

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-23,949

MARTIN, Billy Eugene, 1928-
ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH ACCREDITATION: AN
ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PUBLIC SCHOOL ACCREDITATION
AND ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS OF STATE
DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1973
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH ACCREDITATION: AN ANALYSIS
OF CURRENT PUBLIC SCHOOL ACCREDITATION AND
ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS OF STATE
DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
BILL E. MARTIN
Norman, Oklahoma
1973

ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH ACCREDITATION: AN ANALYSIS
OF CURRENT PUBLIC SCHOOL ACCREDITATION AND
ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS OF STATE
DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

APPROVED BY

Harry R. Linder
Jack F. Parker
Philip B. B.
Charles S. Butler

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to those persons whose assistance was imperative for the completion of this study.

First, acknowledgment of profound appreciation is due Dr. Glenn R. Snider for his excellent direction of this study. Appreciation is also extended to the other members of the dissertation committee, Dr. Robert Bibens, Dr. Charles Butler, and Dr. Jack Parker. A special thanks is extended to Dr. Gerald Kidd. The guidance and cooperation of these persons was most instrumental during the conduct of this study.

Second, special thanks are extended to members of State Accreditation Committee and other State and National professional educators who provided invaluable assistance in the development of instruments used in this study.

This acknowledgment would be incomplete without expressing a special note of gratitude to my wife Charlsie, and to our children, Deana, Dan, and David for their unselfish assistance and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background, Need and Purpose of of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	15
Delimitations of the Study	17
Methodology	18
Organization of the Study	20
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	21
Introduction	21
A Review of the Literature Pertaining to the Accreditation Process	22
A Review of the Literature Pertaining to the Concept of Accountability	31
Summary	48
III. AN ANALYSIS OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCREDITATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES	50
Introduction	50
Legal Authority for the Accreditation of Public Schools	53
Status of Required or Voluntary Programs for Accreditation	57
Classification Categories and Terms	61
Purposes of State Accreditation	67
The Meaning of State Accreditation	73
Review and Revision of Accreditation Standards	76
State Accrediting Committees	82
Practices Concerning On-Site Visits	84
Summary	87

Chapter	Page
IV. ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION AND LEADERSHIP	89
Legal Responsibilities for State Accountability Programs	90
Profiles of New State Accreditation/ Accountability Programs	93
Leadership Roles and Responsibilities of State Education Agencies	128
Summary	138
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	141
Summary	141
Major Findings	143
Conclusions	146
Recommendations	147
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152
APPENDIX A--STATE QUESTIONNAIRE	157
APPENDIX B--EDUCATORS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE REFINEMENT OF THE STATE QUESTIONNAIRE .	163
APPENDIX C--INSTRUMENT USED IN VALIDATING THE PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITATION	165
APPENDIX D--EDUCATORS WHO SERVED AS JURORS IN VALIDATING THE PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITATION	169
APPENDIX E--LETTERS OF INQUIRY AND TRANSMITTAL . . .	171

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Accreditation of Public Schools With Respect to State Legal Authority	54
2. Accreditation Practices of State Departments of Education	57
3. State Department of Education Accreditation Practices Relating to Classification Categories	62
4. Purposes of State Department of Education Relating to the Accreditation of Public Schools	70
5. Meaning of State Accreditation	74
6. Involvement in the Review and Revision of State Department of Education Accreditation Standards	77
7. Practice of State Department of Education Concerning On-Site Visits	85

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background, Need and Purpose of the Study

Background

Each state is responsible to its citizens for the quality of public school education within its borders. This responsibility is authorized by state constitutions and statutes. Normally, legal authority to meet such state responsibility is vested in the State Department of Education, State Board of Education or the Chief State School Officer.¹ The methods and procedures by which the State Department of Education carries out this responsibility are a matter of vital importance.

Approval or accreditation by the State Department of Education should be a very useful tool in stimulating, encouraging, and assisting local school officials in the improvement of their education facilities and programs. Ostensively, the state programs further attest to the public and the school patron that the local school district has the administration,

¹For the purposes of this study, the term "State Education Agency" refers to the State Board of Education, the Chief State School Officer, or the staff of the State Department of Education as is appropriate in the context.

faculty, program and facilities which should provide at least an adequate, if not an excellent, learning situation for all students who may attend school, and that these students should each find an equal opportunity to develop their capabilities to the utmost.

The meaning and usage of the terms "approval" and "accreditation" varied considerably throughout the various State Departments of Education. What was understood to be an approval program in one state may, in another state, be an accreditation program. Within a given state the State Department of Education may "approve" some schools while "accrediting" others. In another state some schools may be only "approved" while others were both "approved" and "accredited."

Accreditation of a school by a State Department of Education almost always required an exercise of judgment of the quality of the school, whereas the approval of a school may, or may not, have required an exercise of the judgment of quality. The term "approval" was used when the State Education Agency was administering a specific state statute directing that the public schools be approved for a specific benefit.

For example, a state statute might require a school to meet certain criteria, such as the number of days required to be taught during a school year and the employment of certified teachers. If the State Department of Education ascertained that the school had complied with the law, then the

school would be approved and receive state financial aid. In this situation the State Department of Education made no attempt to inquire into or judge the quality of a school's program and facilities.

On the other hand, a State Department of Education might approve only certain phases of a school's program, such as the course of study, textbooks, or adequacy of facilities. The state agency might administer one or several such approval programs without, however, exercising a judgment on the quality of the total school.

An examination of the various state accreditation manuals and handbooks revealed a considerable diversity among the state agencies as to the meaning of the terms "approval" and "accreditation." The Council of Chief State School Officers defined approval and accreditation as follows:

Approval is defined as the official act of the State Department of Education certifying that a school or a school system complies with laws, rules and regulations for administrative purposes.¹

Approval may be mandatory in some instances but in others may be voluntary. In either case, the legal basis for the approval may be a statute or a regulation of the State Board of Education having the force of law. In most cases, the criteria for approval, as opposed to accreditation, were quantitative in character and limited in scope.

¹Council of Chief State School Officers, Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools, (Washington, D.C., 1960), pp. 3-4.

Accreditation is defined as an official decision by the State Department of Education that, in the judgment of the department, a school or school system has met the standards of quality established by the state.¹

Accreditation may be based on minimum requirements only or on a system of classification reflecting higher levels of adequacy. Unless made mandatory by state statute or regulation, accreditation was normally voluntary on the part of local schools and school systems.

The terms "approval" and "accreditation" were used synonymously throughout this study unless otherwise indicated. They referred to activities of the State Education Agency concerned with standards for regulating the approval, establishment, and operation of schools within the state. This includes activities such as the application and enforcement of standards prescribed by law or regulation, the development and application of rules and regulations as mandated by law, and the establishment of accreditation that may exceed basic approval.

Accreditation often involves one of the older kinds of formal evaluation. It would be a difficult, if not an impossible task, to trace programs of approval and accreditation of public schools by State Departments of Education to a definite point of origin. Generally speaking, many approval programs of the State Departments of Education grew out of responsibilities, delegated to them by the legislature for

¹Ibid., p. 5.

the administration of state financial aids or for the establishment of uniform systems of instruction.¹

Since broad authority has been delegated by the states to local school officials for the management and operation of the schools, states have had to establish safeguards which would insure a minimum performance. Approval programs have become a principal instrument of many state educational authorities in the exercise of this regulatory function.

Regulatory responsibilities of State Departments of Education varied widely, depending upon the degree to which the legislature enacted specific standards or delegated broad responsibilities to the state agency, the programs for approval of schools varied greatly from state to state.²

The sixties saw many changes in the United States and the world in technological fields, in concern about environment, and in human relationships. There will be more changes in the decades of the seventies and eighties. Education, too, made numerous advances in the last decade. But it lagged in important respects and must be drastically modified and improved if it is to meet the increasing demands for accountability. One of the significant reasons education has lagged has been that many State Departments of Education have been

¹William B. Rich, Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools, the Responsibilities and Services of State Departments of Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin No. 36, 1960, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 1.

²Ibid.

reluctant to provide leadership in bringing about needed changes in accreditation policies and procedures.

The Concept of Accountability

Accountability has become an increasingly popular and controversial concept among educators and laymen. Accountability is both simple and complex; it can be applied to the activities of an individual, a school, a school system, a community, a state or a nation. To some people accountability suggests financial responsibility and business management; others think of accountability in terms of student learning. From a practical standpoint accountability can apply to these and many other activities. The preponderance of literature that is now available on the subject suggests that accountability is a concept that could well become one of the most important educational movements in the decade of the 1970's and schools are undergoing increasing pressure to demonstrate and report the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, of their programs.

Several writers have attempted to explain why the taxpayer is becoming increasingly restive with the system of public education. One such writer, Rice, stated:

Public education is not our special birthright. Rather, it is a tax-supported service in which teachers participate. Public education belongs to all the people, and

all the people have the right to seek its improvement, to determine its purposes, and to evaluate its outcomes.¹

According to Sciara and Jantz:

Accountability has been transformed from a theoretical notion to a formidable force in American education because of the grave concern shown by the federal government, politicians, taxpayers and unhappy parents. No longer are the majority of the taxpayers satisfied with the old triad of the past; qualified teachers, the latest equipment and methods, and modern school plants--indicators of effective schools.²

Another explanation of why the public has generated an intense interest in accountability was offered in this explanation by Roueche, Baker and Brownell:

The concept of educational accountability has been around for many years. Perhaps the best explanation for the historic rejection of the concept is what might be called educational determinism and the consequent acceptance of student failure. Simply stated, educational determinism is the belief that people have a predetermined capacity for learning, a capacity best defined by intelligence quotient. This being the case, it is reasonable and acceptable that an increasing number of students will fail as they climb the educational ladder. Until recently this belief in a limited and predetermined capacity to learn precluded the idea of accountability for learning. Currently this belief in educational determinism is being discarded by a growing number of people. By now, given the evidence of many studies and the re-examination of basic beliefs about learning, many notable educational researchers and writers are arguing that almost all students can learn if a variety of

¹Arthur H. Rice, "Good Teachers Stand to Benefit from Accountability Plans," Nation's Schools, 86:16, December, 1970.

²Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz, Accountability in American Education (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 5.

instructional approaches are available and if sufficient time is allowed each student.¹

The changing beliefs about learning and what can reasonably be expected of students, schools, and education has led to a growing interest in accountability. No longer will the public accept wide-spread failure and attrition. As Silberman so aptly stated, "It is only when men sense the possibility of improvement, in fact, that they become dissatisfied with their situation and rebel against it."²

The word accountability was laden with a host of meanings, and, because of the newness of the term, a precise definition has yet to emerge. The writer examined a number of definitions of accountability coined by educational writers. Notable among these were: Vlaanderen and Ludka,³

¹ John E. Roueche, George A. Baker, and Richard L. Brownell, "Accountability in the Two Year College," in Accountability in American Education, Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz, eds, (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 186 .

² Charles Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 10.

³ Russell B. Vlaanderen, and Arthur P. Ludka, "Evaluating Education in a Changing Society," in Emerging State Responsibilities for Education, Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser, eds., (Denver, Colo.: Designing Education for the Future, 1969), p. 145.

Snider and Hall,¹ Harris and Seibert,² Meade,³ and Morphet, Jesser and Ludka.⁴

In each of the definitions of accountability presented by the aforementioned writers, common components or characteristics were observed. For the purpose of this study the following components have constituted and embodied the meaning of educational accountability.

Accountability accented results: Accountability focused directly on the output of an educational system as opposed to what goes into it. If schools existed only for the purpose of causing learning, then educators should re-evaluate the results of their efforts. Teaching should cause learning. If learning does not occur, then teaching has not taken place.

Lessinger, former Associate Commissioner of Education, has stated clearly the urgent need for accenting results:

¹Glenn Snider and Donald J. Hall, "The Accountability Concept and Testing Programs," The Oklahoma Teacher, (53:3, November, 1971), p. 23.

²Yeuell Y. Harris and Ivan N. Seibert, The State-Education Agency, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Handbook VII, 1970, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 140.

³Edward J. Meade, Jr., "Accountability and Governance in Public Education," (address to the Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Atlantic City, N.J., February 12, 1968), p. 3.

⁴Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser, and Authur P. Ludka, eds., "Emerging State Responsibilities for Education," Improving Leadership in Education (Denver, Colo.), p. 86.

. . . the American educational commitment has been that every child should have an adequate education. This commitment has been stated in terms of resources such as teachers, books, space, and equipment. When a child has failed to learn, school personnel have assigned him a label--"slow" or "unmotivated," or "retarded." Our schools must assume a revised commitment--that every child shall learn. Such a commitment includes the willingness to change a system which does not work, and find one which does; to seek causes of failure in the system and its personnel instead of focusing solely on the use of resources.¹

Accountability required evaluation: Accountability suggests that we stop counting the number of volumes in the library, quit measuring square footage per student, and start looking at how well students are being taught. Educators must use relevant criteria to evaluate teaching. Learning, the only valid evidence of teaching, can be defined as a change in behavior. If specific behavioral objectives are established, educators may be held accountable for students who are able to demonstrate learning by acting in ways that were impossible before teaching took place.

The concept of accountability was based on specifically defined objectives, evaluation procedures that described what the teacher intended to accomplish, and instructional methods which insured that most students would obtain the objectives.

Accountability assumed and shifted responsibility:
Accountability assumed responsibility for the success or

¹Leon Lessinger, "Accountability in Education," (National Committee in Support of Public Schools, February, 1970), p. 1.

failure of individual schools and pupils.¹ Students have traditionally been held responsible through tests and recitations for whatever they may or may not have learned. Accountability has shifted the emphasis of that responsibility away from the student.

Another associate commissioner, Davies, has said:

This concept of accountability . . . links student performance with teacher performance. . . . It means . . . that schools and colleges will be judged by how they perform not by what they promise. It means . . . shifting primary responsibility from the student to the school. It also means that a lot of people are going to be shaken up.²

Accountability means involvement: The accountability concept included the notion that the school should be accountable to the people of the state, the local school patrons and to the student of the school for the development of the most challenging programs for children and youth. For this end to be achieved, the people of the community, the administration and faculty of the school and the students served by the school should, in appropriate degree, be involved in identification of educational objectives and the evaluation of the results of the educational process.

Accountability required leadership: Accountability needs leadership at all levels of the educational enterprise. The state education agency, which has major leadership

¹Meade, op. cit., p. 3.

²Don Davies, "The Relevance of Accountability," The School Administrator, (April, 1970), p. 11.

responsibility for the improvement of public education in the state, should provide leadership and services in planning and improving the state's educational system and assist local school systems in planning and improving their processes for education and in evaluating progress toward attaining goals.

Accountability was far more than a passing fancy in the world of education. It was an operational concept "that comes to grips with the notion that schools should shoulder responsibility for their pupils."¹ Accountability was an obligation and a privilege, not a burden. It calls forth the best within us. It challenges us to examine our purposes, to find better ways to make education responsible to our society that pays the bills.

Under our system of government the primary responsibility for education rests with the citizens of each state. In most states a major responsibility for the governance of education has been delegated by legislative mandate to the state education agency. The state agency normally included a State Board of Education (a policy-making board), a Chief State School Officer and his professional staff assistants which have the major role and responsibility for the general direction of elementary and secondary education. The state education agency is expected to provide the professional leadership and services required to establish goals and

¹Meade, op. cit., p. 3.

priorities, to insure effective planning for the improvement of all aspects of public school education, and to facilitate changes and help implement them and finally, to provide a system for continuous evaluation of progress.

In accomplishing these tasks, the state education agency should recognize that the needs of education are rapidly changing and that the roles, responsibilities and functions of this agency also must change. All state and local education agencies should be cognizant of the fact that a major force that has altered the role, operation and functions of education was the incessant demand for public accountability for the educational process and its products.

Need

School accreditation as a State Department of Education function has, from its inception, existed for the primary purpose of insuring compliance with constitutional and statutory mandates. As accreditation standards were first developed, they tended to emphasize the quantitative (inputs) aspects of the school. The original emphasis upon input in terms of staff, facilities and hard and software may have served a purpose. It served as a lever to acquire and keep basic tools, manpower and accommodations at the local school district level.

When a school was accredited by a regional or state accrediting agency, patrons presumably were assured that all

was well, that their school was a "good" school, and that their students were getting a "good" education. The logic was that if the tangible elements (things that can be counted) of a good teaching-learning situation were present, the situation itself existed.

Traditionally, accreditation standards have been expressed in terms of certain physical conditions on the assumption that they were "believed to be related to quality education." Experienced administrators and teachers have worked within this framework and have tended to accept it, and the "public" has tended to accept this measure of a "good school." Following is a statement which summarized this approach:

For many years, regional and state accrediting agencies have evaluated the quality of various education units and systems. These evaluations have been largely concerned with inputs to education such as the qualification of teachers, class size and the number of books in the library. Present and future efforts toward the improvement of accreditation practices must emphasize not the process of education but the outputs of education.¹

With increasing frequency the public wanted to know what it was getting for its educational dollar. The public wanted to know if the young people could read, could obtain and hold a job and would successfully compete at a higher level of education. This was a call for accountability for results, and the call must be heeded if the quality of

¹J. Stanley Ahmann, "Assessment Programs--Implications for Education," Compact, (September, 1971), p. 16

education is to rise above the level of mediocrity.

The current accreditation policies and procedures used by the Oklahoma State Department of Education indicated that a redirection of accreditation philosophy, criteria and procedures may be genuinely needed if the Oklahoma State Department of Education was to assume its proper leadership role in the improvement of public school education in this rapidly changing society.

A need existed to pursue a study which would result in the formulation of recommendations designed to establish accountability through the accreditation process and, hopefully, to assist in solving some of the problems and failures of traditional education that abound in many of the public schools of Oklahoma.

The need for a soundly planned, sophisticated accreditation and accountability program operated on a continuous basis cannot be too strongly stressed. Without such a program, a state or local school system would expect crisis-generated evaluation by parents, students, legislators and others. This study has attempted to develop guidelines and recommendations for such a program.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate and analyze current policies and procedures of state education

agencies in the accreditation of public schools. More specifically, it was intended to develop principles by which a state education program may be evaluated; to identify promising practices and perceptible trends as they relate to the accreditation of public schools; and to identify approaches in relating educational accountability to the accreditation process.

Definition of Terms

Approval: A term used to denote an official act of the State Department of Education certifying that a school or a school system complies with laws, rules and regulations for administrative purposes.

Accreditation: This term is defined as an official decision by the State Department of Education that, in the judgment of the department, a school or school system has met the standards of quality established by the state.

