opportunity to develop potential skills that could be applied in careers. Many people seem to feel that all students, college bound or not, should have an opportunity to develop vocational-technical skills that could help students be able to perform useful and needed jobs that would bring the individual financial independence immediately after high school graduation and later if need be. Many people stress that every student should become familiar with the world of work and prepare himself to produce in as many ways as possible. The schools do not seem today to offer many vo-tech opportunities, and many people feel that the schools are not adequately providing for the needs of all of the students or for the needs of society.
Planning Project Areas of Interest - Continued 3

The problem is caused by a lack of staff to direct a vo-tech program and by a lack of previous effort by anyone to begin developing a program of cooperation among home economics, business, vocational agriculture, and local businesses. The problem also may be one of lack of information among school community members or, in some groups, a lack of acceptance of such a program.

Our Goal for Improvement is to name a task group of school community members to seek and present to the community information on the current planning that has been done by the superintendent and staff on development of a vo-tech or cooperative education program. The group may also choose to try to present to the community at large information about federal funding available for support of vo-tech programs and to inform the community about purposes of a program of this type as developed by Montana Vocational Education representatives of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since the May 15 special school election includes funds for a program of this type, the task group, if developed, in April may wish to campaign to pass the mill levy which includes the development of a vo-tech project. The task group should develop a working relationship between the high school and local businesses through publicity and conferences. The group should help the superintendent when possible in the selection of well-qualified staff members to work in the project. The measure of success this year will be the passing of the mill levy and the creation of opportunities in the school and community for students to begin next fall work in a developed program.

C. Expand the Program to Meet Individual Learning Needs and Interests - Develop a Broader, less competitive, P.E. Program - Decide Who Teaches Values.

Some people feel that the schools do not adequately provide each student with an ample opportunity to develop his interests or to satisfy his individual needs. Community members and students have asked for more breadth and depth in the curriculum, and that the school respond to current needs. While to list areas of expansion desired by community members would be too long here, the expansion of P.E. offerings, the development of more academic electives, and the development of improved methods for providing attention to individual students were frequently mentioned.

The problem is probably caused first by the tradition of our schools to be oriented toward teaching certain subjectives and electives over the past years. Scheduling methods used in our schools, grading methods,
grouping methods, and training of teachers are all part of school organi­zational reasons that more options may not be offered. Attitudes of teachers, parents, and community members may also be related to problems in broadening the curriculum or changing the organization of the school's program. The problem affects all students, since our curriculum offerings today determine the daily activities of each student as he is part of a group.

Our Goal for Improvement is to develop a task group to study and present information to the community on alternative methods of expanding the curriculum. The group should investigate and present results of studies of types of individualized instruction and non-graded schools in which students progress at their own rate through a very extensive list of offerings. It has been suggested that workshops and in-service training sessions be held to begin bringing about orderly communication about task group work, and to encourage implementation of a broader type of instruction over the next five years. Measure of the success of the task group at first will be in their holding community meetings on the topic to acquaint the community with it. The task group may with Title III funds next year want to hire a consultant to help begin a pilot project. Also a measure of the success of the group will be an increase in the amount of school community satisfaction with the relevance and diversity of the program. The increase can be measured on a questionnaire.

As a part of an interest in evaluating the school's offerings some people are concerned that teachers don't seem to be directly teaching students values. While students are being affected by this lack of opportunity to learn, society also may be affected because people growing up without a strong sense of right and wrong may not help society to maintain stability. While this problem may be a student problem and a society problem, it also becomes an individual problem because of the difficulty for our society to agree on the meaning of values and which of those loosely defined concepts should be taught by the school and which should be the responsibility of other social institutions. Rapid social change resulting from developing technology and growing numbers of people cause values once certain to be questioned and the results is that some students find little to believe in firmly and these people may not allow society to grow gradually but may cause society to become unstable.

A task force of people should study what members of the school community feel are values and which values can be agreed upon as to be taught by the school. We will know when this task group has achieved its
Planning Project Areas of Interest - Continued

first goal when the results of questionnaires on values are presented in a community meeting. If a consensus can be made by the community on definitions of the desired values, and if a list of agreed-on values is presented for the school to teach, the school must be given a means of measuring the teaching of these values.