Accountability: This term shall be defined as a responsibility of educational groups, individual educators and individual schools or school districts to identify educational and/or teaching goals and objectives and describe the manner and degree in which they are being realized. Accountability also includes the responsibility of educators and schools to account for human and material resources in terms of the results achieved. This involves the evaluation of achievement in relation to goal attainment.

Classification: A term which referred to the grouping of schools by various criteria within the approval or accreditation standards of a state education agency.

Total School System: This term referred to the total educational program operated by a public school district. It includes all grade levels and all school centers operated by the district.

Delimitations

It was beyond the scope of this study to include the following functions which are related, directly or indirectly, to the accreditation process:

1. The accreditation of private and/or parochial schools.
2. The accreditation of public area vocational-technical schools.
3. The accreditation by regional accrediting associations of public schools and institutions of higher learning.
4. State laws, regulations and practices pertaining to public school finance.
5. Federal laws and programs which provide financial aid to education.

The Data

The data analyzed have included selected information obtained chiefly from the following resources:

1. State approval or accreditation manuals.
2. Current research and literature on the accreditation process and systems of accountability as reported by the various state, federal, and private agencies and educational writers.

3. State statutes pertaining to accreditation and accountability.
4. Historical literature relative to accreditation.
5. A questionnaire survey soliciting information from State Departments of Education.

In order to assess appropriately the data received in response to the aforementioned questionnaire, a set of "Principles for Accreditation," was devised. The "Principles for Accreditation," hopefully, are characteristic of a good state accreditation program and were formulated following a study of current literature and research. The "Principles for Accreditation" were subjected to the judgment and validation by a panel of educators noted for their expertise in the area of public school accreditation. This procedure was designed to substantiate the final results of this study.

Methodology

Procedure

A request was made to each of the fifty State Departments of Education for materials relating to programs for the approval or accreditation of public elementary and secondary schools. Specifically, each state agency was requested to furnish the following materials and/or information: a current copy of the state's approval or accreditation standards; plans or procedures employed in the revision of the state's approval or accreditation standards; and the results of any recent research or planning relating to approaches to accreditation and accountability.

From the initial information and materials received, a questionnaire was designed to elicit basic information pertinent to the purposes of this study. The questionnaire survey was made in an effort to gain insight beyond that made possible through the analysis of the printed approval or accreditation materials.

Treatment of the Data

The data for this study were generated chiefly from the information derived from the approval or accreditation manual of State Education Agencies and from the results of a questionnaire soliciting selected items of information relative to the accreditation functions and systems of accountability which were employed by the various states.

Specifically, the data were organized and analyzed within the following categories:

1. Practices of State Department of Education with respect to their approval or accreditation programs.
2. The legal authority to approve or accredit public schools.
3. Terms used and classification categories.
4. Responsibilities fulfilled by the State Departments of Education relating to the approval or accreditation of public schools.
5. The meaning of state approval or accreditation.
6. Some selected requirements for approval and accreditation.
7. The evaluation, inspection, or visitation of local schools by the State Department of Education.

8. Procedures and practices used in the revision of school accreditation programs.
9. Practices and plans of State Departments of Education with respect to the development of a system of accountability.

The data from the foregoing categories were presented in a more understandable and usable form through the use of tables and illustrations. Quantification of the data was revealed in the tables and described in the narrative of the study.

Organization of the Study

This study was reported in five chapters and reference section. The background of the problem, statement of the problem, data to be appraised and the methodology of the study was discussed in Chapter I. A review of the literature and related research was presented in Chapter II. Chapter III included an analysis and discussion of the status of current accreditation policies and procedures of the various State Departments of Education. The development and establishment of new or revised systems of accreditation and accountability was described in Chapter IV. Chapter V concluded the study with a summary, conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of accreditation policies and practices of the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter literature and research related to the process of accreditation and the concept of educational accountability was reviewed. The criteria for the inclusion of these specific studies in the present investigation were: (1) studies that were concerned with the accreditation of public schools, (2) studies that were concerned with accountability for the quality of public school education by local and State Education Agencies, (3) studies that were concerned with leadership roles in education as they related to the improvement of education, (4) studies that were concerned with methods, models and strategy related to accreditation and accountability, (5) they involve studies which were reported after 1959.

In searching for literature which fell within these categories three primary resources were utilized: Education Index; Dissertation Abstracts; and the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). In addition to the primary resources, State Accreditation Manual, Handbooks and Administrator Guides were used extensively. Of particular significance

were the responses received from State Education Agency staff members pertaining to the purpose, planning and organization of their State's approach to accountability through accreditation. It was hoped that this review of the pertinent literature and research would contribute to a better understanding of the problem investigated in this study.

A Review of the Literature Pertaining to the Accreditation Process

In reporting on the literature which was presented in this chapter, the writer attempted to select research and professional writing which were timely and pertinent to this study. There was not an abundance of current research pertaining specifically to the accreditation of public schools by State Education Agencies. There were, however, voluminous materials relating to the concept of educational accountability and the emerging role of local and State Education Agencies relating to this concept. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, was to report the significant professional literature relating to accreditation and accountability.

A search of the professional literature in these areas revealed several studies which were pertinent to the purpose of this study. Prominent among these studies was one conducted in 1960 by Statler.¹

¹E. S. Statler, "An Analysis of Current Secondary School Standards of State Agencies and Regional Accrediting Associations" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Ohio State University, 1960).

Statler's study involved an analysis of secondary school standards of state and regional accrediting agencies. The purpose of the study was to determine the present status of established secondary school standards in the United States and trends which these standards were taking. Statler found that increasing numbers of State Departments of Education were developing standards for accreditation and that horizontal growth accompanied by vertical growth of accreditation of elementary and secondary education was producing a trend for system-wide recognition or accreditation. The Statler study further concluded that accreditation standards were being developed and modified without benefit of scientific study and with little regard to the role of the classroom teacher with respect to the development of accreditation standards. A final conclusion by Statler was that inspectional accreditation by state departments of education was giving way to emphasis on self-evaluation by local schools.

Huitt, in a doctoral study completed in 1964, made a survey of elementary school accreditation practices and standards in the United States.¹ The purpose of the study was to conduct a review of elementary school accreditation practices employed by state agencies in the United States in order to obtain information which would suggest revisions for

¹R. E. Huitt, "A Survey of Elementary School Accreditation Practices and Standards in the United States" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964).

improving present state accreditation standards.

Huitt's study revealed that only fifteen states provided an accreditation program for elementary schools with five other states being in the process of implementing accreditation procedures. In concluding his study, Huitt recommended that: (1) procedure should require boards of education to make application for accreditation; (2) a one or two year period for self-evaluation should be permitted; (3) schools should be re-evaluated every five years; (4) the basic principle of accrediting unified, or K-12 school systems should be continued; (5) accreditation standards should continue to recommend proven effective organizational plans and teaching approaches but should also encourage well-planned experimentation.

Another study germane to the present investigation was one completed in 1967 by Beggs,¹ who made a study of the position of state departments of public instruction and other educational agencies and professional groups concerning experimentation and innovation in public secondary schools. The crux of the investigation was that the organizations investigated did not encourage innovation, nor did they take a positive position about innovation and experimentation.

¹David W. Beggs, et al., "A Study of the Position of State Departments of Public Instruction Accrediting Agencies and Selected National Professional Organizations Concerning Experimentation and Innovation in Public Secondary Schools" (Indiana University, September, 1967), 73 p. ERIC Document, ED-017-968.

One of the more comprehensive studies related to approval and accreditation of public schools was compiled by Rich, under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.¹ This report was published in 1960, and was concerned chiefly with the approval and accreditation of public schools by state departments of education. The main purpose of this report was to provide data regarding the various approval and accreditation programs of state departments of education. The bulletin provided information on all types of programs, including those which involved only basic approval functions, as well as those with highly developed accreditation criteria and evaluation procedures.

Morphet and Jesser, editors of Emerging State Responsibilities for Education, described accreditation as a method of evaluation.² They took the position that although accreditation is one of the older kinds of formal evaluation, unfortunately, little emphasis has been placed on measuring outputs with most of the emphasis on inputs. Further, most of the evaluation criteria had not been tested empirically

¹William B. Rich, Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools, the Responsibilities and Services of State Departments of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin No. 36, 1960, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), 40 p.

²Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser, (eds.), "The Emerging Role of State Education Agencies," p. 145-147, Emerging State Responsibility for Education, Improving State Leadership in Education (Denver, Colo., 1970), 177 p. ERIC Document, ED-047-409.

and had not been demonstrated to have a high positive correlation with desirable educational outcomes when measured in terms of pupil accomplishment. Morphet and Jesser concluded that standards used in accreditation had, for the most part been developed through the use of expert judgment rather than by empirical means. The opinions of experienced educators based on a great many observations of pupil and teacher behavior is not to be taken lightly, but the point to be made was that the traditional accreditation process has not been validated.

In 1960 the Council of Chief State School Officers published a policy statement which is relevant to this study.¹ The basic policies and principles which underlie the development and administration of approval and accreditation programs by which the State Department of Education may appraise the quality of the public schools was the subject of this statement.

The first section of this bulletin stated that legal authority for public school education is mandated by state constitutions and statutes and that legal authority to meet such state responsibility is vested in the State Board of Education or Chief State School Officer, and is administered by the State Department of Education. This bulletin suggested

Council of Chief State School Officers, Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools (Washington, D.C., 1960), pp. 1-12.

ways by which the State Department of Education may assess the quality of public education. It attempted to differentiate between compliance with relatively narrow requirements and with performance at higher levels of quality. The first section concluded with a definition and explanation of the terms approval and accreditation.

The second section of the bulletin sets forth specific policies for the development, organization and administration of an accreditation program. In brief, these policies provided for the State Department of Education to: conduct a periodic review and appraisal of its entire program of accreditation; formulate standards for the accreditation of schools which are both qualitative and quantitative in nature; and to consider a multiple-standards type of accreditation program.

The policies for the administration of an accreditation program stress that in the area of evaluation the State Department of Education can most effectively exercise its leadership function in the accreditation process. The policies relating to the administration of the accreditation program further emphasize that the evaluation procedure should provide for self-appraisal and contribute to self-improvement.

The concluding section of this bulletin stresses the importance of involvement, cooperation and coordination between the State Department of Education and other agencies. In this section it was pointed out that the State Department

of Education should continually seek opportunities for co-operation in the evaluation of education. In order to provide positive leadership to local educational agencies the State Department should have full, up-to-date knowledge of the objectives, practices, costs, and services of the varied organizations which can lend assistance in the evaluation and accreditation of education.

An interesting variation on present accrediting procedures was developed by the Colorado Department of Education. This new "Accreditation by Contract" plan,¹ by focusing on goals, was designed to lead to more meaningful educational improvements through long-range planning and a better perspective. A school district may choose to become accredited, or to maintain its accreditation status, by agreeing to an improvement contract with the State Board of Education.

The success of this method of evaluation was contingent upon the kinds of provisions included in the contract. If the items agreed upon were in part of a performance nature, the method was strengthened. However, if the performance criteria were in terms of input only and correspond to present accreditation criteria, little may be gained.

Evaluation was a significant ingredient in the Colorado concept and must be developed prior to participation in

¹Colorado Department of Education, A School Improvement Process--Accreditation by Contract (Denver, Colo., October, 1971), 41 p.

a system of contract accreditation. A rather extensive evaluative effort is necessary to establish local data before the terms of the contract could be formulated, especially if gains to be made are to be in terms of pupil performance. Evaluation would also have to occur at the end of the contract period to determine whether or not the terms of the contract had been fulfilled, and possibly at intervening points if the contract were for a period of longer than one year.

The concept offered some interesting possibilities. For example, schools would have to have a clear statement of goals, which hopefully, can be stated in measurable terms. This in itself could result in clearer thinking about purposes and resource allocations than has heretofore been the case. If the terms of the contract were to be expressed in measures of output, a system of accountability could be established. A local school district would be contracting with an agency of state government to accomplish certain agreed upon goals.

The Washington State Department of Education is currently in the process of developing a new approach to the process of accreditation. Rasp described the concept in a recent article entitled, "Accountability Through Accreditation."¹ A brief resume of the article follows:

Involvement was a key element in the Washington design and accreditation was viewed as a "process" rather than a

¹Alfred Rasp, Jr., "Accountability Through Accreditation--An Olympia-Eye View," Washington Education, (February, 1971), pp. 13-15.

status. The state education agency provides leadership and services in planning and improving the state's educational system by assisting local school systems in planning and improving their provisions for education and in measuring progress toward attaining goals.

A school or school-district gains accreditation by becoming involved in a program aimed at school improvement. The process is one that depends on the education staff, students, and community working together to survey needs, set goals, develop and implement plans, and evaluate their impact. A cycle of two to five years should be visualized and the accreditation program should be voluntary.

Two or more types or levels of accreditation are possible:

Accreditation in Process--for those schools or districts going through the process for the first time.

Accredited--for those schools or districts which have completed the cycle and are ready to start again.

Accredited Exemplary--for those schools or school districts whose programs and processes exemplified a high degree of quality based on criteria developed by the State Department of Education in cooperation with the local school district.

Financial reimbursement should not be contingent on accreditation of a school district; and if accredited, the school district should be accredited as a total system rather

than a separate organizational structure within the system.

A Review of the Literature Pertaining
to the Concept of Accountability

Seldom, in the history of American education, has an educational concept generated more interest and concern on the part of educators and in fact, the general public, than has the concept of accountability in education. Accountability is viewed by many as one of the most important educational movements in the decade of the 1970's.¹ The issue of accountability in education has been raised by the federal government, politicians, taxpayers, unhappy parents, as well as private learning corporations. Accountability has been transformed from a theoretical notion to a formidable force in American education.

The complexity of our society makes it difficult to distinguish the major influences that brought the accountability concept to the forefront of thinking regarding America's schools. Some give credit to the report of the Commission on Equal Educational Opportunity (Coleman Report), which concluded that input into a school (such as reduced class size, new buildings, modern equipment) is not a reliable measure of how good the school is.² Others cite the effect of the

¹Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz, Accountability in American Education (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972), p. 1.

²James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), pp. 20-23.

U.S. Office of Education when, late in 1969, it began requiring program audits for Title VII and Title VIII programs. Whereas programs funded through the U.S. Office of Education formerly required only physical audits, this new requirement audited the program through previously established student performance goals. President Nixon emphasized the concept of accountability when he stated in his address on educational reform early in 1970:

. . . From these considerations we derive another new concept: accountability. School administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performance, and it is in their interest as well as in the interest of their pupils that they be held accountable.¹

There are certain fallacies in the statement by President Nixon that school administrators and school teachers be held accountable for their performance in education. Administrators and teachers may influence but they certainly do not completely control the forces and conditions which determine the quality of education that is existent at the "building" level. The influence of administrators and teachers diminishes even more as it reaches the higher levels of district and state education agencies. It is a fallacy, therefore, to hold accountable those who exercise little control and influence over prevailing conditions.

¹President Richard M. Nixon, Education Message of 1970. As cited by Leon Lessinger, "Robbing Peter to Pay Paul": Accounting for our Stewardship of Public Education, Education Technology, January, 1971.

The National Assessment Program has been another influence on the movement towards educational accountability.¹ Attempting to establish a qualitative measure of American education efforts, the program concentrated on determining what youngsters know and can use in problem solving. A sample of the body of knowledge which persons of a certain age group can reasonably be expected to command was utilized to make such an assessment. Findings reported through the National Assessment Program will undoubtedly exert some influence on state and local education agencies and indicate new directions for them to take.

As the cost for education continues to rise, there has been increasing pressure by taxpayers and parents for school accountability. The largest portion of education budgets is allocated to salaries. The public is questioning the relationship between school costs and student performances. The issue has not become a question of whether to have accountability, but an attempt to determine what kind of accountability is to prevail. Congruent with this issue is the question of who is accountable--board members, administrators or teachers? The growing public demand for some system of accountability that will improve student performance appears evident.

¹William A. Mehrens, "National Assessment of Educational Progress," Childhood Education, (May, 1970), p. 33.

In response to the question of teacher accountability, an opinion poll of a national sample of school administrators was conducted in 1970 by Nation's Schools.¹ This opinion poll revealed that 72 percent favored teacher accountability. It is significant, however, that only 23 percent favored the use of internal incentive with teachers.

Wagoner, a school board member, wrote:

The ills of public education will be cured, say the education watchers, if only school boards are made accountable. Hold the feet of boardmen to the fire of accountability is the current cry.²

Wagoner denounces this as a responsibility to which school board members should answer. He contended it is the teacher, because of collective bargaining power and declaration of teacher rights, who should be held accountable. He further stated:

In the negotiation process this means that school boards must bargain to establish and maintain their own rights--the right to expect that teachers will improve the performance of their students, the right to hold teachers accountable for their pupils' failures and to reward them for their successes in the classrooms.³

Wagoner, unlike school administrators, favored the use of internal incentives along with teacher accountability.

¹"Large Majority Favors Teachers Accountability," Opinion Poll, Nation's Schools, (December, 1970), p. 33.

²David E. Wagoner, "Do You Know Anything At All About How Well or How Much Your Teachers Teach?" The American School Board Journal, (August, 1970), p. 21.

³Ibid., p. 22.

Several writers have adopted the stand that good teachers stand to gain from the accountability concept. One such writer, Rice stated:

Public education is not our special birthright. Rather, it is a tax-supported service in which teachers participate. Public education belongs to all the people, and all the people have a right to seek its improvement, to determine its purposes, and to evaluate its outcomes.¹

Strong positions were being taken by teachers' professional and union organizations on the issue of accountability. Bain, president of the National Education Association in 1970, reflected the position that, "To make the easy assumption that teachers are primarily responsible for the quality of education today is absurdly naive."² Furthermore, she stated, "The classroom teacher has either too little control or no control over the factors which might render accountability either feasible or fair."³

As the application of the accountability concept becomes more widespread--a change--or perhaps a new direction of educational purpose--will be one of the outcomes. The efforts of educational writers and/or education agencies have, to this point, failed to produce a unity of purpose. Goodlad spoke clearly to this point when he stated:

¹Arthur H. Rice, "Good Teachers Stand to Benefit from Accountability Plans" Nation's Schools, (December, 1970), p. 16.

²Helen Bain, "Self-Governance Must Come First, Then Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, (April, 1970), p. 413.

³Ibid.

Few State Departments of Education and even fewer school districts have seriously tried to determine the precise purpose of their schools and the objectives to be achieved. And yet Americans cling stubbornly to the idea of local control of education while permitting, through sheer neglect, many of the important decisions to be made by remote curriculum planners. To develop an increased awareness of what these decisions are and to whom we are leaving the responsibility for making them is a curricular debate for tomorrow.¹

At the present time, according to Sciara and Jantz, the accountability thrust seems to be directed primarily toward the improvement of cognitive skills as opposed to the attainment of affective goals of humanity.²

Accountability is not new to teachers and schools (although the use of the term in connection with teacher performance did not appear in the Education Index until June, 1970). For the most part schools have always been accountable to some one or some constituted authority. "The success of education," stated Morris, "has often been determined by the performance of its end product."³ Morris contended that the concept of accountability is not new, but that its form has varied from time to time. He identified seven reasons for the current accountability on a public basis, the most serious of which centers around accountability and the affective domain.⁴

¹ John L. Goodlad, The Changing School Curriculum (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966), p. 17.

² Sciara & Jantz, op. cit., p. 6.

³ John E. Morris, "Accountability: Watchword for the 70's," The Clearing House, (February, 1971), pp. 323-327.

⁴ Ibid.

It would be premature and beyond the scope of this study, to try to envision all that will be required in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, personnel, money, and technology to put public education on an accountability basis as envisioned, for example, by Lessinger.¹ However, a number of requirements which are related to this study are significant.

First, Davies stated that accountability will require ". . . changing people . . . and changing institutions that control education."² Lessinger believed that ". . . educational objectives are clearly stated before the instruction starts."³ "Since accountability implies predetermined levels of performance by students, an educational performance contract would have to be initiated prior to beginning of a prescribed program of instruction."⁴

Second, accountability probably should require application of principles involved in differentiated staffing

¹Leon Lessinger, "Accountability in Public Education," Today's Education, (May, 1970), pp. 52-53.

²Don Davies, "The Relevance of Accountability," Journal of Teacher Education, (Spring, 1970), p. 128.

³Lessinger, op. cit., p. 52.

⁴Ibid.

similar to those advocated by Olivero¹ and Barbee.² Perhaps a more fundamental requirement, and one that may be more difficult to secure, is self-determination of the teaching profession. Bain stated that, "self-governance will have to become a reality before accountability is possible."³

Third, there must be more involvement between the community, local and state education agencies in determining policies, programs, performance levels, and incentive criteria. According to Rasp. ". . . involvement is the key element in attaining accountability through accreditation." "The process is one that depends on the education staff, students, and community working together to survey needs, set goals, develop and implement plans, and evaluate their impact."⁴

Fourth, instruments which are more reliable, individualized, and valid for measuring ability and performance in the cognitive and affective areas must be developed. Lessinger conceives of ". . . a process designed to insure that any individual can determine for himself if the schools are producing the results promised." The most public aspect of

¹James L. Olivero, "The Meaning and Application of Differentiated Staffing in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, (September, 1970), pp. 34-40.

²Don Barbee, "Differentiated Staffing: Expectations and Pitfalls," TEPS Write-in Paper No. 1 on Flexible Staffing Patterns (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, March, 1969).

³Bain, op. cit., p. 413.

⁴Rasp, op. cit., p. 14.

accountability would be independent accomplishment audits that report educational results in factual, understandable, and meaningful terms."¹

The role of state education agencies as it relates to the accountability concept has received considerable attention from educational writers. Notable contributions have been made by Morphet and Jesser. Following is a resume of some of the role concepts to which Morphet and Jesser subscribe:

Technological revolution, knowledge explosion, are necessitating a new role definition for state educational agencies. This new role should be tailored through an alliance among the state agency and citizens and institutions with interests in education, an alliance which should insure that the agency provides creative leadership, as well as assists in developing a planning mechanism to insure that final decisions of the agency are both defensible by and reflective of the needs and wishes of the people. The state agency, in conjunction with citizens, must seek to improve learning environments, opportunities, and procedures, strengthen the research, development, demonstration, and dissemination; and encourage adequate evaluation of education for a changing society.²

Morphet and Jesser continued to press home the point that: a state education agency cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to the direction of the changes that are occurring, or to the improvement of education and at least indirectly of society, if it simply continues to do only what it has done in the past. It must anticipate and prepare for its

¹Lessinger, op. cit., 0. 52.

²Morphet and Jesser, op. cit., pp. 18-22.

appropriate roles in the emerging future.¹

The Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education² indicated that state education agencies were developing an awareness of the need and are beginning to take steps to provide leadership in educational planning with the assistance of federal funds and by utilizing limited state funds, some state education agencies were developing bona fide planning competence. The progress achieved in Colorado, Florida, Nevada, Texas, Vermont, and Virginia, for example, is reported in several case studies sponsored by the Improving State Leadership in Education project. Other states have made comparable progress. Regional Interstate Project Programs, funded by Section 505, Title V, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), provided opportunities for state education agencies to cooperate in developing state plans for certain federally supported programs and in exploring the advantages to be gained from consolidating the administrative funds available to states from various federal programs. These examples and other developments reinforce the point of view that the state is the logical entity to coordinate the piecemeal and

¹Ibid.

²U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, The State Departments of Education: Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on State Departments of Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Printing Office, 1969).

compartmentalized planning that is prevalent in much of education.¹

Morphet, Jesser and Ludka, commenting on the emerging role of State Education Agencies made the following generalizations:

Many state education agencies were not in a position to utilize financial incentives as a means of helping to bring about change in accreditation procedures which would enhance the accountability concept. Moreover, since they were not directly involved with teaching and learning, they cannot directly bring about changes in teaching and learning procedures--as is possible for local agencies. Finally, if state education agencies continued to emphasize the establishment and enforcement of minimum standards that often fail to meet the needs of a changing society, they probably will tend to retard--or at least would not encourage needed improvements in education. The chief role for the state education agencies in the future, therefore, should be to provide the leadership and services needed to plan and effect improvements in education, and to evaluate progress. It can influence change primarily to the extent that it can convince legislative bodies to support projects which are deemed necessary and worthwhile, and persuade, encourage and assist local school systems in planning and providing for quality education.²

The primary and ongoing purpose of all State Education Agencies should be to insure, insofar as possible, adequate and relevant learning opportunities for all who can benefit from education. This concept should guide all planning activities, constitute the basis for all changes that are proposed, and provide a rationale for all designs for evaluating.

¹Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka, "Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education," Improving State Leadership in Education (Denver, Colo., 1971), p. 17.

²Ibid., p. 114.

In recent years there have been many practical and applied approaches to the concept of accountability. An attempt has been made to select and review some of these approaches, irrespective of their success or failure, in order to demonstrate the varied efforts being made to achieve the challenge of accountability.

A statement of position of the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, viewed performance contracting as a tool in the educational process with the potential for good or evil. Important areas covered by the author, Mayrhofer,¹ are elements to consider in entering into performance contract agreements, the function of the management support group, and a list of steps toward employment of educational technology to meet the needs of children and society.

Basic considerations needed to satisfy the legal requirements for entering into a performance contract agreement by a school district were covered by Martin.² He cautioned against the use of sole source contracts and stands as an advocate for proposals which encouraged competitive bidding and established a set of educational specifications to be contracted for, allowing the school district to retain control over policy matters. The two most controversial

¹Sciara and Jantz, op. cit., pp. 234-245.

²Reed Martin, "Performance Contracting: Making It Legal," Nation's Schools, (January, 1971), pp. 62-63.

areas of the performance contract--testing and payment are discussed also.

Tyler¹ asserted that norm-referenced tests, which measured the relative standings of one student with others, were not adequate for use as accountability measures. The small samples of knowledge assessed by these tests were poor indicators of the skills a student has learned. Changes in student scores from one testing to another may be due to change variations.

McKinney and Manneback² discussed the development of performance objectives as a necessary requisite for accountability. Although the article applied to vocational agriculture, the strategy of development was such that it could be readily transferred to other areas of the curriculum. In addition to suggestions for clearly stating performance objectives, the need to define levels of performance, and the assessment of the worth or value of an objective were emphasized.

Jassen³ presented arguments favoring the use of educational vouchers, as well as those opposed to such a move.

¹Ralph W. Tyler, "Testing for Accountability," Nation's Schools, (December, 1970), pp. 37-39.

²Floyd L. McKinney and Alfred J. Manneback, "Performance Objective: Foundations for Evaluation," Agricultural Education Magazine, (June, 1970), pp. 301-302.

³Peter A. Janssen, "Education Vouchers," American Education, (December, 1970), pp. 9-11.

Those favoring education vouchers believed that vouchers can break the monopoly of public elementary schools making them more competitive, more responsive to the needs of children and the wishes of parents. The past use of vouchers in some of the southern states, to avoid desegregation while using public funds, has led several civil rights groups beyond the point of rejection to condemnation of the principles underlying the voucher plan.

Fantini, Harris and Nash,¹ contended that consumer choice is presently lacking in today's public schools, giving parents a single option when many are possible. Seven possible types of elementary schools were identified as well as seven criteria for quality public education. Although the use of education vouchers is not identified as a vehicle for actualizing the authors' options, the need for a similar consideration was apparent.

The National Assessment Program has been identified earlier in this chapter as one of the factors influencing the surge of interest in the concept of accountability. Mehrens² presented a rather concise description of the philosophy, goals, and methods used in the National Assessment Program. The overview of National Assessment identified this movement as a form of educational accountability with a well

¹Mario Fantini, Donald Harris, and Samuel Nash, "Options for Students, Parents, and Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, (May, 1971), pp. 541-543.

²Mehrens, op. cit., p. 32.

designed approach for establishing an educational index of American schools. The knowledge, skills, and attitudes of four different age groups were measured in ten subject matter areas. Mehrens explains the carefully selected sampling plan and the unique features of the testing devices and their uses.

The rising rate of educational costs has brought with it a correspondingly high rejection of school budgets by the voting public. Program-planning budgeting system (PPBS) was described as an accountability approach which was utilized in the Pearl River School District of New York. The authors, Alioto and Jungherr,¹ claimed the PPBS has the potential for greater community involvement, better explanation of services, and more relevant information for decision-making regarding the school budget.

Lopez² probed reasons for the failure of accountability systems to gain acceptance and suggested an approach for overcoming this problem. The charter of accountability advocated was a modified version of "Management by Objective," also known as planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS). Use of the Charter approach provided for goal-setting at all levels of the educational ladder; top, middle, and base. An approach which established accountability measures for

¹Robert F. Alioto and J. A. Jungherr, "Using PPBS to Overcome Taxpayers' Resistance," Phi Delta Kappan, (November, 1969), pp. 138-141.

²Felix M. Lopez, "Accountability in Education" Phi Delta Kappan, (December, 1970), pp. 231-235.

superintendents, principals, and supervisors, as well as teachers, he thought, appears to be a primary step in minimizing opposition to accountability from various groups.

Many of the practical approaches to accountability which have been reviewed on the preceding pages have found application in various school districts throughout the United States. On the following pages the writer will review the literature which described attempts to apply the various plans to the accountability concept.

Possibly one of the most publicized attempts to apply performance contracting occurred in Gary, Indiana. Banneker Elementary School received much publicity as the first school to have its entire program managed by a private business corporation. Opposition to this performance contract stemmed from many sources, including the Gary Teachers Union and The Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. The authors, Mecklenburger and Wilson¹ identified some major issues that have developed out of this conflict and described major operations of this program.

Another much publicized attempt at performance contracting occurred in Texarkana, Arkansas. There has been a lot of controversy over education's first performance contract awarded in October, 1969, to the City of Texarkana. However, charges of "teaching for the test" did not prevent the school

¹James Mecklenburger and John Wilson, "The Performance Contract in Gary," Phi Delta Kappan, (March, 1971), pp. 406-411.

system from continuing contracting for a second year. An article in Nation's Schools¹ analyzed some of the strengths and weaknesses of the first year's contract.

According to Hendrickson,² one of the by-products of the accountability movement was a renewed emphasis on individualized instruction. One method of accomplishing this was through contract teaching. The author identified three essential and unique characteristics of a typical contract teaching plan, and he outlined the major structural components of most contracts. The use of contracts in some North Dakota high schools was one way accountability was being applied at the local level.

While many programs of accountability offered incentives to students, parents, and teachers, a county in Florida developed a plan which provided for accountability pay for principals and other administrative personnel. Included in an article in Nation's Schools³ was an outline of a proposal that won bonus pay for one of the district principals. This was one district's response to the demand for accountability by the taxpaying public.

¹"Texarkana: The Second Year Around," Nation's Schools, (March, 1971), pp. 32-33.

²Lloyd Hendrickson, "Contract Teaching--A Reality," North Dakota Journal of Education, (October, 1970), pp. 26-27.

³"Florida's Accountability Plan Focuses on the Nation's Principals," Nation's Schools, (November, 1970), pp. 54-55

The Michigan Assessment Program¹ recently provided an improved information base for research and planning. Its assumptions were that education is an important investment in human welfare, that both school and nonschool inputs influence educational performance, that education services were inequitably distributed, and that resources available for education need to be efficiently allocated. The specific assessment in Michigan involved an immediate determination of school performance in the areas of basic skills, then a further determination of educational goals and procedures for assessing them. Descriptions of the level of educational performance and its correlates for the state, for geographic regions and types of communities, and for each of Michigan's local school districts were included. While this assessment procedure will not automatically alleviate educational problems, it can assist state decision makers in providing equitable education.

Summary

From its inception school accreditation as a state agency function has had as its central purpose the challenge of providing better educational opportunity for the children of the state. This purpose continues as both valid and primary even though change was occurring in the general areas

¹Robert L. Crowson and Thomas P. Wilbur, "Purposes of the Michigan Assessment of Education," ERIC Document ED-043-663, March, 1970.

of evaluation and accreditation. Essentially these changes were in rationale and methodologies rather than basic purposes and were being invoked, to some degree, by the demand for accountability.

Current trends and directions noted in the literature with respect to accreditation/accountability did not represent over-reaction or perhaps far-reaching change in every instance. Some changes were a process of evolution; others reflected a redirection deriving from a reappraisal of purposes and procedures in the light of today's schools and the complex, diverse society within which they function.

The literature pertaining to both accreditation and accountability emphasized that material and human resources continue to be vital to a good instructional program. Several State Departments of Education have planned and implemented new approaches to the accreditation process, while other state departments, moved to action by the cry for accountability, were in the process of planning new or revised accreditation programs. Selected models of these programs will be presented in a subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCREDITATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the vital data regarding the various accreditation programs currently being employed by State Departments of Education over the nation. The data presented in this chapter provides an insight into the basic state accreditation practices and programs now operating in the fifty states. As the data is analyzed it became readily apparent that no two state accreditation programs were alike, although threads of commonality were found throughout many of these programs.

There did not appear to be a consensus of agreement on the meaning of the terms "approval" and "accreditation," therefore, for the purpose of this study, the two terms were used synonymously, unless otherwise indicated. They referred to the procedures which the State Department of Education, State Boards of Education, or Chief State School Officers used in determining whether a school, or school district met minimum requirements or standards.

In this study there was no attempt to categorize precisely the public schools according to grade levels. Therefore, the terms "elementary," "junior high school," and "high school" were used without attempting to draw a precise line between them regarding the grades contained in each.

The substance of this chapter was based on information submitted on a questionnaire which requested data on the accreditation programs of each of the State Departments of Education and upon information contained in current state accreditation manuals. The initial draft of the "State Questionnaire" form was developed and submitted to members of the Oklahoma State Accreditation Committee for their review and appraisal. The questionnaire was then sent to a group of ten educators selected for their professional background and knowledge in the area of public school accreditation and administration. Following a critical perusal of the instrument by each of the ten educators, their recommendations were incorporated in preparation of the final draft of the questionnaire. A copy of the "State Questionnaire" was mailed to specific individuals in each of the State Departments of Education. These individuals were previously identified as having specific responsibilities relating to the state accreditation program. A response was received from each of the fifty State Departments of Education. A copy of this questionnaire may be found in Appendix A. The names of educators who participated in the refinement of the questionnaire are listed in Appendix B.

Prior to the development of the aforementioned "State Questionnaire" a set of selected principles for state accreditation of public schools was formulated and were designed to be characteristic of a good state accreditation program. These "Principles of Accreditation" were formulated for the purpose of providing a basis for the evaluation of the quality of state accreditation programs. These tentative principles for accreditation were then submitted to a jury of eleven professional educators recognized for their expertise in the area of public school accreditation and administration. Each of the eleven jurors responded and took part in the evaluation. A principle was considered valid if there was a consensus of opinion by at least seven of the jurors. An example of the "Principles for Accreditation" instrument is shown in Appendix C. The names of the jurors that participated in the evaluation of this instrument are listed in Appendix D.

The following selected principles for accreditation were judged to be appropriate elements of a good state accreditation program and as such, were used in this study as evaluative principles for judging the quality of a state accreditation program.

1. Accreditation is mandatory.
2. Accreditation is provided for the total school system.
3. School districts must be accredited in order to receive state financial aid.
4. Levels of accreditation are employed by State Education Agencies.

5. Standards for accreditation are both qualitative and quantitative in nature.
6. Accreditation standards are formulated by the state and local education agencies in close collaboration with various segments of the organized education profession and appropriate laymen.
7. State accreditation standards are reviewed annually by a representative body of professional educators and laymen and the recommendations of this body are presented to the State Board of Education.
8. Reevaluation, through self-study and a visiting committee will occur at least once each five years, with annual reports submitted during the interim years to the State Department of Education.
9. State Departments of Education should not rely entirely on regional accrediting agencies for the accreditation of public schools.
10. The application of accreditation procedures will be characterized by less rigidity and the exercise of greater discretionary action on the part of local school districts.
11. Accountability for the quality of public school education will be a "shared" responsibility between the state and local education agencies.
12. The concept of "educational accountability" is an integral part of the accreditation process.

Legal Authority for the Accreditation of Public Schools

State legislatures generally delegated the legal authority for the accreditation of public schools to the State Board of Education, the Chief State School Officer, the State Department of Education or to a combination of these three. Table 1 presents data regarding agencies to which this authority was given. Twenty-five State Boards of Education, two

TABLE 1

ACCREDITATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS WITH RESPECT
TO STATE LEGAL AUTHORITY

State	Delegated by State Statute to			State	Delegated by State Statute to		
	State Dept of Educ	State Board of Educ	Chief State School Officer		State Dept of Educ	State Board of Educ	Chief State School Officer
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Ala.	X	---	---	Mont.	---	X	---
Alaska	Est. by law but not implemented			Neb.	---	X	---
Ariz.	Not est.	by law		Nev.	X	X	---
Ark.	---	X	---	N.H.	---	X	---
Calif.	Not est.	by law		N.J.	---	X	---
Colo.	---	X	---	N.M.	---	X	---
Conn.	---	X	---	N.Y.	X	X	X
Del.	Not est.	by law		N.C.	Not est. by law		
Fla.	X	---	---	N.D.	X	---	---
Ga.	---	X	X	Ohio	---	X	---
Hawaii	X	---	---	Okla.	---	X	---
Idaho	---	X	---	Ore.	X	---	---
Ill.	---	---	X	Penn.	---	X	---
Ind.	---	X	---	R.I.	---	X	---
Iowa	---	X	---	S.C.	---	---	X
Kans.	---	X	---	S.D.	---	X	---
Ky.	X	X	---	Tenn.	X	---	---
La.	X	---	---	Texas	---	X	X
Maine	X	X	X	Utah	---	X	---
Md.	Est. by law but not implemented			Vt.	---	X	---
Mass.	Not est.	by law		Va.	---	X	---
Mich.	---	---	---	Wash.	---	X	---
Minn.	---	X	---	W. Va.	X	---	---
Miss.	---	X	---	Wis.	---	---	---
Mo.	---	X	---	Wyo.	---	X	---

Chief State School Officers, and eight State Departments of Education exercised this authority exclusively. In two states the legal authority was shared by the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education, in two states by the State Board of Education and the Chief State School Officer, and in two states by all three.