Some people feel that providing counseling services is part of expanding and individualizing the school's program. As an immediate step, this task group may wish to investigate methods of encouraging community members to support the May 15 mill levy which includes funds for guidance and counseling.

D. Combination - Improve School-Community-Board Relationship - Define Student Freedom and Responsibility.

The members of the school community have a problem of lack of communication caused by infrequent involvement in common meetings. The Goal for Improvement is to develop a task group of school community people to conduct at least twice a year a community meeting or communications problem-solving workshop involving students, faculty, board members, and community members and to develop these meetings around the goal of improving relationships by building communication among school community members. The task group should also be responsible for investigating the development of a superintendent's newsletter to the community about board meetings and school events. The group will also function to ensure that news coverage is obtained for all school events. The measure of the success of the group will be in improving the kind of responses school community members make on questionnaires related to school-community-board relationships and sent to community periodically.

To improve school community relationships a task force should immediately direct attention to defining student freedom and responsibility. There seems to be confusion in the community about the meaning of student freedom and responsibility. The problem is affecting the community because many community members seem to feel that the students have too much freedom without responsibility, and this may be producing a lack of unified community support of the schools. It is also affecting the students because they feel that they don't know what is expected of them by the community or by the school. There is pressure on administration and the teachers from the community because the faculty is unsure what rules the total community wants to guide the school.
The problem is one of the school and community not clearly understanding one another. It is a communication problem. Our Goal for improvement is to develop a task group of people to find ways of bringing about communication about the terms among the school community members and to build consensus on the terms and community expectations. It might be possible for the task group to work directly with students, staff, and administration in conjunction with current problem-solving being done in the school. The task force, students, faculty, and administration might attempt to focus a meeting on this one issue. The results of the task group's work would be presented to the community and administration as a guide to the development of a school handbook on student, teacher, administrator, community member responsibilities. This task force should try to meet this goal this year, if possible, to guide policies for next fall. The measure of the success of the task group will be in terms of their building a definition that community members can in a questionnaire accept, and success also measured by how the definition as accepted by staff, students, and community as indicated by a lack of complaints on the issue as heard by administration and community next fall as measured by a questionnaire.

E. Emphasis on the Primary Grades - Get a Good Start in Kindergarten.

Many community members feel that more emphasis should be placed on providing at the primary level more physical and emotional readiness testing, and attention to the development of each child. Many people seem to feel as well that measurement and development of a child's physical and emotional skills should begin in a formal kindergarten program, which Three Forks does not have at present. People seem to feel that children of primary age level are not being provided enough individual attention because of a lack of adequate and available testing and because of a lack of a kindergarten program. There seems to be an interest in developing a primary program, with a kindergarten, in which individual attention to children can insure their placement in material in which they can continually achieve without the disappointment of failure.

Our Goal for Improvement is to develop a task group to seek and present information on kindergarten program development and on primary level testing programs. The general goal is to establish a compulsory kindergarten in the Three Forks Schools. The group's success will be measured by the development of a kindergarten program, a primary testing program, and a primary program which can develop each individual student to his ability.
Planning Project Areas of Interest - Continued

F. Adult Education Needs

The school facility sits unused for a large portion of its life, and if it were open to all students, including adults, many people feel it would be better used and also satisfy more of the community's needs.

Adults desiring training, high school equivalency diplomas, educational interest outlets, and general education courses are being denied an opportunity to go to school because of tradition regarding use of public school facilities.

Our Goal for Improvement is to develop a task group to first contact Mr. Brent Polton, Adult Education Specialist, Office of the Montana Superintendent of Public Instruction, about available funds and programs for development of adult education programs in the state. The group should present a report of this information at a community meeting and then begin a study of community interest in adult education. The measure of the success of the task group will be in their bringing about the implementation of an Adult Education Program in the Three Forks schools.