Two states reported that accreditation was established by state statute but not implemented, while five states indicated that accreditation was not established by state statute but was enforced through regulations developed by the State Education Agency.

There were a variety of ways by which the legal authority to accredit public schools was delegated to the State Education Agency. There were many states in which specific direction for the accreditation of public schools may be found in the state statutes. For example, section 2-3.3 of The School Code of Illinois directs the Superintendent of Public Instruction, among other things, "to supervise all the public schools in the state." Furthermore the Superintendent of Public Instruction "may grant recognition by attendance centers or school districts" (Amendment to The School Code, Sections 2-3.25 and 18-8, 1969). The Sixty-first General Assembly (section 257.25, 1966 Code of Iowa) directs the State Board of Public Instruction to establish standards for the approval of all public and nonpublic schools covering a wide range of areas" Kentucky State School Law 156.160

provides for the "State Superintendent to prepare school budgets and rules and regulations governing schools, for adoption by the State Board of Education . . . Rules and regulations for grading, classifying and accrediting all common schools, and for determining the scope of instruction that may be offered in the different classes of schools . . ."

The 1970 Mississippi Legislature enacted House Bill 476 to provide for legal accreditation. Section 1 states, "The power and authority to prescribe standards for the accreditation of public schools, insure compliance with such standards and to establish procedures for accreditation of public schools is hereby vested in the State Board of Education."

The Texas Statutes state in Title 49, Chapter 9-B, Article 2654-3, section 3, "The State Board of Education shall review periodically the educational needs of the State and adopt or promote plans for meeting these needs. It shall evaluate the outcomes being achieved in the education program. It shall, with the advice and assistance of the State Commissioner of Education: . . . Establish regulations for the accreditation of schools; . . ."

Section 3301.7 of the Revised Code of Ohio requires the State Board of Education to "formulate and prescribe minimum standards to be applied to all elementary and secondary schools in the state for the purpose of requiring a general education of high quality. . . ." School districts and non-public schools are chartered by the State Board of

Education and may legally operate on the basis of compliance with the adopted standards. Ohio is the only state which "charters" schools.

Status of Required or Voluntary Programs for Accreditation

Officials in each of the State Departments of Education were asked to indicate whether accreditation practices were related to the total system, the high school, the junior high school or the elementary school and to designate if accreditation was voluntary or required. The results are described in Table 2.

TABLE 2

ACCREDITATION PRACTICES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS
OF EDUCATION

[illegible]

TABLE 2--Continued

[illegible]

TABLE 2--Continued

State	No State Accreditation for:				State Accreditation Voluntary for:				State Accreditation Required for:			
	Total System	High School	Junior High School	Elementary School	Total System	High School	Junior High School	Elementary School	Total System	High School	Junior High School	Elementary School
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Tennessee	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--
Texas	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Utah	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--
Vermont	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--
Virginia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--
Washington	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--
West Virginia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--
Wisconsin	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X
Wyoming	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--

Returns from two states indicated that they had no program of accreditation. They were:

Alaska--Accreditation was required by state law but is not being practiced. It was reported, however, that a set of Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Elementary Schools was being developed and will be field tested in sample schools and put into final working form during the summer of 1972. A position within the State Department of Education was requested for fiscal year 1974, which will be that of an accreditation officer and whose responsibility will be to establish procedures and goals of state accreditation.

Hawaii--This state school system was unique, in that it has a single statewide public school system operated under an elected Board of Education and a Superintendent and his staff. Under this organizational structure, Hawaii does not officially consider accreditation as a function of the administration although there has been built into the operating procedures such things as a State Master Plan for Education, The Foundation Program for Public Schools in Hawaii, the State Minimum Testing Program and Evaluation Studies.

Twenty-five states reported that public school accreditation was provided for the total school system. Of these twenty-five states, six states indicated that accreditation was voluntary for the total system while nineteen states reported that accreditation for the total system was required. Fifteen states accredited individually the high schools, junior high schools and elementary schools within the district but they did not accredit the total system.

Six states stated they did not have a program of accreditation for elementary schools while one state reported it did not accredit junior high schools. Utah indicated that it did not provide state accreditation for high schools in that the regional accrediting association provided this service and this satisfied minimum requirements for state approval. In that accreditation by regional accrediting associations is voluntary, it was not clear if Utah required high schools to be accredited by the regional association.

Of the states which had voluntary programs, twelve percent accredited the total system and twelve percent accredited individually the high school, junior high school and elementary school. Of the states in which accreditation was mandatory, thirty-eight percent accredited the total system while eighteen percent accredited the school segments separately.

Classification Categories and Terms

An examination of Table 3 clearly indicated a wide divergence in the practices of State Departments of Education regarding accreditation classification terms and categories.

State statutes, in many states, prescribed for the "classification" of schools. The term "classify" is normally used in two ways. When used in one context "classify" does not pertain to the accreditation of schools, but to grouping of schools by various combinations of grade levels. For example, an elementary school may be classified as grades one through six; the junior high school including grades seven through nine; and the high school encompassing grades ten through twelve.

The terms "classify" and "classification" were also used, as they were in this study, to indicate schools which are accredited; for instance, in the high school accreditation procedures and standards of the State of Texas public schools are classified for purposes of accreditation as: "fully accredited," "advised," "warned," and "dropped."

TABLE 3

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCREDITATION PRACTICES
RELATING TO CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES

State	Classification Categories and Terms	Applies to			
		Total System	Attendance Center		
			Elem Sch	Jr. High Sch	High Sch
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ala.	Accredited - - - - -	- - - -	X	X	X
	Advised				
	Warned				
Alaska	None - - - - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Ariz.	Class I - - - - -	- - - -	- - -	X	X
	Class II				
	Class III				
Ark.	Class A - - - - -	- - - -	X	X	X
	Class B				
	Class C				
Calif.	None - - - - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Colo.	Standard - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Contract				
Conn.	Approved - - - - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	X
Del.	Accredited - - - - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	X
	Approved				
Fla.	Accredited - - - - -	- - - -	X	X	X
	Non-accredited				
Ga.	Accredited - - - - -	- - - -	X	X	X
Hawaii	None - - - - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Idaho	Approved - - - - -	- - - -	X	X	X
	Advised				
	Warned				
Ill.	Full recognition - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Probationary recognition				
	Non-recognition				
Ind.	Certified - - - - -	- - - -	X	X	X
	Continuous Commission				
	First-class Commission				
	Special First-class Comm.				
Iowa	Approved - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Provisionally approved				
	Non-approved				
Kans.	Accredited comprehensive -	- - - -	X	X	X
	Accredited				

TABLE 3--Continued

State	Classification Categories and Terms	Applies to			
		Total System	Attendance Center		
			Elem Sch	Jr. High Sch	High Sch
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ky.	Comprehensive - - - - - Standard Basic	- - -	X	X	X
La.	Approved - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
Maine	Accredited - - - - - Basic Approval	- - -	- - -	- - -	X
Md.	Approved - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
Mass.	Approved - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	X
Mich.	Approved - - - - -	- - -	- - -	X	X
Minn.	Classified - - - - -	- - -	X	X	X
Miss.	Accredited - - - - - Class A Class AA	- - -	X	X	X
Mo.	Class AAA - - - - - Class AA Class A	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
Mont.	Multi-year - - - - - Regular	- - -	X	X	X
Neb.	Advised and probationary Accredited AA - - - - - Accredited Basic	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
Nev.	Approved - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
N.H.	Approved comprehensive - Approved schools	- - -	X	X	X
N.J.	Approved - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
N.M.	Approved with commendation Approved Approved-advised Approved-conditional Disapproved	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
N.Y.	Registration - - - - -	- - -	- - -	X	X
N.C.	Accredited - - - - -	- - -	X	X	X
N.D.	Level I - - - - - Level II Level III	X	X	X	X
Ohio	Chartered - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
Okla.	Accredited - - - - - Non-accredited	- - -	X	X	X

TABLE 3--Continued

State	Classification Categories and Terms	Applies to			
		Total System	Attendance Center		
			Elem Sch	Jr. High Sch	High Sch
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ore.	Standard - - - - -	X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Conditionally Standard				
	Non-standard				
Penn.	Approved - - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	X
	Conditional approved				
R.I.	Approved - - - - -	- X	- - -	- - -	- - -
S.C.	Accredited (All-clear) - -	- - - - -	X	X	X
	Advised				
	Warned				
	Probation				
	Dropped				
Tenn.	Grade A - - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	X
	Grade B				
	Grade C				
Texas	Fully accredited - - - - -	- X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Advised				
	Warned				
	Dropped				
Utah	Accredited - - - - -	- - - - -	X	X	- - -
Vt.	Approved - - - - -	- X	- - -	- - -	- - -
Va.	Accredited - - - - -	- X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Accredited-advised				
	Accredited-warned				
	Not accredited				
Wash.	Standard accreditation - -	- - - - -	- - -	X	X
	Temporary accreditation				
	Probationary accreditation				
W. Va.	First class - - - - -	- X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Second class				
	Unclassified				
Wis.	None - - - - -	- - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Wyo.	Accredited - - - - -	- X	- - -	- - -	- - -
	Accredited with advise				
	Not accredited				

The accreditation manual of the Missouri State Board of Education listed standards for the following classifications: "accredited," "class A," and "class AA." The administrative handbook for Indiana schools published by the Department of Public Instruction listed standards for the following classifications: "certified schools," "continuous commissioned school," "first-class commissioned school," and "special first-class commissioned school."

Generally, the term "classify" as used in legislative statutes referred to the grouping of schools by various grades, while the term "classification" as used in programs of accreditation usually referred to the grouping of schools by various criteria within the accreditation standards. The various state statutes, in delegating authority, usually directed the State Education Agencies to do one or more of the following: accredit, approve, commission, recognize, charter, classify, grade, register, standardize or rate.

In Delaware evaluation by the Department of Public Instruction does not represent official accreditation. It provides approval of each secondary school as a prerequisite for accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In Maine, as of January 1, 1972, state accreditation for secondary schools can be gained only in conjunction with a visitation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

In Michigan, the State Department of Education did not accredit directly the comprehensive aspects of Michigan public school programs. The local school districts have maintained considerable autonomy in planning and management of education programs, except the 180 instruction day requirement for receiving the full amount of state school aid, and a high school civics course requirement for a high school diploma. Many Michigan secondary schools participate on a voluntary basis in the extra-legal accreditation programs of the University of Michigan and of the North Central Association.

In New Hampshire accreditation services were provided by the New England Association of College and Secondary Schools. The approval of schools, however, was implemented by the Division of Instruction of the State Department of Education. Schools were designated as "approved comprehensive" programs if facilities, programs and staffing provide that type of education. The narrow academic school programs were approved as "approved schools." In case the minimum standards for approval were not met or negotiated, the school would not be approved.

Purposes of State Accreditation Programs

An examination of the state accreditation manuals and administrative handbooks gave some indication relative to the purposes and objectives of the accreditation process. Most

of the manuals and handbooks were written and organized in a manner which was designed to be helpful and encouraging to schools seeking accreditation, rather than setting up rigid standards in inflexible terms, which must be met to the finest detail. Many states clearly stated that excellence in meeting one standard may compensate for a deficiency in another. Another statement that was found in most of the manuals specifically encouraged experimental and innovative programs, subject in many cases to prior approval by the appropriate State Education Agency.

In some of the manuals it was rather difficult to determine the difference between required standards and recommendations because of the manner in which they are interspersed. It should be noted, however, that in manuals of more recent revision, precisely distinguishing between standards and recommendations was simpler.

Many of the states provided a statement of the purposes of accreditation. Some of the statements of purpose emphasized the more traditional aspects of accreditation such as: (1) to stimulate growth and improvement in the educational program; (2) to implement the law; (3) to provide evidence of certification of high school graduation; (4) to facilitate the transfer of students between high schools; and (5) to guarantee minimum acceptable standards.

The following excerpts were taken from state manuals and were considered to be representative of traditional

statements of purposes expressed by State Education Agencies:

Alabama--The purpose of accreditation is to give stimulus to the State Course of Study and to set forth procedures for organized curriculums; to expand instruction in terms of quality education so that pupils who have finished the prescribed courses may be eligible for college, trade schools, and other post high school courses, and be acceptable for employment in certain areas without further study.

Idaho--The purpose of secondary accreditation is to stimulate growth and improvement in the educational program. The accreditation procedure also serves other purposes and functions: (1) provides evidence of certification of high school graduates for admission to college and post high school activities; (2) facilitates the transfer of students between high schools; (3) provides data essential for the development and administration of a more efficient program of education; (4) ensures the performance of certain specified duties legally required of the educational program.

Tennessee--The rules, regulations, and minimum standards of the State Board of Education are adopted pursuant to the provisions of law and are intended to: (1) implement the law, and (2) provide a broad framework of policies under which local school systems operate in providing education opportunities for all the children of Tennessee.

While some states conceptualized their purposes of accreditation in a more traditional manner, other states adopted purposes which represented a more contemporary approach to the accreditation process. The following excerpts were representative of this point of view:

Colorado--Better education through better planning is the central purpose of accreditation by contract. More specifically, accreditation by contract is proposed by--

1. A way to individualize school district accreditation by basing it on the particular needs of the students in each district.

2. A way to implement comprehensive, continuous, long-range planning by establishing specific staff responsibilities and district-wide procedures.
3. A way to make the best possible use of all available resources by better relating: a) school and community, b) needs, goals, and objectives, c) programs, practices, and services, d) program planning and budgeting, e) inputs, processes, outputs, and f) costs and benefits.
4. A way to determine results by establishing measurable objectives.
5. A way to take timely action by charting a long-range operational plan of who is to do what at what time.

Florida--These standards have been developed to stimulate involvement and utilization of a systems approach to school evaluation. The multi-level and multi-type standards incorporated in this document provide for recognition of improvement above the minimum and describe differences among levels of improvement of instructional programs . . . This accreditation program as it is phased into the long-range plan for evaluation is considered a major step forward in meeting the demand for accountability.

Ohio--The State Board of Education placed great emphasis on the efficacy of a broad and individually oriented curriculum in this revision of standards. While the standards are minimum, they are not intended to be restrictive--rather, guiding, suggestive and directive. Schools are encouraged to achieve above the minimal and to develop innovative programs that are responsive to the needs of the time.

The purposes of accreditation were closely related to what State Educational Agencies profess to be functions of the accreditation process. Table 4 shows the responses to item thirteen on the "State Questionnaire" which sought data on different major purposes which might be fulfilled by State Departments of Education through programs of accreditation.

TABLE 4

PURPOSES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION RELATING
TO THE ACCREDITATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Purpose	Ala.	Alaska	Ariz.	Ark.	Calif.	Colo.	Conn.	Del.	Fla.	Ga.	Hawaii	Idaho	Ill.	Ind.	Iowa	Kans.	Ky.	La.	Maine	Md.	Mass.	Mich.	Minn.	Miss.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1. Stimulate growth and improvement in local school systems	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	-	X
2. Certify eligibility of school districts to receive state financial aid	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
3. To insure legal operation of the local school system or school	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X
4. To insure a uniform minimum level of education in all public school districts	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X
5. To provide for the general guidance and direction of all public schools in the state	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	X
6. Encourage experimentation and innovation	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	X
7. Encourage self-evaluation by local school districts	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	X
8. To incorporate the concept of educational accountability into the accreditation process	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	-	X

TABLE 4--Continued

Purpose	Mo.	Mont.	Neb.	Nev.	N.H.	N.J.	N.M.	N.Y.	N.C.	N.D.	Ohio	Okla.	Ore.	Penn.	R.I.	S.C.	S.D.	Tenn.	Texas	Utah	Vt.	Va.	Wash.	W. Va.	Wis.	Wyo.	# Ckd	Appli- cable
1	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	
1. Stimulate growth and improve- ment in local school systems	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	44	
2. Certify eligibility of school districts to receive state financial aid	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	X	X	35	
3. To insure legal operation of the local school system or school	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	44	
4. To insure a uniform minimum level of education in all public school districts	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	43	
5. To provide for the general guidance and direction of all public schools in the state	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	39	
6. Encourage experimentation and innovations	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	34	
7. Encourage self-evaluation by local school districts	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	-	36	
8. To incorporate the concept of educational account- ability into the accredi- tation process	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	27	

Code: X = Applicable
- = Not applicable

A majority of the states fulfilled, through programs of accreditation, those objectives dealing with the general supervision of the public school program. Responses showed that programs of accreditation also fulfilled, to some degree, objectives in forty-four states for stimulating the growth and improvement of the quality of local schools; in thirty-nine states for providing for the general guidance and direction of schools throughout the state; and in forty-three states for assuring a uniform minimum level of education in all public schools.

Responses presented in Table 4 also showed that the objective is fulfilled in forty-four states for enforcing legal requirements which must be met by all public schools or school systems, in thirty-four states for encouraging experimentation and innovation, and in thirty-six states for encouraging self-evaluations by local schools, however only a few states included this as a requirement in their accreditation criteria.

State financial aid is directly related to the accreditation program in thirty-five states, while the responses from twenty-seven states indicated that incorporating the concept of education accountability into the accreditation process was an objective. The extent to which the accountability concept has been incorporated into state accreditation programs will be a major point of discussion in the following chapter.

The Meaning of State Accreditation

The tabulations shown in Table 5 were in response to a question seeking the meaning of state accreditation. Since the responses were to the specific questions shown in the table, they did not, in some cases have much significance due to the nature of the particular state programs.

Forty-two state officials indicated by their answers that accreditation meant that the local schools which were accredited met, or exceeded, minimum acceptable state standards. Among these are several whose states do not base their accreditation on the meeting of a comprehensive set of standards or criteria. These responses show that throughout the country there are minimum state standards which local schools are required to meet. Though an indication as to the extent of the standards may be found through a study of published standards or criteria, it was difficult to determine the degree to which minimum acceptable standards were enforced. The extent to which local schools were required or encouraged, to meet or exceed, minimum acceptable standards was apparently determined in a large measure by state supervisory policies and activities.

Responses to question four as shown in Table 5 indicated that thirty states endorsed the quality of the school's program through their accreditation program. It was not the intent of this study to attempt to determine the degree to which individual states endorsed the quality of the local

TABLE 5

MEANING OF STATE ACCREDITATION

State	Accreditation means that the State Dept. of Education				
	Officially accepts and acknowledges the existence of the school	Officially sanctions the operation of the school or school system	Certifies that the school meets all legal requirements	Endorses the quality of the school's program	Certifies that the school meets or exceeds, minimum acceptable standards
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Number checked applicable	29	29	31	30	42
Ala.	-	-	-	X	X
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-
Ariz.	-	-	X	X	X
Ark.	X	X	X	X	X
Calif.	-	-	-	-	-
Colo.	-	-	-	X	X
Conn.	X	X	X	X	X
Del.	-	-	-	-	-
Fla.	-	-	-	-	X
Ga.	-	-	-	X	X
Hawaii	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Idaho	X	X	X	X	X
Ill.	X	-	X	X	X
Ind.	-	-	X	X	X
Iowa	-	-	X	-	X
Kans.	X	X	X	X	X
Ky.	-	-	-	-	-
La.	X	X	X	X	X
Maine	X	X	X	X	X
Md.	-	-	-	-	-
Mass.	-	-	-	-	-
Mich.	-	X	-	-	-
Minn.	X	X	X	X	X
Miss.	X	X	X	X	X
Mo.	-	-	-	-	X
Mont.	X	X	X	-	X
Neb.	X	X	X	X	X
Nev.	X	X	X	-	X
N.H.	X	X	X	-	X

TABLE 5--Continued

State	Accreditation means that the State Dept. of Education				
	Officially accepts and acknowledges the existence of the school	Officially sanctions the operation of the school or school system	Certifies that the school meets all legal requirements	Endorses the quality of the school's program	Certifies that the school meets or exceeds, minimum acceptable standards
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
N.J.	X	X	X	X	X
N.M.	X	X	X	X	X
N.Y.	X	X	X	X	X
N.C.	-	X	-	X	X
N.D.	X	X	X	X	X
Ohio	X	X	X	X	X
Okla.	X	X	X	X	X
Ore.	X	X	X	X	X
Penn.	X	X	X	X	X
R.I.	X	X	X	X	X
S.C.	-	-	X	-	X
S.D.	X	X	-	X	X
Tenn.	X	X	X	X	X
Texas	X	X	X	-	X
Utah	X	X	X	X	X
Vt.	-	-	-	-	X
Va.	X	X	X	-	X
Wash.	-	-	-	-	X
W. Va.	-	-	-	-	X
Wis.	X	-	-	X	X
Wyo.	X	X	X	X	X

X = Applicable

- = Not checked as applicable

program. Since a majority of states emphasized in their standards that accreditation was based on minimum standards, it was inferred that these states are endorsing an acceptable, but minimum, quality. The several states, which included categories in their accreditation programs, were apparently categorized in schools or school districts by level or quality.

Education officials from thirty-one states indicated that accreditation meant that the state certified school had met all legal requirements; while twenty-nine states indicated that accreditation, when conferred, meant that the state accepted and acknowledged the existence of the school. Officials in twenty-nine states indicated that it meant that the state officially sanctioned the operation of the school.

Review and Revision of Accreditation Standards

Table 6 showed that forty of the State Departments of Education had established procedures for the review or revision of their standards for accreditation of public schools. The frequency of meetings for the purpose of review or revision of accreditation standards, however, varied considerably among the various State Departments of Education. Sixteen state officials indicated that meetings were held on an "as needed" basis to give special attention to the review of accreditation standards. Eight states reported that a revision committee is currently meeting for the first time in fifteen years.

In seventeen states the responsibility for the revision of accreditation standards rested exclusively with personnel in the State Education Agency. Fourteen states utilized, to some extent, the services of persons in the various categories shown in columns two through seven of Table 6. Laymen, most frequently involved in the review of accreditation standards,

TABLE 6

INVOLVEMENT IN THE REVIEW AND REVISION OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

State	Accreditation standards are reviewed and revised by						
	State education agency personnel	Public school administrators	Public school teachers	College or university personnel	Professional education organizations	Laymen	Frequency of meetings
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Ala.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Weekly
Alaska	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Ariz.	X	X	--	X	--	--	Each 4 mos.
Ark.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Annually
Calif.	--	X	--	--	--	--	As needed
Colo.	X	--	--	--	--	--	7 years
Conn.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Del.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Fla.	X	--	--	--	--	--	As needed
Ga.	X	--	--	--	--	--	As needed
Hawaii	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	X	X	X	X	X	X	As needed
Ill.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Annually
Ind.	X	--	--	--	--	--	As needed
Iowa	X	X	X	X	X	X	As needed
Kans.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Annually
Ky.	X	X	X	X	X	X	--
La.	X	--	--	--	--	--	N/A
Maine	X	X	--	--	X	--	Monthly
Md.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Mass.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Mich.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Minn.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Annually
Miss.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Bi-annually
Mo.	--	--	--	--	--	X	As needed
Mont.	X	X	X	X	X	X	--
Neb.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Annually
Nev.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
N.H.	X	--	--	--	--	--	As needed
N.J.	X	X	X	X	X	X	--
N.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X	As needed
N.Y.	X	--	--	--	--	--	As needed
N.C.	X	X	✓	X	X	X	As needed
N.D.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Monthly

TABLE 6--Continued

State	Accreditation standards are reviewed and revised by						
	State education agency personnel	Public school administrators	Public school teachers	College or university personnel	Professional education organizations	Laymen	Frequency of meetings
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Ohio	X	X	X	X	X	X	As needed
Okla.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Annually
Ore.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Bi-monthly
Penn.	X	--	--	--	--	--	--
R.I.	X	X	--	--	--	X	As needed
S.C.	X	X	--	--	X	--	--
S.D.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Annually
Tenn.	X	X	X	X	X	X	As needed
Texas	X	--	--	--	--	--	As needed
Utah	X	X	X	X	X	X	Annually
Vt.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Weekly
Va.	X	X	X	X	X	--	As needed
Wash.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Quarterly
W. Va.	X	--	--	--	--	--	Monthly
Wis.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--
Wyo.	Not applicable		--	--	--	--	--

were members of state and local boards of education and students.

Public school administrators were involved in the review procedures in twenty-two states; public school teachers participated in seventeen states; college or university personnel assisted in eighteen states; and professional organizations were represented in eighteen states.

In correspondence received from school officials in the State Departments of Education of Kansas, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Oregon, and Wyoming, a description of the procedures

used in the revision of their accreditation programs was developed. Although the methods, procedures, and policies of revision programs varied from state to state, they contained certain common elements, such as provision for participation by local school personnel or an emphasis on the leadership role of the State Department of Education officials. Following are some selected examples of the revision process:

Kansas--According to state statutes we must update and revise our accreditation rules and regulations annually. We also, according to statute, must submit such revisions of the rules and regulations to the Professional Standards Board for Approval and then to the State Board of Education for final adoption.

Each year, as part of the accreditation process, we work with various curriculum committees as to proposed revisions. We also seek additional information from educators in the State of Kansas through a statewide referendum. Our research seems to indicate that educators are interested in having the kind of accrediting rules and regulations that allow for a great deal of flexibility of choice as regards program implementation.

Iowa reactivated its Advisory Committee on Approval Standards for the purpose of updating standards and procedures. The short-range objective of this committee was to develop certain amendments and new standards for the existing framework. Then, as a long-range objective, attention was being paid to possible new approaches to the identification of school quality and ways to improve it. The progress of this committee and its implications with regard to the concept of accountability will be discussed in the next chapter.

In Michigan, the State Department of Education did not accredit directly the comprehensive aspects of Michigan public school programs although a concerted move was being made in this direction, as indicated in the following comments by Dr. Ki-Suck Chung, Research Consultant for the State Department:

In recent years the State Board of Education has raised, repeatedly, the issue of accrediting Michigan secondary schools as an attempt to improve the quality and equality of educational programs available to all Michigan's children and youth. Viewing that the traditional accreditation programs have emphasized only the input conditions for educational processes, the staff recommended to the State Board of Education an output-centered evaluation program as a pilot study project.

As an outgrowth of the pilot study project mentioned above, the Michigan State Board of Education recently adopted an accountability model designed to coordinate the statewide efforts to improve the quality and equality of education. This model included six interrelated elements: The Identification of Common Goals; The Development of Performance Objectives; The Assessment of Needs; Analysis of Delivery Systems; Evaluation of Programs; and Recommendations for Improvement. Details of this project will be discussed in the following chapter.

Missouri reported that it is presently taking another look at its classification program. Eleven regional educational conferences were conducted where one of the topics for discussion was the classification and accreditation program. Approximately 3,000 persons including school administrators,

school board members, parents, teachers and students participated in the discussion of the classification program. Following these group meetings throughout the state, advisory committees were appointed to continue the process of discussing the classification program with members of the department staff.

Oregon was still in the process of standardizing schools, but they were working to move the program toward local school accountability. State school officials, in cooperation with local school administrators, were reconstructing and retooling the standardization program as well as the elementary and secondary guides to assist local schools in establishing goals and objectives. Evaluation of the local programs will be on the basis of what a school or school district says it will do or is doing.

The Wyoming Board of Education has a revision currently under consideration for their accreditation standards. The plan is to divide evaluation and accreditation. Accreditation will be based on statutory requirements and state board regulations. Each school district will be required to develop long-range comprehensive plans based on evaluative criteria. The long-range plans and criteria will vary from district to district as they develop their own criteria from a needs assessment based on their own standards.

State Accrediting Committees

A number of states have permanent committees which have varying degrees of responsibility with regard to the accreditation process. In some cases these committees have the final responsibility for accreditation. In other instances the committees serve in an advisory capacity and make recommendations on accreditation policies and procedures to the appropriate State Education Agency. Listed below are the names, composition, and functions of some selected accreditation committees.

The Alabama State Committee for Recommendations on Accreditation for Junior and Senior High Schools is composed of the staff members of the Division of Secondary Education of the Alabama State Department of Education . . . The primary functions of the committee are evaluation and policy recommendations. Accreditation standards must be approved by the State Board of Education. Procedures and criteria for accreditation must be approved by the State Superintendent of Education.

The Arizona State Committee on Accreditation is composed of nine members. Three are secondary principals elected for a three-year term by the Arizona Association of Secondary School Principals. Two members-at-large and two advisory members are appointed by the Committee for two-year terms. A representative from the State Department of Education and the High School Visitor are ex officio members.

The State Committee is responsible for making decisions relative to the classification of approved schools, and for initiating, promoting, and carrying into effect plans for the upgrading of secondary education.

The functions of the State Committee were:

1. To review the annual reports from member schools and making recommendations regarding their classification.

2. To formulate policies to guide member schools in all instances where the Committee has discretionary powers.
3. To interpret to member schools the policies and programs for secondary education.
4. To assist the High School Visitor in planning and participating in evaluation programs for schools seeking high classification.
5. To hold such meets as are necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Committee.

The Rhode Island State Board of Education, in approving revisions to accreditation standards, also approved the following recommendation made by an ad hoc Advisory Committee:

It is recommended that there be established a standing Advisory Committee on Secondary School Standards whose membership be made up of secondary school principals, school superintendents, members of the staff of the State Department of Education and other professional educators to be appointed by the Commissioner of Education. Such a committee would meet once a year, would continue the study of secondary school standards in Rhode Island and would be prepared to recommend revision, modification, or expansion of the criteria as the experience of the schools with these outlined herein would be on a continuing basis.

The Texas State Commission on School Accreditation has a membership of twenty-eight persons, representative of college, administrative, instructional, and school board personnel, appointed by the State Commissioner of Education, subject to confirmation by the State Board of Education.

The functions of this Commission were: (1) to advise the staff of the Division of School Accreditation concerning application of standards to the school systems of the state and development of new materials relating to school

administration; (2) to make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education concerning standards for school accreditation and policies for applying these standards; (3) to receive the reports of the Director of the Division of School Accreditation concerning the status of accreditation in individual schools and to make recommendations to the Commissioner and to the Board concerning action to be taken; and (4) to hold a hearing on appeal by a school system on any recommendation of the Director, Division of School Accreditation, and submit its recommendations on the appeal to the State Commissioner of Education.

Practices Concerning On-Site Visits

Various procedures are used by State Departments of Education relative to the evaluation, inspection, or visitation of local schools to insure compliance with accreditation standards. Table 7 deals primarily with information relative to who performs this function and the frequency with which it is performed. The normal procedure used by State Departments of Education to insure that schools or school systems were complying with accreditation standards was accomplished by on-site visitations and/or the requirement that local schools file periodic status reports.

Thirty-nine states reported that on-site visits were conducted. These visits are conducted exclusively by personnel from the State Department of Education in twenty states. In seven states, state and local education officials combine

TABLE 7

PRACTICE OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
CONCERNING ON-SITE VISITS

State	Local schools are evaluated, inspected, visited by			
	State Education Agency personnel only	State and Local Education Agency personnel only	State and Local Education Agency Faculty and Laymen	Frequency of on-site visits
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Ala.	X	--	--	As needed
Alaska	--	--	X	As needed
Ariz.	--	--	X	7 years
Ark.	X	--	--	7 years
Calif.	Not required	--	--	--
Colo.	--	--	X	Std 3 yrs Contr 1 yr
Conn.	Not required	--	--	--
Del.	Not required	--	--	--
Fla.	--	--	X	3 years
Ga.	X	--	--	As needed
Hawaii	Not required	--	--	--
Idaho	--	X	--	10 years
Ill.	--	X	--	3 years
Ind.	X	--	--	As needed
Iowa	X	--	--	2 years
Kans.	X	--	--	10 years
Ky.	X	--	--	Annually
La.	X	--	--	As needed
Maine	--	X	--	10 years
Md.	Not required	--	--	--
Mass.	Not required	--	--	--
Mich.	Not required	--	--	--
Minn.	X	--	--	As needed
Miss.	--	--	X	10 years
Mo.	X	--	--	1 year
Mont.	--	--	X	As needed
Neb.	--	--	X	10 years
Nev.	--	--	X	Annually
N.H.	--	X	--	Annually
N.J.	--	X	--	5 years
N.M.	--	--	X	Annually
N.Y.	--	X	--	5 years
N.C.	--	--	X	5 years
N.D.	X	--	--	7 years
Ohio	X	--	--	4 years

TABLE 7--Continued

State	Local schools are evaluated, inspected, visited by			
	State Education Agency personnel only	State and Local Education Agency personnel only	State and Local Education Agency Faculty and Laymen	Frequency of on-site visits
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Okla.	X	--	--	Annually
Ore.	--	--	X	5 years
Penn.	X	--	--	5 years
R.I.	X	--	--	Annually
S.C.	X	--	--	Annually
S.D.	Not required	--	--	--
Tenn.	--	--	X	As needed
Texas	X	--	--	5 to 17 yrs
Utah	--	X	--	3 years
Vt.	X	--	--	As needed
Va.	X	--	--	As needed
Wash.	Not required	--	--	--
W. Va.	X	--	--	As needed
Wis.	Not required	--	--	--
Wyo.	Not required	--	--	--

to conduct an on-site evaluation, while twelve states indicated that a combination of state and local education officials as well as community representatives were involved in the evaluation process. The remaining eleven states indicated that on-site visits were either not required or only recommended.

If state education officials indicated that on-site visits were conducted, they were asked to specify the frequency of these visits. The frequency of visits ranged from annually to each ten year period. Eighteen states reported that on-site visits were required and conducted within a five year

period. Seven of these states noted that annual visits were conducted, and in most cases by a representative from the State Department of Education. Eleven states reported that on-site visits were conducted on an "as needed" basis. Generally this occurred when there was an indication that a school or school district was not complying with accreditation standards; or when a new school was seeking accredited status; or when a school applied for upgrading its level of classification.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present and analyze information concerning the status of current programs of accreditation by State Departments of Education. An examination of the data revealed a wide variation in the various state programs as they relate to accreditation policies and procedures. A number of the programs were the result of careful planning for development or revision, whereas others were the accumulation of sporadic pieces of legislation or piecemeal revisions added from year-to-year by state education officials.

In most cases it would appear that those who have the responsibility for administering state accreditation programs were on the alert for revisions which might be useful in improving standards, procedures, and reporting. Minor revisions often were made from year to year. Such changes

were placed into effect as new report forms were issued or as accreditation manuals or handbooks were reprinted. For the most part, major changes resulted from serious and detailed study of the problem of the revision of standards. Often such revision resulted from the leadership and efforts of one or more individuals in the State Department of Education. In other instances, the revisions resulted from a periodic review of the standards involving extensive study and discussion by a broad representation of professional and lay people.

Models of new state accreditation programs will be presented and discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION AND LEADERSHIP

Accountability, as a basic idea, is not new. Educators over the years have been accountable, but the accountability of the past had much to do with materials and budgets. This has been a rather convenient application of accountability, and the tendency has been not to question it. But the old accountability deserves questioning, because it is concerned only with the input of things which, when misplaced or misdirected, influence the outcomes of an educational program.

The new accountability is not "thing-centered," but student centered. It deals, among other things, with skills, attitudes, adjustment and accomplishments of the student. The new accountability can only be considered successful if it helps the educational process to the extent that the goals and objectives of education are continually modified to meet the changing needs of children and youth; and if educational programs are continually modified to facilitate the attainment of those objectives. Many State Education Agencies have directed their actions or operations toward this process to

analyze programs and to introduce alternative educational practices.

In this chapter, several alternative practices were examined which illustrate the manner in which various state education agencies applied the concept of accountability to the accreditation program. Equally significant were the changes in leadership roles that evolved as these new state programs were planned and implemented.

Legal Responsibilities for State Accountability Programs

One area investigated in this study related to the practices of State Departments of Education with regard to:

- (1) legislation dealing with educational accountability;
- (2) the responsibilities of state agencies in planning and implementing a system of public school accountability; and
- (3) plans by state agencies to incorporate the accountability concept into the accreditation program.

Responses by state officials to items listed in the State Questionnaire (Appendix A, Items 21, 22 and 24) indicated that in ten states, educational accountability legislation had been enacted. Twenty-three states reported that the responsibility for planning and implementing a system of accountability was vested in the State Department of Education, either by legislative enactment or by direction of the State Board of Education. Twenty-five State Departments of Education were planning for, or have recently completed major

revisions in their accreditation programs. Many of these revisions were undertaken for the expressed purpose of establishing a system of accountability. It is significant that only ten states have enacted legislation dealing with accountability. It is noteworthy that many State Departments of Education have initiated plans for accountability/accreditation programs as a result of leadership initiative on the part of individuals within the organizational structure of the state agency.