The four remaining areas of interest might be combined into a board, faculty, and administration problem to solve. These areas seem to be the responsibility of the staff and board. A task group representing these groups should be formed to meet the following goals:

- **Maintain A Good Staff** - Clarify Teacher Duties, Prerogatives, and Respect
- **Hire a Counselor for the Elementary and Secondary Levels**
- **Investigate the Usefulness of Tenure**

School community members are very concerned that a good staff is maintained in the schools. Our Goal for Improvement is to ask the staff, board, and administration to develop a task group soon to construct criteria for maintaining and evaluating a good staff. The results should be presented at a community meeting for the consideration of school community members. The measure of the success of the group will be in their ability to show that the staff continually meets the criteria, that school community members answering questionnaires indicate approval of the staff, and that staff improvement programs are developed and carried out. One of the functions of the task group will be to clarify in writing teacher duties, prerogatives, and respect and present the re-
Another task will be to investigate and present to the community the influence of tenure in the maintenance of a good staff.

Many people feel that each student should have the opportunity to get individual career guidance and personal counseling. The schools do not have a professional counselor available full-time to provide this service. Our Goal for Improvement is for the board and administration to hire a full-time counselor for the elementary and secondary levels. The passing of the May 15 mill levy would provide the satisfaction of this goal.
PHASE V OF THE PROJECT WAS TO PRESENT RESULTS OF COMMUNITY EFFORT AND TO DEVELOP TASK GROUPS.

1. How satisfied were you with this meeting in general? Circle one number.

- Very Little
  - (1.9%) 1
  - (13.5%) 2
  - (26.9%) 3
  - (38.5%) 4
  - (19.2%) 5

2. How much do you understand the 1971 statement of the purpose of the Three Forks Schools?

- Very Little
  - (3.8%) 1
  - (1.9%) 2
  - (32.7%) 3
  - (40.4%) 4
  - (21.1%) 5

3. How much do you feel that this statement of purpose is one that you can support?

- Very Little
  - (1.9%) 1
  - (1.9%) 2
  - (36.5%) 3
  - (36.5%) 4
  - (23.5%) 5

4. How much do you feel that you understand how the problem statements were developed?

- Very Little
  - (0.0%) 1
  - (7.8%) 2
  - (35.3%) 3
  - (33.3%) 4
  - (23.5%) 5

5. How satisfied were you with the 6 issues combined from the 15 Issues of main importance and written into behavioral terms?

- Very Little
  - (9.6%) 1
  - (19.2%) 2
  - (17.3%) 3
  - (26.9%) 4
  - (26.9%) 5

6. How valuable to task groups do you feel the problem statements will be?

- Very Little
  - (1.9%) 1
  - (3.8%) 2
  - (28.8%) 3
  - (40.4%) 4
  - (25.0%) 5

(Continued on next page)
7. How satisfied were you with the development of task groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.9%) 1</td>
<td>(21.1%) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What would you say was the most valuable outcome of the total project this year?

Sample of comments attached

We need to know how you feel about the project. Your opinions will be measured by Title III officials in Helena who considers the success of the first year of three year projects.

9. How successful has the project been during its first year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%) 1</td>
<td>(11.8%) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment:

Sample of comments attached

10. How effective has the director of the project been this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%) 1</td>
<td>(23.0%) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How worthy is the project of federal funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.9%) 1</td>
<td>(28.8%) 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you feel there have been changes in the community, school, or individuals as a result of the Project?

Yes **(80.7%)**

No **(11.5%)**

Please comment on any changes you have seen.

Sample of comments attached

(Continued on next page)
13. What parts of the project have you liked best?

Sample of comments attached

14. How could the project be improved?

Sample of comments attached

Additional Comments:

Sample of responses to open-ended questions above:

Question 8
A awareness of school needs
Actually getting task forces on the job
Got to know more people
Learning to communicate with people
Community becoming more involved in school affairs

Question 9
Most people attending are very interested in improving school
It has brought out feelings, goals – both good and bad
An awakening of the minds of our society and school
A good start
Previously unstated problems are now clear and can be given attention

Question 12
Awareness of our mutual aims and concepts
Much improved communication among a few people
The community is speaking out
More positive attitudes towards our school
Increased feelings for all

Question 13
Workshop and program on individualized instruction
Getting other opinions
Talks by individuals and slides shown – being able to state likes and dislikes
All have brought another aspect and awareness
Interchange of thoughts

Question 14
More people participating in it
Better explanation from beginning
More involvement, review contacts
To have creative results for the tasks to help people see that they really can have a voice and that voice can bring about change. That will create more confidence in people’s ability to change things.
Task Group Meetings – May into July

Each task group was given the following NWREL Research Utilization
in Problem Solving Handouts at the first two task group meetings:

1. Steps in Problem Solving
2. Features of a Successful Task Group
3. The Force-Field Analysis
4. A Case Study of the Problem Solving Process
5. Using Force-Field Analysis
6. Five Resources in Planning and Taking Action

Each task group studied the handouts with the project director.