The purposes and responsibilities set forth in State Accountability Laws were identified in the following description of legislation enacted by the State Legislators of Florida and Colorado. Each of these states have implemented the law through its programs of accreditation. These accountability laws were not selected as being exemplary, but, rather to give the reader a clearer insight pertaining to the intent and provisions of this type of enactment. The relative merits or shortcomings of these laws were not considered to be an important point for discussion. A detailed discussion of the Colorado and Florida accountability/accreditation program are presented in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Florida--Several sections of the statutes bear on the question of accountability. The State Board of Education has the general powers to determine, adopt or describe such policies, rules, regulations or standards . . . as it may find necessary for the improvement of the state system of public

education. (229.053(1). The Commissioner of Education is "to assemble all data relative to the preparation of the long-range plan for the development of the state system of public instruction . . ." (229.512(6) and to "utilize all appropriate modern management tools, techniques, and practices which will cause the State's education program to be more effective and which will provide the greatest economics in the management and operation of the State system of education," (229.551(4). The major legal base is in Chapter 229.57 enacted by the 1971 Florida Legislature. This law has five major purposes:

1. To provide for implementation and further development of education assessment procedures.
2. To provide for the establishment of educational accountability in the public school system of Florida.
3. To assure that education programs operated in the public schools of Florida lead to the attainment of established objectives for education.
4. To provide information for accurate analysis of the costs associated with public education programs.
5. To provide information for analysis of differential effectiveness of instructional programs.

This law reaffirmed the responsibility for the State Board of Education to adopt uniform statewide educational objectives. It also required the Commissioner of Education to administer statewide assessment and to make a public report of results. It required local school boards to make a public report of results. It required local school boards to issue accountability reports beginning in 1973-74 and required the

consolidation of state assessment objectives and accreditation standards by 1973-74.

Colorado--The Colorado Department of Education, working with the local districts, has moved, step by step, toward valid assessment. The order to make this first step emerged with the passage in 1971 of an Educational Accountability Act. This act required every district of the state to adopt, by July 1, 1972, an accountability program for the 1972-73 school year. Thereafter they must report on and revise that plan annually.

There were two important aspects of the act that deserve mention:

1. The purpose of the act was "to define and evaluate quality in education, and thus to help the public schools of Colorado to achieve such quality and to expand the life opportunities and options of the students of this state."

2. The act required each school district to appoint an Advisory Accountability Committee including, minimally, a teacher, a school administrator, a parent, and a taxpayer. Colorado Department of Education rules and regulations further suggested strongly that each committee have representatives of students and minority groups.

Profiles of New State Accreditation/ Accountability Programs

In April, 1972, seven states embarked on an accountability project touching directly on the roles to be played

by various groups on the question of accountability. The project was called the Cooperative Accountability Project and is described by Woodington, Colorado State Commissioner of Education:

The Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) was entered into by the State of Colorado, Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with funding from the U.S. Office of Education under ESEA, Title V, Section 505, for three years. Colorado is the administering state. The project Operations Board consisted of the seven Chief State School Officers or their designees.

The project has five specific objectives that will be pursued by one or more of the states:

1. Legislative Mandate. The existing constitutions and legislation of all the states will be analyzed insofar as they relate to accountability. The administrative policies of state boards of education will also be examined. CAP's aim was to find commonality and, ultimately, to draft model legislation for accountability. The State of Wisconsin has this work in hand. CAP expects to publish preliminary findings in 1972.

2. Criterion Standards. Baseline federal, state and local district criterion standards (such as levels for student performance and date requirements) for the development and operation of a state accountability system will be analyzed and reported. Florida has accepted this responsibility and will be assisted by Maryland.

3. Model Identification. The aim here, through the literature and through examination of actual operating accountability systems, will be to define several models that could be adopted generally. Minnesota will apply effort to reach this objective.

4. Role Expectations. This will be an attempt to define the roles of all possible participants--teachers, administrators, boards, students, parents, taxpayers, community groups--in accountability, and to determine the information they need in order to perform their roles well. Colorado assumed this responsibility.

5. Reporting Practices and Procedures. One of the absolute requirements of accountability is reporting,

accurately and intelligibly, to those involved. This aspect of the CAP study will be to examine both what is being done and what can be done, with Michigan doing the necessary work.

The hope of all seven states embarking on this project was that the project output will be useful in assisting states and local districts to avoid some of the problems related to accountability--unnecessary pitfalls of time and resources. It is an ambitious project that deals with the most significant issues and problems in education today. The project has established its goals and objectives, has devised programs to attain them, will measure performance and the amount spent per program and report fully. In other words, the project itself will reflect a model for accountability.¹

While some states were collectively approaching the problem of devising a system of accountability, other states were developing the accountability concept and implementing it, in varying degrees, through accreditation programs.

Several state accountability/accreditation programs are presented which appear to be consistent, for the most part, with the "Principles of Accreditation," as listed on page 52 of Chapter 3. The programs described on the following pages should not be regarded as the final word for accountability/accreditation models. They do, however, contain certain elements considered appropriate for the inclusion in a good accountability/accreditation plan.

Washington--The State of Washington has not lagged behind in its efforts to make school accreditation a meaningful instrument for school improvement. Elementary and

¹Donald D. Woodington, "Accountability from the Viewpoint of a State Commissioner of Education," Phi Delta Kappan, (October, 1972), pp. 96-97.

secondary school administrators, under able leadership from the State Department of Education, were seeking a process that was something more than a response to resource criteria. State Department of Education personnel provided leadership and encouragement to bring about changes in present procedures to include K-12 education, to broaden the base of the program so that, in reality, it became a process for school improvement, and to insure that accountability originated in the local district as it worked with the community to meet the needs of children and youth.

The design for establishing "Accountability Through Accreditation"¹ started with the assumptions that involvement is a key element and that accreditation is viewed as a "process" rather than a "status." The design also rests on the assumption that the State Education Agency will provide leadership and services in planning and improving the state's educational system; and will assist local school systems in planning and improving their provisions for education in measuring progress toward attaining goals.

In Washington, a school or school district can attain accredited status by becoming involved in a program aimed at school improvement. The process is one that depends on the education staff, students, and community working together to survey needs, set goals, develop and implement plans, and evaluate their impact. A cycle of two to five years was

¹Rasp, op. cit., pp. 13-15.

visualized and the accreditation program would be voluntary.

Using a school or school district as an example, here, step by step, is the idea of accreditation by process:

1. The school staff declares its intent to become involved in the accreditation process by making application to the State Department of Education.
2. The school staff, students, and community establish school goals and objectives and prepares a description of the present school program.
3. The school staff, students and community cooperatively survey student needs, determines desired outcomes, study instructional processes, inventory resources, and develop appropriate methods of measuring outcomes.
4. The school staff develops an action plan for school improvement based on student needs and desired outcomes. The plan describes specifically how the goals and objectives are to be achieved, including time and resource allocation and assessment techniques.
5. The plan is submitted for approval to the appropriate educational agency.
6. A decision is made on the ability of the plan to improve education in the school or school district.
7. The school publishes the approved action plan with sufficient copies to circulate among staff, community and news media.
8. The work of implementing the action plan begins and continues for the time specified.
9. As culminating activity during the final year of implementation, the school will invite an evaluation team to visit the school to assess its progress in terms of the objectives and evaluation techniques developed in the action plan.
10. An accreditation report will be prepared by the visiting team recommending specific action by the State Board of Education.
11. Following action by the State Board (if action is favorable) accredited status will be awarded when the process is successfully completed. To maintain accreditation the school or school district must "recycle" within two years.

The Washington plan for accreditation visualizes two or more types of accreditation:

Accreditation in Process--for those schools or school districts going through the process for the first time.

Accredited--for those schools or school districts which have completed the cycle and are ready to start again.

Accredited Exemplary--for those schools or school districts whose programs and processes exemplify a high degree of quality based on criteria developed by the State Department of Education in cooperation with the local school district.

Other aspects of Washington's plan for establishing "Accountability Through Accreditation" specified that: (1) state financial aid should not be contingent on accreditation of a school district; (2) the school district should be accredited as a total school system rather than separate organizational structures within the system; (3) accreditation would not focus specifically on educational resources but more generally on a broader program of accountability.

During the Fall of 1970, a series of input sessions focusing on the "new design," were conducted throughout the State of Washington. The meetings were presented by personnel from the State Department of Education and almost 1,000 administrators representing elementary and secondary schools and central offices attended and expressed their views.

Reactions of school administrators to the Washington plan are presented in the following:

As method for systematically improving all schools, I would rate the new plan as follows:

Good or very good	56.5%
Fair	20.3%
Poor	7.6%
I do not understand it well enough for judgment	15.7%

The greatest strength of this plan is:

- a. The plan is an active process with much involvement 14%
- b. The plan leads to self-improvement and continual evaluation 23.5%
- c. The plan emphasizes local responsibility 21%
- d. The plan promotes proper improvement through the setting of goals, developing plans, and evaluation 19.3%
- e. The plan provides equalized opportunity for all children--all levels 9.3%
- f. The plan is based on State Board goals for education 5%
- g. Other 7.9%

The area of greatest weakness is:

- a. The plan requires additional staff and money 32.2%
- b. The process is too complicated 25.2%
- c. The roles of participating agencies are not clearly defined 13.1%
- d. The plan is too idealistic--lacks incentive, should not be voluntary 9.6%
- e. The plan should include a set of minimum standards 11.5%
- f. The sequence of procedures is not appropriate 2.3%
- g. Other 6.1% (based on 519 responses)

Should accreditation be by school or school district?
 School 25.5%, school district 57.5%, both 13.5%, other 3.6%
 (based on 505 responses)

Providing consultative help and guidelines are available, would you be willing to participate in a pilot project beginning in 1971-72?

Yes 47.8%, maybe 23.9%, not yet 26.3%, other 2.1%
(based on 431 responses)¹

According to Rasp,² "the reactions to the 'new design' seemed to say loud and clear that the idea was worthy of further investigation and that the process of self-improvement with local responsibility was its strength." He continued, "the challenge was to simplify the process and make it workable."

North Carolina--The North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction has completed the process of changing its approach to accreditation. The plan focuses on state accreditation of school administrative units and embodies many of the "Principles of Accreditation" subscribed to in Chapter 3 of this study.

State officials reported that all areas of the State, all levels of the educational community and representatives of different interest groups participated in the formulation of the "Accreditation of School Administrative Units."³ The plan was based on the assumption that recent developments in education dictated a change of focus and direction of the

¹Rasp, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

²Rasp, op. cit., p. 15.

³North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, State Accreditation of School Administrative Units in North Carolina (Raleigh, N.C., August, 1972), 15 p.

state accreditation program.

Among the more significant developments which influenced this change were:

1. The administrative unit level is the center of responsibility for school operations, curriculum improvement, and staff development.
2. Introduction of comprehensive planning which includes a continuous cyclical process of evaluation/accreditation rather than a "one-shot" effort at intervals of from five to ten years.
3. The emphasis in accreditation has shifted to educational outcomes and accountability and away from quantitative measures of resources.
4. Accreditation at the administrative unit level rather than at the individual school level.
5. Leadership prerogatives of local unit personnel inherent in educational accountability were being recognized.
6. Reorientation toward outcomes or results in terms of student learning achievement, and progress and away from input in terms of "things."¹

It was the opinion of state officials that reorientation of the evaluative processes in terms of learning, achievement, and progress of students was possibly the most essential of the developments listed and would be the most difficult to accomplish.

The transition from the quantitative to the qualitative aspects of assessing the effectiveness of schools necessitated changes with respect to instruments, techniques, and concepts. The process, according to the educational planners,

¹Ibid., p. 1.

could be greatly facilitated by the introduction into education of some of the principles of planning and management borrowed from the business and industrial community.

Architects of the North Carolina plan advocated that a status study, as a point of departure, would be a well established procedure. Local units and schools would first conduct a needs assessment of the community and the pupils served. Out of the findings derived from a needs assessment the school staff would develop a statement of philosophy and objectives. A school self-study based upon its own statement of philosophy and objectives and upon findings of the school and community survey would conceivably result in the establishment of specific objectives.

Comprehensive planning, as envisioned in the North Carolina Plan, would be a continuous process with the emphasis upon results and these results would be derived from clearly stated long- and short-range objectives. Briefly, the sequence was stated as follows: Assessment --> planning --> implementation --> reassessment --> and recycle. It was anticipated that schools and administrative units would continue to identify deficiencies and weaknesses. It was suggested that establishing priorities, fixing responsibility, and assigning resources (human and material) to high priority objectives may represent new tactics in some instances.

According to provisions of the plan, schools and administrative units would move ahead with a continuous

pattern of comprehensive assessment/planning and accreditation would become an integral part of a system of accountability. The focus on the administrative unit and the school would be on results accruing to children rather than on accreditation as an isolated and perfunctionary process engaged in at irregular intervals.

Proponents of this plan suggested that the local school administrative unit would become the centerpoint for accreditation functions. The local board of education along with the superintendent and his immediate staff would constitute the control center, in many respects, for all schools in the unit. The plan does not imply that the central office would assume a more authoritarian role over schools within the district, but that leadership in these areas would be viewed as a shared responsibility involving appropriate representation from administrators, supervisors, teachers, pupils, patrons and state agency personnel.

Several significant factors were presented in the North Carolina Plan that indicated the desirability and feasibility of the administrative unit as the level for accreditation. The administrative unit should be the center of control and the seat of responsibility for staff development and curriculum planning. In-service education was viewed as an administrative unit concern, not a responsibility of each teacher or a separate matter for each individual school within a unit. The rapid change in student population from one

school attendance area to another and the emphasis on quality and equality of education suggests the need for a high degree of inter-school coordination with respect to programming and materials selection; more frequent sharing of staff and services, and a greater utilization of leadership talents.

A central element in the concept of the State Plan was the provision for a high degree of local on-site involvement, leadership, and autonomy. The self-study would play an important role as units and schools engaged in the several stages of sequential, comprehensive planning. Resources outside the administrative unit in the form of consultants and advisors would have a prominent place in the accountability/accreditation process. Essentially, however, personnel at the local level would play the dominant roles. These roles would relate primarily to the responsibilities and routines having to do with providing the best possible educational opportunity for children and youth. Only secondarily would these roles relate to the accreditation process. This would apply equally well to the professional staff of the Department of Public Instruction. These staff members were visualized as resource people to assist local units and schools and their primary role would be that of improving schools and education throughout the state.

In order to demonstrate the sequence or plan of action of the program described on the foregoing pages, the following example was presented which is illustrative of the process.

It should be understood that the calendar for each local unit may vary.

First year

- July --Superintendent and the unit's Instructional Leadership Team brief the local board of education on the new accreditation program, the planning process, and the purposes to be achieved. This briefing might include an over-view of the Mission Statement and the continuing objectives which have been developed. The board should officially adopt a position policy on the program and give direction to the staff.
- August --Other staff members and lay groups are briefed and their cooperation and participation are solicited.
- September--The organizational structure is developed, leadership is identified and trained, and a schedule of activities is prepared.
- October --The philosophy and objectives for the unit are finalized and the status study is begun. If the organizational structure was perfected in September and the leadership was trained, the various committees know their assignments and can get down to business. The status study may take from six months to a year depending on the number of people involved, the amount of time they can spend on this assignment, and the amount of data already available. The importance of an in-depth analysis of the situation cannot be over-emphasized, because the credibility of the plan is dependent on an accurate analysis of the status.
- March --Based on the analysis of the situation, the local unit is ready to develop specific objectives. Dependent on staff and time, this phase of the planning process should take from three to six months. State Agency personnel as well as outside consultants can be helpful in developing specific objectives.
- June --Strategies are developed for each specific objective in the plan. Broad participation

in decision making about strategies will result in bringing about changes in the schools and classrooms. As strategies are developed in program areas, the school board can consider these in the budget making process. Priorities must be set since the unit will not have sufficient resources to do everything.

August --The plan is presented to the board of education and accepted with any desired modifications. The plan is implemented when school opens.

Second Year

The second year is a year of implementation of the plan. Specific assignments of responsibilities should be made for the implementation of various components of the plan. The superintendent or his designee is responsible for overall implementation. State Agency staff members will visit the unit and observe the progress being made in implementing the plan. A continuous monitoring program should be carried out by the local unit. Frequent progress reports should be made to the local board of education and an official annual report to the board and to the public. Such a report should address itself to the specific objectives and should speak specifically to the progress made in language laymen can understand. The annual report becomes the basis and instrument for continuing State Accreditation.¹

Parallel to the plan of action initiated by the local administrative unit were the steps in the accreditation process as envisioned in the North Carolina Plan:

1. A comprehensive plan for education embracing all areas of the school system's program is developed and approved by the local board of education.
2. An abstract of the plan is submitted to the State Superintendent. This summary of the plan should include the major findings in areas of objectives, status, strategies, and a plan for evaluation.

¹Ibid., pp. 10-12.

3. The State Superintendent will review the abstract and upon recommendations of the staff of the State Department of Public Instruction who have worked with the unit will give tentative approval to the plan.
4. State Agency staff will work with the unit for a period of time approximating a school term in implementing the plan. Within this year, the plan will be submitted to the State Agency for official approval.
5. State Agency approval signifies that the administrative unit schools are accredited. Continued accreditation will be contingent upon the content of annual reports which the unit makes to its local board and citizenry, a copy of which will be reviewed by the State Superintendent.
6. Accreditation will be continuing subject to approval of the annual evaluation reports. However, a major review and refinement of the unit's total plan and accreditation status may be anticipated at five year intervals. Major reorganization of schools in the unit itself might require a change in the five-year sequence.¹

Florida--The Florida State Department of Education, in 1971, adopted new and sweeping changes in its "Accreditation Standards."² The adoption of these standards were a result of more than four years of planning, discussions, writing, pilot studies and revisions. Involved in the change process were students, classroom teachers, administrators, district staff members, university personnel, department of education staff and lay public. Florida's new accreditation program was initiated at the beginning of the 1971-72 school year, and according to state education officials, the program

¹Ibid., p. 13.

²Florida State Department of Education, Accreditation Standards (Tallahassee, Fla., 1971), 82 pp.

is meeting all expectations. On the following pages the major features of the Florida "Accreditation Standards" are described:

The major changes that were reflected in this accreditation program were designed to be far-reaching and should serve as a challenge to all interested in improving the educational opportunity of public school students. The scheme of the Florida plan for accreditation encompassed the concept of accountability by including standards which evaluated student progress or "product." More flexibility was provided in standards which encouraged more innovative and experimental programs, but greater responsibility was also placed on local school districts and individual schools to evaluate more effectively the results of these programs in terms of what students learn and what they could do as a result of their participation.

According to state education officials, one of the significant features of the 1971 adopted standards was the addition of the "district section." Standards were designed for the evaluation of services provided schools and students by the school district. The district office staff was expected to evaluate the compliance with standards on the services provided schools and students in the district. Compliance with district standards would be applied to the percentages of each school as one factor in arriving at the school's accreditation classification. The school district office would not receive an accreditation classification since

the standards are intended only for evaluating the services provided the students and schools. The district's self-evaluation report would be filed as a single document and the percentages of compliance with standards would be made a part of the school's evaluation through data processing procedures.

The accreditation document was distributed in five sections; section one--district; section two--overall; section three--elementary; section four--junior high and middle school; section five--senior high. The reason the total document was divided into five sections was that it made the document smaller in size and easier to utilize in the evaluation process and as a reference document.

There were three types of standards included in the accreditation program. These were Status, Process, and Product. A definition and example of each were provided:

Status--These standards contained quantitative or observable requirements to which compliance was easily determined. This type of standard applied to such areas as student-teacher ratio, number of certified teachers, square footage requirements, minimum course requirements, length of school day and any other area that a "yes" or "no" compliance could be observed or easily determined by counting and/or measuring.

Process--These standards specified action of the staff in implementing the planned educational program. This type of standard was found primarily in the district and overall sections and relates to programs offered, resources provided and staff action.

Product--These standards specified outcomes of student performance resulting from the implementation of a planned educational program. This type of standard was found primarily in the subject area divisions of the

accreditation document. Compliance with these standards were not reported "yes" or "no" but were reported by the percentage of students who met requirements.¹

Each school was required to conduct a self-evaluation and report compliance on only two of the three types of standards for accreditation purposes. All schools within a given district were required to report on the same type of standards. It was the responsibility of each district school board to designate which standards would be used for reporting by the schools of that district.

Compliance with product standards were reported in percentage quintiles rather than "yes" or "no" answers. Each school was asked to report whether 0, or 1-25, or 26-50, or 51-75, or 76-100 percent of their students complied with a given standard. Schools reported compliance on a random sampling of their students in accordance with instructions provided with the input forms completed by the school.

A state-wide evaluation system in lieu of self-evaluation was a unique feature of the Florida accreditation plan. As evaluation instruments were developed and programs implemented under pupil assessment, cost-effectiveness analysis and process-effectiveness analysis, the self-evaluation accreditation process would be phased out and the output from the state evaluation system will be used for the purpose of assigning accreditation classification of schools.

¹Ibid., p. vii.

Only two types of accreditation classifications were to be issued; "accredited" and "non-accredited." This replaced the four classifications in the 1963 standards: (1) accredited; (2) accredited-limited deficiencies; (3) accredited-warned; (4) non-accredited.

The accreditation process also provided for a visitation program conducted by members of the Department of Education Staff. Each school would be visited by at least one member of the Department of Education Staff every three years. The visitation would focus on an assessment of the evaluation procedures used in the self-evaluation.

In addition to the types of standards discussed above, there were three levels of standards: Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. The meanings of the three levels were indicated as follows:

Level 1 Standards: These standards delineated basic indispensable essentials in the school program. They related to what a school has, to the measureable practices employed in implementing the program and to behavior expected by a majority of students. The standards tended to be objective and quantitative in nature and included items which are easily appraised. Most Level 1 Standards were required to be met for a school to be assigned an accredited classification.

Level 2 Standards: These standards were reported to be of great importance, but in contrast to Level 1 Standards they were not considered so significant that missing one or two of them would cause a school to be classified as non-accredited. These requirements were intended to insure functionality of the school as an institution, give scope and effectiveness to its program and delineate desirable performance by a relatively high percentage of students.

Level 3 Standards: Level 3 Standards designated quantities or qualities which made it possible for a school meeting a large number of such standards to achieve added effectiveness in its program. Level 3 Standards were designed to define the schools of tomorrow, to offer goals for long-range planning and achievement, and to portray achievement to a high degree in selected objectives. The basic minimum accreditation requirements for each school were: (1) compliance with most of the Level 1 Standards; (2) compliance with a stipulated percentage of Level 2 Standards; and (3) compliance with a smaller percentage of Level 3 Standards.

If this system can be properly implemented, it should offer excellent possibilities for improving the schools of Florida through establishing an indispensable minimum standard of compliance below which no school may go and be accredited and through offering substantial stimulation to those schools with richer possibilities for achievement. By establishing Level 1 and Level 2 Standards as incentives, this system should enable schools to plan and pursue desirable long-range goals.

Michigan--The Michigan State Department of Education, in response to changing demands, has undertaken the development and implementation of a major new approach for its delivery of educational services.¹ This new approach was designed around a process or a model which contained six basic elements. The process was aimed at achieving genuine educational reform and, thereby, improve education for all children, youth, and adults in Michigan. The six basic

¹Michigan State Department of Education, Developing a New Role for the State Education Agency: The Michigan Experience (Lansing, Mich., 1971), 19 pp.

elements in the accountability model were:

1. Identification, discussion and dissemination of common goals for Michigan Education.
2. Approaches to educational challenges based on performance objectives consistent with goals.
3. Assessment of educational needs not being met, and which must be met to achieve performance objectives and goals.
4. Analysis of the existing (or planned) educational delivery systems in light of what assessment revealed.
5. Evaluation and testing within the new or existing delivery system to make sure it serves the assessed needs.
6. Recommendations for improvement based on the above.¹

State officials viewed this six-step accountability process as being applicable to the entire state educational system, as well as to the several sub-systems within the state system. It was believed that the process could serve as a guide for the overall activities of the State Department, as well as each of the subdivisions of the state educational system.

Although the elements were not considered to be novel, the commitment of a state's entire educational system to such a program of coordinated improvement was considered to be new. It was realized by educational leaders that the assumption of responsibility by individuals at all levels of the educational system would have to accompany this commitment

¹Michigan State Department of Education, A Position Statement on Educational Accountability (Lansing, Mich., 1972), p. 2.

if the program was to be carried forward.

Following is a step by step explanation of the six basic elements in the model and the general activities employed in developing and implementing each of these steps.

The Identification of Common Goals

In this step the aim was to delineate a common set of purposes toward which all public schools in Michigan should be working, without denying the existence and desirability of additional goals and purposes that might have been unique to a given school or school district. The idea was to assert that there was a commonality of educational purposes throughout the schools of Michigan.

Educational planners found that the common aims of Michigan's public schools could be identified and that consensus could be reached among educators and lay citizens as to what these common aims could or should be. The following procedures were used to achieve this product.

In 1970, the State Board of Education appointed an advisory task force composed of Michigan educators, students and lay citizens. This task force was given the charge of identifying and delineating what they felt should be the common goals of an educational system capable of meeting the growing and changing needs of society. In June, 1970, this task force presented its recommendations to the State Board. The State Board reviewed the recommendations and made revisions

and additions. A document of the revised goals was distributed to educators and citizens throughout the state.¹ Twenty-five public meetings were held throughout the state to elicit the opinions and concerns of local educators and lay citizens regarding the tentative common goals. The State Board reviewed these opinions and concerns, revised the tentative common goals accordingly and adopted the goals as State Board Policy effective September, 1971.

The Development of Performance Objectives

As educational goals were developed, state officials reasoned that these goals would become useless unless they were translated into measurable objectives. The question, "What is it that schools should do?" had to be asked and answered in general terms as well as in very specific terms. This was the purpose of step two.

In step two the task was to develop criteria to measure the degree to which specific objectives within the goal areas were being met. For example, one of the Common Goals of Michigan Education reads as follows:

Michigan education must assure the acquisition of basic skills to the fullest extent possible for each student. These basic skills fall into four broad categories: (1) the ability to comprehend ideas through reading and listening; (2) the ability to communicate ideas through writing and speaking; (3) the ability to handle

¹Michigan State Department of Education, The Common Goals of Michigan Education: Tentative (Lansing, Mich., 1970), 11 pp.

mathematical operations and concepts; and (4) the ability to apply rational intellectual processes to the identification, consideration, and solution of problems.¹

Within this statement can be found broad purpose and general direction. How were specific objectives to be obtained under this goal? In terms of the goal, what was the child to accomplish by the time he reached the sixth grade? What should he have accomplished in terms of his ability to handle mathematical concepts? Or his ability to comprehend ideas through reading? It was reasoned by the program planners that there was a need to develop a set of specific objectives for each of the goals, and that the goals should be translated in specific statements of what the schools should do.

At this point the State Department Staff identified and the State Board adopted seven priority instructional areas drawn from and based on the common goals. These priority areas included: (1) communication skills; (2) mathematics; (3) social science; (4) science; (5) fine arts; (6) health and physical education; and (7) occupational skills. It was in these seven goal areas that the staff developed statements of objectives by grade level. This work was done with the assistance of and in conjunction with local school personnel. As an outgrowth of this planning a document

¹Michigan State Department of Education, The Common Goals of Michigan Education (Lansing, Mich., September, 1971), p. 5.

was developed and adopted which presents common program objectives for grades kindergarten through six in the priority instructional areas.¹

Assessment of Needs

The third element in Michigan's six-step program called for an assessment of needs. The assessment program gathered and reported three basic kinds of information descriptive of the educational system: (1) student's background characteristics; (2) school and school district characteristics and resources; and (3) student and school performance.

In the first year of its operation, the assessment program gathered student performance information on fourth and seventh grade students in four areas of academic skill--vocabulary, reading, mechanics of written English, and mathematics. These areas were chosen by the State Board because together they constituted the skills which were basic to each child's elementary education and were considered to be the foundation for all further educational development.

In its second year, the assessment plan again assessed students' performance in the basic skills with the important difference that the instruments used were altered so that results would be reliable and valid for individual students

¹Michigan State Department of Education, Program Objectives for Elementary School Subjects (Lansing, Mich., July, 1971), 36 pp.

rather than, as in the previous year, reliable and valid only for groups of students. With this change, the results of the 1970-71 Michigan Assessment Program also could be used to identify individual students whose needs in the basic skills required further investigation.

By combining the data on individual students, information was created which provided measures of average educational need for each school and for each school district in the state. By combining the scores on all students in Michigan, a measure was created of the educational need of all students in the state. This system of assessment provided measures of educational need at four levels: (1) individual student; (2) school; (3) district; and (4) state.

State officials saw the assessment effort serving two basic purposes at the state level: (1) it provided information to help in making decisions regarding the allocation or distribution of resources and (2) it provided additional information to help in making decisions regarding the structuring of major educational programs.

The role of the assessment program in local applications of the Board's six-point program was to provide basic information which would guide local officials in the areas of student need and system operation which required intensive examination.

State officials emphasized that the assessment program was not designed to serve as a local evaluation.

instrument. Data from the assessment program only indicated areas requiring further investigation in order to carry out local evaluations and to make specific recommendations which were appropriate in each local area.

Analysis of Delivery System

The fourth element in the model investigated the ways the system used its human and material resources. In this step, educational planners were concerned with procedures through which the maximum utilization of buildings, books, materials, people, methods and other resources could be attained in the development of programs and projects.

Efforts in this area centered around developing a new role for curriculum consultants. The idea presented was to merge these consultants with the existing consultant staff in the areas of school district organization, transportation, school lunch, and pupil personnel services, thus developing a team of instructional specialists who would become skilled in analyzing the several diverse components that comprise any instructional program.¹

Evaluation

The basic premise of this step was that there are components which are common to the design of any sound

¹Michigan State Department of Education, Staff Position Paper Relative to the Instructional Specialists Program of the Department of Education (Lansing, Mich., February, 1971), p. 13.

evaluation. These components were placed in four categories: the purpose category, the instructional category, the procedural category, and the decision-facilitating category.

State officials perceived evaluation as having three purposes: (1) to determine whether or not the program was effective; (2) to determine why the program was effective or why it was not; and (3) to enable decision makers to make recommendations as to modification, expansion, or continuation of the program.¹

Recommendations for Improvement

The sixth step of the model encompassed all five of the previous elements and was intended to provide specific answers to the question: "How can a state educational system be altered so that it can be responsive to the needs of all those it serves?" The common goals outlined the general areas in which the system must direct its efforts. The performance objectives gave the specifics of student needs and desired system responses. Needs assessment was designed to measure the degree to which the student needs were met. Delivery system analysis examined the ways in which the system responded to these needs. Evaluation drew conclusions about the effectiveness of the system's responses. In the final element, information provided through each of the five

¹Michigan State Department of Education, Some Components of Educational Evaluation (Lansing, Mich., March, 1971), p. 12.

activities would be assembled and recommendations for specific changes in the system would be proposed. Designers of this model asserted the importance of the final element but noted that it would be of little value if the other five activities were not carried out effectively.

Colorado--The Colorado State Department of Education has moved from a traditional "minimum input-level" accreditation program to an output oriented approach which was described as "Accreditation by Contract."¹ Under the new procedures, those local districts which contracted to effect total school improvement received accreditation status from the Colorado Board of Education upon submission of a comprehensive school improvement plan. Accreditation was conditional upon successful completion of the plan.

The key to contract accreditation was the development and implementation of an action plan which would best meet the educational needs of children and youth. Under the new plan, accreditation was granted when a local school district committed itself to a plan of action designed to improve the quality of education, at which time a contract was entered into between the local board of education and the Colorado State Board of Education.

According to state officials, the new accreditation program offered local agencies the opportunity to be accredited

¹Accreditation by Contract, op. cit., 41 p.

on the basis of developing specific objectives uniquely suited to the educational needs of their students and then carrying out a planned sequence of activities designed to attain those stated objectives. The focus was on the requirements of the future, rather than standards of the past. The emphasis was changed from measuring inputs to evaluating results and from meeting minimum standards to striving for self-developed objectives consistent with the needs and capabilities of the local district.

Better education through better planning was reported to be the central purpose of accreditation by contract. More specifically, accreditation by contract was proposed as:

1. A way to individualize school-district accreditation based on the particular needs of the students in each district.
2. A way to implement comprehensive, continuous, long-range planning by establishing specific staff responsibilities and district-wide procedures.
3. A way to make the best possible use of all available resources by better relating (a) school and community; (b) needs, goals, and objectives; (c) programs, practices and services; (d) program planning and budgeting; (e) inputs, processes, outputs, and (f) costs and benefits.
4. A way to determine results by establishing measurable objectives.
5. A way to take timely action by charting a long-range operational plan of who is to do what at what time.¹

The procedures for developing an accreditation by contract were perceived by state planners as including five basic

¹Ibid., p. 4.

and sequential steps. The steps were: (1) Commitment; (2) Pre-Planning; (3) Planning; (4) Approval; and (5) Implementation.

The major steps employed in attaining accreditation by contract can be analyzed as follows:

Step 1: Commitment

The initial step to be taken would be a letter sent by the local school board to the State Commissioner of Education indicating the district's intent to enter into the planning activities leading to accreditation by contract. This first step was necessary to plan ahead for the type and extent of consultant services which the local district may request of the State Department of Education. In order to provide services with dispatch, two members of the State Department are assigned to each participating district to serve in a liaison capacity.

Step 2: Pre-Planning

A pre-planning phase was deemed necessary before launching into the multiple activities involved in developing a district-wide plan for education. Many people in many roles were involved in the process, in fact, school staff and patrons were most certainly involved in the initial decision of the board of education to enter into the contract accreditation program. Immediate and continuous involvement of all interested parties was considered imperative in the

development of long-range plans for education. Parents, teachers, students, school administrators, school board members and concerned citizens should be involved, representing every social, economic, racial and ethnic group of the community.

A coordinating or steering committee was usually given the responsibility for answering such pre-planning questions as:

1. What public information procedures would be necessary to bring about the involvement of all groups in the community?
2. What jobs would need to be done, and how would they be shared?
3. Are any changes necessary in the present assignments of the school staff? What outside consultant services may be necessary?
4. Should assignments and committees be organized district-wide, by grouping of schools, by individual schools, or be a combination of these?¹

Step 3: Planning

Designers of the Colorado Plan for Accreditation by Contract advanced the notion that there were two parts to the planning process.² The first half of the planning process involved analyzing the problem in terms of the questions: Where are we? <- - -> Where do we want to go? Before a solution to any problem can be developed, the problem should be

¹Ibid., p. 6.

²Ibid., p. 8.

thoroughly analyzed. Needs were defined as the difference or distance between (1) where we are and (2) where we would like to be. Once this difference was determined, solutions can be developed for closing the gap.

The second half of the planning process was to develop a solution to the problem in terms of the questions: How do we get there? <- - -> How will we know? Once the problem has been identified, the development of a solution was a matter of deciding upon (1) ways to close the gap as well as ways to measure the extent to which the gap was being closed.

Using the above rationale for problem solving, state officials applied this process as a model for analyzing student needs, quality education, student information, program information, staff information, facilities information, and financial information. Numerous examples of charts and and survey forms were presented as procedural planning guides for use by the participating school districts.

Planning was closely allied to the evaluation design in the Colorado Accreditation Program.¹ Student and staff evaluation was considered to be an intricate part of the planning process.

Student evaluation was viewed as a process of gathering, recording, and interpreting data which would indicate

¹Ibid., pp. 38-39.

the extent to which stated behavioral objectives for students were attained. Staff evaluation was explained as a process of gathering, recording, and interpreting data which would indicate the extent to which stated operational data for staff had been achieved.

The point was made that it was programs, rather than students, that were evaluated. For example, the extent to which a student succeeded or failed was a measure of the extent to which a given program succeeded or failed for the student. In short, programs were considered successful when they helped the students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to meet their needs. Therefore, when a course failed to meet student needs it was assumed that the course failed the student as opposed to the student failing the course.

Evaluation was perceived as a means for determining the extent to which desired results and actual results coincided. Each stated objective for student and staff was designed as an evaluation checkpoint for determining progress to that point. Checking the accomplishment of both intermediate and terminal objectives resulted in a system of continuous evaluation. Such continuous evaluation of student and staff performance provided the "feedback" necessary for making timely revision in the program to meet the needs of students.

Step 4: Approval

Following the completion of the first three steps, a contract committing the school district to implementing the plan would be drawn up by the local board of education and submitted to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education. The Contract-Accreditation Review Committee would evaluate proposed contracts on the basis of the following check list:

1. The extent of school-community involvement in the improvement plan.
2. The thoroughness with which present plans were analyzed.
3. The thoroughness with which future goals and objectives were determined.
4. The thoroughness with which improvement plans were developed.
5. The thoroughness with which evaluation procedures were developed.¹

Agreement to the contract and the subsequent implementation of its commitments would constitute accreditation by contract.