The first task of each task group was to insure that all parts
of the school organization affected by a task group had representatives
on the individual task groups. Each task group appointed a secretary
and a chairman. Task group secretaries gave reports of task group meet-
ings to the advisory group so that the advisory group could coordinate
task group efforts and decide when general community meetings should be
held. Each task group began their work with a force-field analysis of
how to better identify and diagnose their problem.
APPENDIX D

RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY PROJECT SURVEY WITH COMMENTS
SURVEY RESULTS BY PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
(421 People Responded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of years you have resided in this district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4-10 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>11 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Blank Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results - Continued

| Group (1) | 88 | 1-8 years |
| Group (2) | 79 | 9-10 " |
| Group (3) | 111 | 11-12 " |
| Group (4) | 81 | 13-16 " |
| Group (5) | 36 | more than 16 |
|           | 26 | Blank Surveys |

How to read Charts:

There are six columns in each chart.

Column (1) shows the percentage of people answering a given question with response No. (1) or "Very Much."

Columns (2), (3), (4), and (5) also correspond to the same numbers of the survey responses.

Column (6) shows the percentage of people who did not answer a given question.

The percentage of people answering a question with a particular response is written above the appropriate column.

Column (1) Very Much (2) Much (3) Moderately
(4) Somewhat (5) Very Little (6) Blank Survey

SAMPLE GRAPH

Percentages

(Same as question response numbers)
Survey Results - Continued

QUESTION NUMBER ONE: How much of an opportunity has the school system provided you to express your opinions and feelings on school issues and decisions in the past?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 9 19 20 43</td>
<td>8 10 20 29 30</td>
<td>0 15 23 30 15</td>
<td>4 4 19 11 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER TWO: How satisfied have you been in the past with the amount of influence you have personally had in evaluating school programs, policies, and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 11 19 13 4 1</td>
<td>6 14 25 13 39</td>
<td>0 15 30 11 30 11</td>
<td>4 5 13 13 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER THREE: How well do you know about the total program your school has offered in the past few years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 8 25 23 35 0</td>
<td>1 8 27 30 31 0</td>
<td>26 30 23 0 7 11</td>
<td>6 4 24 19 45 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey Results - Continued**

**QUESTION NUMBER FOUR:** In the future would you like to see more people in the community involved in evaluating school programs, policies, and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 19 17 8 3 0</td>
<td>55 23 13 5 1 0</td>
<td>34 7 19 6 11 0</td>
<td>51 15 19 8 4 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION NUMBER FIVE:** In the past how well do you feel the faculty, students, and people in the community worked together to improve their educational system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 10 23 34 0</td>
<td>8 14 29 24 23 0</td>
<td>3 7 19 30 30 7</td>
<td>2 7 21 20 47 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION NUMBER SIX:** How well do you think the schools have satisfied the educational needs and interests of all of the people they have served?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 21 14 15 10 1</td>
<td>10 25 39 14 8 1</td>
<td>0 19 42 26 7 3</td>
<td>4 17 48 14 14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results - Continued

QUESTION NUMBER SEVEN: How active do you feel that community members have been in developing goals that they felt the school should try to follow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 8 22 28 35 2</td>
<td>6 1 29 30 21 0</td>
<td>0 3 3 26 53 11</td>
<td>1 7 16 26 45 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER EIGHT: In the past how much has the school system recognized, clarified, and offered for public discussion the important educational problems the school faced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 4 15 21 52 2</td>
<td>4 7 21 25 39 1</td>
<td>3 3 0 23 57 11</td>
<td>1 2 11 17 64 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER NINE: How much do you feel that your school system is in need of improvement? (If you think change is needed, you may want to offer suggestions at the bottom of this page.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 18 26 20 18 3</td>
<td>12 14 20 21 30 0</td>
<td>7 19 46 11 3 11</td>
<td>15 21 28 22 8 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6
QUESTION NUMBER TEN: In the past how much do you feel there has been an atmosphere of mutual respect and acceptance among students, faculty members, community members, and administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 11 31 18 32 1</td>
<td>5 13 26 20 33 1</td>
<td>0 15 38 23 19 3</td>
<td>4 8 34 15 34 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER ELEVEN: How well do you feel that your school system has used the resources of its staff and community in the past to provide the school's educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 16 33 24 14 4</td>
<td>8 21 33 24 8 3</td>
<td>3 7 34 26 11 15</td>
<td>4 11 34 25 20 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER TWELVE: How satisfied have you been with the quality of instruction in your schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 27 35 14 9 1</td>
<td>19 30 26 14 9 0</td>
<td>11 42 30 7 0 7</td>
<td>6 22 45 14 9 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION NUMBER THIRTEEN: How well do you feel that the school's facilities and equipment have provided for the school's educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 26 38 16 5 1</td>
<td>18 29 28 16 7 0</td>
<td>3 30 42 19 0 3</td>
<td>6 23 46 15 4 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER FOURTEEN: How well do you feel that your school board has served the best interests of the student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 20 28 18 21 1</td>
<td>10 21 30 17 19 0</td>
<td>3 19 23 30 11 11</td>
<td>6 20 28 18 24 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION NUMBER FIFTEEN: Would you be personally interested in spending about two hours each month during this winter discussing educational issues with other community members? (Meeting times and group membership would be determined by members of the groups.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Community Member Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 17 19 10 14 6</td>
<td>31 17 21 12 15 1</td>
<td>30 26 19 3 15 3</td>
<td>28 14 19 9 15 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS FROM COMMUNITY EDUCATION SURVEY SENT OUT FALL OF 1970

About one-half of the community members returning surveys wrote comments in the space provided on the last page for comments. These comments were typed exactly as written and they were included in a booklet. The comments seemed to fall into the categories below. Each individual recorded comment was preceded by a label (parent, student, community member, etc.), and a number. The number was that which was put on the survey to enable the original comment to be found.

CATEGORIES INTO WHICH COMMENTS SEEMED TO FIT:

SCHOOL PERSONNEL

INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD & EVALUATION

THE SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

SCHOOL POLICIES, RULES, STUDENT BEHAVIOR

VALUE OF SURVEY AND/OR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF SCHOOL

COMMUNITY EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS

SUBJECT MATTER SUGGESTIONS:
   General
   Language
   Art & Music
   Physical Education

SCHOOL FACILITIES & SERVICES

(A sample of 23 pages of obtained comments is included here.)
1970 Survey Comments

SCHOOL PERSONNEL:

0050
Parent 8
The elected School board becomes a cliche after election and will not discuss issues concerning us and teachers.

0184
Hi School
Make sure teachers are well qualified - for example - When my classmates and I were freshmen - we had a terrible algebra teacher. We are still hindered in trig and college algebra because we never learned the basic fundamentals from the beginning.

0035
Parent 7
More attention to total needs of the child - not just academic - but also emotional, social, physical.

0056
Community Member
Being a former Grad. (1967) I feel high school provided very little in helping choose my vocation also very little in facing the world after Graduation Day.

INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD & EVALUATION:

0018
Parent 7
I feel that our school systems today try to push the children too fast. Sometimes too much homework does not allow for any outside activities such as music, etc.

0107
Jr. Hi Student
More freedom for students in Jr. High. More right to say something in reason without getting sent to the office. Teachers should talk to you more than at you. Students are people. Don't forget, give them more freedom.

0172
Teacher
Teaching aids have been upgraded in past considerably. There is much old equipment at hand. Some classes are oversize for particular curriculum which limits doing job. The student is often lost in scheduling - can't always choose subject he wants.

0168
Hi School
One of the main things I don't like is grading according to how smart you are with no averages. I think we should be graded on how well we can learn.
1970 Survey Comments - Continued

THE SCHOOL’S EDUCATION PROGRAM:

0401 Parent 7  I feel the atmosphere has changed a lot this year. For the first time in years I felt welcome when I visited both grade and high school parent teacher conference.

0252 Hi School I like the way the administration is acting on ideas & problems. Our administration, in my opinion, is very fair in the way it is running the school.

0238 Hi School I think this school year will go real well because the students have the chance to do more things & prove themselves. We also have a great superintendent.

0172 Teacher 4 Students and faculty enjoy the freedom as of lately - Hope we can keep this.

SCHOOL POLICIES, RULES, STUDENT BEHAVIOR:

0356 Parent 7-9 Physical punishment should be done at home not by the "Teachers." When correction is needed the parents should be told by the teacher.

0399 Parent 7 Our only gripe (loudest) is school lunch and that only for the "shortage" of it. Time, as with the teachers, should improve that as well.

0094 Jr. Hi Student The kids of Three Forks need to read over their manners and respect for themselves and teachers.

0071 Parent 8 Presuming there are some rules of conduct of necessity made for school operation, are they not analogous to students as are laws to adults? If so, and I think they are, then their complete enforcement is necessary lest the young folk feel that laws in adulthood can as easily be ignored and violated. Proper conduct in school could help reduce crime. The drop-out, of course, is outside the reach of school authority but until he does drop out he is fully within
VALUE OF SURVEY AND/OR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:

0171 Teacher 4
I would be glad to participate in community endeavors to discuss the welfare of the entire school program. Not a PTA gripe session - not a one family complaint offering - but an all-around feeling of selfless effort.

0155 Hi School
I still feel we have some problems in our education system, but none too great they can't be solved for the benefit of everyone, if we all pull together.

0408 Parent 7-8
I would be willing to help our school in any way possible and thank you and commend the new administration on their interest in the school and community.

0360 Parent 9
This school system has been in need of a very drastic change for the last eleven years.

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF SCHOOL:

Comment Only Parent 8
I do not feel qualified to answer these questions since my children graduated several years ago.

0396 Elem. Teacher
One community member expressed to me that they felt unqualified to criticize the school either pos. or neg. is why they didn't fill out the survey - possibly why a lack of participation.

Comment Only Parent 8
Have not had any children in school for past 10 or 15 years.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS:

0372 Parent 8
Administrative school faculty are professionals in that field and school board members generally are among the best informed in that field. They have been elected or hired to set school policies. That is how it should be. Total community policy making might lead to regressive policies. In a community of this size, school board members and faculty are known and available for informal discussions concerning school activities so persons really interested in school functions can easily make their views known.
1970 Survey Comments - Continued

Community Education Relationships - Continued

0339 Parent 7-8
I feel that the community should be free to attend any or all school board meetings.

0302 Parent 7
I do feel the public should participate more in the school system.

0034 Parent 8
Lack of communication between school board members and parents. (Some teachers included)

SUBJECT MATTER SUGGESTIONS:

0396 Elem. Teacher
Also, I feel counseling is becoming a must in all grades.

0014 Parent 8
Your English instruction has been weak as evidenced by students' performance in the Universities.

0070 Comm. Member
Two courses which I think should be initiated into the school are: Sex education. A good language course - German, French or Spanish.

0001 Parent 7
Every child in school should be able to participate in a sport. Perhaps a volley ball team and a tumbling class. All girls need more exercise and need to participate in a sport. They get a few dreary exercises to do.

SCHOOL FACILITIES & SERVICES:

0408 Parent 7-8
I would like to see the basement of the new gym turned into a recreation area and opened up in the evenings for the young people to use. I believe this could be done with volunteer help.

0165 Hi School
Better lighting in the halls, a cleaner building, wash the windows and keep them clean.

0001 Parent 7
The old gym should be available to the community. I'd like to see children playing ball in there after school and on weekends.
APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF SUBGROUP MEMBERS ATTENDING MEETINGS OF THE PROJECT
SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF SUBGROUP MEMBERS ATTENDING MEETINGS OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randomly Selected Community Members</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Community Members</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board &amp; Adminis.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly Selected Students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>