Step 5: Implementation

The action plan described on the previous pages was designed for educational improvement based upon specific, measurable objectives which made it possible to manage the plan on the basis of those objectives. The central thrust

¹Ibid., p. 40.

of the action plan was management-by-objectives. Each objective for student and staff constituted a checkpoint for the implementation of the plan. The action taken at each checkpoint was dependent upon continuous feedback or evaluation concerned with progress at that point. Continuous evaluation and management-by-objectives were, therefore, reported to be inseparable. A commitment to accreditation by contract was, then, a commitment to the implementation of planned improvement based on continuous evaluation and management by student and staff objectives.

The Contract Accreditation Plan was implemented by the Colorado State Department of Education during the 1971-72 school year. It cannot be said, at this point, that the plan has met with unqualified success. It should be noted, however, that this and the other models for accountability/accreditation described in this chapter could have far-reaching implications for the changing role of leadership on the state and local levels.

The concluding section of this chapter, then, will be concerned with the emerging role of state and local education agencies with respect to leadership responsibilities for the improvement of education.

Leadership Roles and Responsibilities of State Education Agencies

Over the past few years, there has been much said and written about the changing role of the State Education Agency

with respect to its responsibility for providing leadership in the development of new systems of accreditation consistent with the emerging demands for accountability in education. This notion was expressed by the observations of two authors who recently wrote:

Educational organizations change as do other organizations; they respond to technological and social changes by modifying their own behavior--by providing more, or fewer, or different services . . . state departments of education are organizations which have and must continue to react appropriately to new conditions if they are to be relevant to the educational enterprise . . . departments of education are today faced with new conditions and providing the stimulus for the emergence of a new role.¹

Examples have been presented earlier in this study which would indicate that perceptable changes in leadership roles were occurring in the State Departments of Education of Florida, North Carolina, Colorado, Michigan, and Washington as evidenced by the new or revised programs of accreditation initiated to incorporate varying degrees of accountability.

State Education Agencies cannot reasonably be expected to make a viable contribution to the changes that are occurring, or to the improvement of education if it continues to do only what has been done in the past. State Agencies must have the vision and foresight to anticipate and prepare for its appropriate roles in the emerging future. In the areas of accreditation and accountability, it is a matter of

¹Ronald F. Campbell and Gerald E. Stroufe, Strengthening State Departments of Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1967), pp. 76-77.

conjecture whether or not the Oklahoma State Department of Education has appropriately discharged its responsibilities for leadership initiative.

If State Education Agencies are to assume the responsibility for leadership in education, traditional organizational and operational concerns must be replaced by new leadership and service activities that are less bureaucratic, less regulatory, less bound by tradition and structures, and more concerned with planning, development, and change.

The term, "leadership," is often either misunderstood or misused because it has meant different things to different people. According to Morphet and Jesser,¹ "The fundamental purpose, or function, of leadership consists of providing assistance in the identification and attainment of goals that have been established by and for the organization." It is in this context that leadership, as both a role and function, is crucial to the State Education Agency."

It is in this vein that the agency can and must provide leadership of the type suggested by Morphet, Johns and Reller² who observed that constructive leadership may be found when assistance is provided in: (1) Defining tasks, goals and purposes of the organization; (2) Achieving or

¹Morphet and Jesser, op. cit., pp. 18-22.

²Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 127.

attaining the tasks, goals and purposes of the organization; and (3) Maintaining the organization by accommodating emerging as well as present organizational and individual needs.

Quite often people, and especially educators, are faced with a basic dilemma relating to the concept of power and leadership. Can a person be a leader without having power and authority? Conversely, does the existence of power and authority result in leadership?

These questions were crucial as State Agencies prepared to assume leadership roles in education. Power and authority may be valid components of leadership, but there was a difference between "power over" and "power with." As Wiles observed:

Under the group approach to leadership, a leader is not concerned with getting and maintaining personal authority. His chief purpose is to develop power that will enable the group to accomplish its goal. He does not conceive of his power as something apart from the power of the group. He is concerned with developing the type of relationships that will give him "power with" the group.¹

When State Education Agencies shift from traditional regulatory roles to greater reliance on the leadership role, more positive aspects of leadership must be utilized; and greater care must be taken to avoid the potential misuse of leadership. Leadership, and all that it implies, must be clearly understood and accepted by all concerned. As Morphet, Johns, and Reller have indicated:

¹Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 164.

No school group is completely autonomous in authority. All school groups, both formal and informal, are sub-groups of the total organization. The ultimate "group" that has the final authority to determine school goals is the people . . . Participation in decision making by all groups and individuals concerned is now being widely advocated. As groups participate in decision making, it is vital that the limits of authority of each group be clearly defined. The administrator-leader must also make clear to groups and individuals participating in decision making, the decisions that he reserves for executive decision making and the decisions in which they can share.¹

Whyte has offered some cogent observations relating to "democratic leadership" that redirects attention to some of the basic problems of leadership:

The leader of a group or organization is expected to be "democratic." He is expected to get results through encouraging "participation" on the part of group members in the decision-making process . . . We are inclined to be more than a little suspicious toward anyone in a position of authority. At the same time, we recognize that a complex society cannot run without exercise of some authority and without some limitations upon individual freedom. Perhaps, then, we can find our way out of the dilemma if we try to make our organization more democratic and substitute "democratic" for "autocratic" leadership.²

The details of how the leadership roles and functions may be assumed by State Education Agencies have been the subject of many recent studies, including those mentioned above. They were also of primary concern in this study. The roles and functions of State Education Agencies in assuming leadership for the improvement of education in public

¹Morphet, Johns, and Reller, op. cit., p. 41.

²William Foote Whyte, Leadership and Group Participation (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1953), p. 1.

schools were described as six primary tasks. They were:¹

Goals: The first step in improving education involved choosing and clearly stating appropriate goals. Efforts to improve schools will be ineffective if the goals are not clearly defined. Goals must be related to specific courses of action. The goals are the major targets and they must be acceptable to the majority of the persons concerned with them: the students, their parents, the public that finances education, and the educators who are charged with seeing that they are attained. Many goals will be statewide in nature while some goals will be designed to meet special local needs. No systematic improvements would be likely to occur until some reasonably firm consensus regarding what society expects from the educational system has been achieved. The State Education Agency would have the major responsibility for leading in the development of statewide goals. It would also have the responsibility for assisting local systems and local schools in developing their supplementary or local goals.

In establishing goals, every effort would be made to insure broad representation of students, parents, interested citizens and professional educators and consultants. All goals for education should be directly or indirectly concerned

¹Clifford L. Dochterman and Barron B. Beshor, "Directions to Better Education," Improving State Leadership in Education (Denver, Colo., 1970), pp. 13-22.

with and designed to facilitate quality or excellence in student learning.

Policies: A goal and a policy are related to the extent that a goal is a fixed objective while a policy is a general guide for future decisions and actions. It indicates the course to be followed. Once policies are agreed upon they should be put in written form to avoid the possibility of misunderstanding and dissension.

The development of sound workable policies required: (a) assembling and analyzing data; (b) systematic study of data to determine the implications of proposed policies and to identify alternative policies; and (c) the use of value judgments where evidence is inconclusive. When value judgments are used in formulating policies a working consensus of all concerned should be sought.

Planning: To design education for the future requires continuous planning. The only way a state can make progress in improving education is to proceed seriously and continuously to identify the needs of society and systematically plan for change.

Educational planning is a complex process involving many interrelated activities, such as:

1. Determining present problems and unmet needs of students and society.
2. Identifying and stating clearly long-range goals.
3. Finding alternative ways to attain the goals and selecting the best.

4. Establishing priorities.
5. Collecting appropriate data and obtaining resources needed to establish and implement plans.
6. Utilizing the most creative imagination and helpful technologies available.

There were certain important areas of responsibility and that should be conducted or initiated at the state level.

They included:

1. The responsibility of the State Agency to plan its own role, functions, services and procedures in order that it may provide leadership in improving education at the local district level.
2. State Education Agencies should develop leadership resources and provide the coordination needed to assist local schools and school districts in systematic planning. While the State Agency should provide leadership assistance and services, it should not do the actual planning for local districts. Developing plans for a local school district should not be a function of a State Education Agency.
3. Competent and concerned lay persons, educators, planning experts, consultants with special skills, local school boards and state school boards must be actively involved in long-range planning. Expert consultants would give valuable guidance and assistance, but would not be expected to make the basic policy decisions for the representatives of the school or the state if the goals were eventually to be accepted by a majority of those affected. Significant educational improvements occurred when the people concerned or affected were realistically involved in planning the improvements.
4. It must be recognized that some of the needed improvements in education would require changes in existing laws, special funding, adoption of new attitudes, extensive retraining and reorientation.

Priorities: It would not be realistic to expect that the state or school districts could undertake all of the needed improvements at once. The demands on staff, students and

economy would be too great. For these and other reasons, priorities or sequential steps should be established. Criteria that should be considered in establishing priorities were:

1. Humane Concerns: The activities, programs or changes that would contribute most to the solution of both current and long-range problems of society.
2. Range of Influence: The potential significance for those served, including the seriously disadvantaged.
3. Feasibility: The probability that what is proposed would make a significant difference.
4. Public Acceptance: The prospects that the change would attract favorable attention and acceptance throughout the state.

Implementation: The election of qualified school boards, selection of a highly qualified staff, establishment of goals, planning and the other things that go into making a good educational system would be of no avail without implementation. Steps to implement new plans, regardless of their merit, could be expected to generate a certain amount of controversy. Developing a detailed strategy for implementing any plan for improving education was considered to be as essential as creating the basic plans.

Implementation required several things:

1. Widespread involvement in the process of developing plans and full communication would be essential if public and staff misunderstandings and resistance are to be avoided or minimized.
2. A basic commitment of human and economic resources would be a necessity if improvement is to be accomplished.

3. Extensive reorientation or retraining of faculty and staff members will probably be needed.

Evaluation and Accountability: The goals established by the state or local agency are only as effective as the methods used to evaluate them. Evaluation must be a continuous process. It must determine the effectiveness of the organization and programs and provide a valid measure of the progress of students. Many of the evaluating procedures and techniques of the past have been inadequate, inappropriate or ineffective.

Local education agencies can be assisted by the State Education Agency by:

1. Developing, with the assistance of a representative committee, the criteria needed by local school districts to evaluate their own organization, procedures, programs, reporting and progress.
2. Assist local schools and school districts in making realistic evaluations and reports to the public.
3. Assist in developing, evaluating, utilizing and interpreting measures of cost effectiveness.
4. Evaluating state objectives, programs and progress and suggesting revisions where necessary.

Evaluation and accountability can be possible only when the educational goals are clearly defined. Evaluation should be viewed as a means for determining the worth of a process. An effective evaluation process must be employed to determine the educational benefits to students; it is essential to provide better information on which decisions, including those involving the allocation of resources, can be made.

Evaluation provided the feedback that education decision makers must have before judgment could be made about the soundness of proposed or operative programs. Sound evaluation techniques were considered essential in the quality of the "outputs" of an educational system can be determined.

The role and functions of many State Education Agencies are being redefined based on the changing needs and expectations of the public which they serve. Because public education should be considered a primary responsibility of each state, the State Education Agency, in close collaboration with local school districts, should be in a logical position to facilitate needed changes in education.

The future success of education in Oklahoma should rest largely with the State Education Agency and the leadership and services provided to plan and effect improvements in all aspects of education and to establish appropriate procedures for evaluating outcomes.

Summary

In this chapter the writer identified five State Departments of Education which were considered to be model accreditation/accountability programs. These states were: Washington, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, and Colorado.

The new programs in Colorado, Florida, and Michigan were operational whereas the Washington and North Carolina programs were still in the planning stage.

Although each of the model programs contained variations in their approach to accreditation/accountability, there were common elements identified in each. Specifically, each state emphasized the importance of involvement by a broad representation of educators, students and lay people during all phases of the planning process. There was some variation in terminology, but each state stressed the significance of sequential steps in the formulation of new programs. These steps included, but were not limited to: (1) a commitment by the local school district; (2) a needs assessment; (3) the planning phase (formulation of goals and objectives); (4) implementation phase; (5) evaluation; and (6) modification phase (recommendations for improvement). This process was visualized as being cyclical, normally on a five year basis. Evaluation was the phase which each of the states devoted much attention and, presumably, it was this element in the process that was the most difficult to perfect.

Of equal importance in this chapter was the role and functions of State Agencies in providing leadership and services to local school districts as they planned and implemented new accountability/accreditation programs.

If State Education Agencies do only what they have done in the past, they cannot be expected to make much contribution to the improvement of education. It became increasingly clear, during the course of this investigation, that the traditional State Agency needs revamping if it is to carry out

its major role effectively: providing leadership and services in planning and helping others to plan for quality education. Its roles and functions can no longer be limited to the traditional tasks of monitoring compliance with regulations, teacher certification, and various custodial functions.

In a time of rapid change and growing demands for accountability, the State Education Agency is under pressure from many sides. It is subject to challenges and demands that tend to shape the kind and quality of educational leadership that can be provided. As evidenced by examples given in this chapter, there are State Agencies that have responded to the challenge for a "new" kind of leadership and they are paving the way for those who have the vision and courage to follow.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to investigate and analyze current policies and procedures of State Education Agencies in the accreditation of public schools. More specifically, it was intended to develop principles by which a state education program may be evaluated; to identify promising practices and perceptible trends as they relate to the accreditation of public schools; and to identify approaches in relating educational accountability to the accreditation process.

The research was characterized by three principal steps: first, each State Department of Education was requested to send a copy of its current accreditation manual along with printed materials, or an explanation, describing any current plans or research pertaining to accreditation and/or accountability. Each of the fifty State Departments of Education responded to this request.

Second, two instruments were developed and tested for the collection and assessment of data presented in this investigation. These instruments were referred to in this study

as the State Questionnaire and the Principles for Accreditation.

A set of Principles for Accreditation was formulated and regarded as basic to a good state accreditation/accountability program. These principles were developed from the professional literature to provide a basis for evaluating state accreditation programs. This tentative list of principles was then submitted to a jury of eleven professional educators recognized for their expertise in the area of public school accreditation and administration. A principle was accepted if there was consensus of opinion by at least seven of the jurors.

The State Questionnaire was developed and submitted to a second group of ten educators selected for their knowledge in the area of public school accreditation and administration. Following a critical perusal of this instrument by each of the ten educators, their recommendations were incorporated in the refinement of the final draft of the questionnaire. A copy of the State Questionnaire was mailed to specific individuals in each of the State Departments of Education. A response was received from each of the fifty State Education Agencies.

The information gained from the administration of the State Questionnaire and other sources was categorized, tabulated and analyzed as follows:

1. Legal authority for the accreditation of public schools.
2. Status of required or voluntary programs for accreditation.
3. Accreditation classification categories and terms.
4. Purposes of accreditation.
5. The meaning of state accreditation.
6. Practices relating to the review and revision of accreditation standards.
7. Practices of State Departments of Education concerning on-site visits.
8. State legislation pertaining to accountability.
9. The responsibility of State Departments of Education in implementing a system of accountability.
10. Leadership procedures used by State Departments of Education to incorporate accountability into the accreditation process.

The third step employed in the development of this study included the identification of model programs, by State Departments of Education, which incorporated the concept of accountability into the accreditation process. Of primary importance was the change or redirection of the leadership role and functions of State Education Agencies emerging as an outgrowth of these new programs.

Major Findings

1. Sixty-six percent of the State Departments of Education indicated that accreditation was mandatory and a majority of the states affirmed that a purpose of accreditation was to certify the eligibility of school districts to

receive state financial aid.

2. Twenty-five State Departments of Education reported that accreditation was provided for the total system. Nineteen states required accreditation of the total system while in six states accreditation for the total school system was voluntary.

3. Seventeen State Departments of Education provided for levels of classification above the minimum level for basic accreditation. Eleven states used only one term in its classification category while eight states used classification terms in descending order from the level of basic accreditation.

4. Forty-three State Departments of Education stated that a purpose of accreditation was to insure a uniform minimum level of education in the state public schools.

5. Thirty-six states reported that a purpose of accreditation was to encourage self-evaluation in the local school districts, while thirty-four states indicated that encouragement of experimentation and innovation was a purpose.

6. Forty State Departments of Education indicated that procedures were established for the review and/or revision of accreditation standards and policies. Sixteen states reported that meetings for the purpose of review and/or revision of accreditation standards were scheduled "as needed," while sixteen states scheduled these meetings at least on an annual basis.

7. State Department of Education personnel were used exclusively for the review and/or revision process in seventeen states, while fourteen states reported that review and/or revision committees were broadly representative of state and local education agency personnel and lay people. Laymen most frequently represented were state and local board of education members and students.

8. Thirty-nine State Departments of Education affirmed that on-site visits of local schools or school districts were conducted. Nineteen states reported that the on-site visits were conducted at intervals of five years or less. The on-site visits were conducted exclusively by State Department of Education personnel in twenty states; by state and local education personnel in seven states; and by a broader representation, including lay people, in twelve states.

9. Ten State Departments of Education reported that State Legislation pertaining to educational accountability had been enacted. Twenty-five states indicated the intention of developing a system of accountability which would be closely allied with the accreditation concept. Most of the states that were developing a system of accountability were assuming this responsibility in the absence of statutory mandate.

10. The emphasis on accountability and new approaches to accreditation indicated a redirection of the leadership role and functions of personnel within many State Education Agencies.

Conclusions

The findings made as a result of this study warranted a number of conclusions:

1. The concept being accepted by many State Education Agencies is to make accreditation mandatory and to provide accreditation for the total school system.
2. The practice of most State Agencies of requiring schools to comply with only minimum accreditation standards did not appear to provide the necessary incentive for local education agencies to improve the quality of education.
3. The provision of multiple, rather than single, levels of accreditation is a practice which probably encourages school program improvement at the local level.
4. Although a majority of the State Education Agencies affirmed that a purpose of accreditation was to encourage experimentation and innovation, the degree to which this was accomplished appeared questionable.
5. There appeared to be a trend toward seeking broader representation, involving educators and lay people outside the state agency, to assist in the review/revision of accreditation standards and procedures.
6. Many State Education Agencies are incorporating accountability programs into the accreditation process in part, perhaps, to forestall inappropriate legislative action aimed at public schools.

7. The findings indicate strongly that many State Education Agencies are providing effective leadership in the improvement of local school programs.

8. The findings of this study strongly suggest that the leadership role and functions of many other State Education Agencies must be modified or changed before any positive progress can be realized in the improvement of public school education.

Recommendations

The foregoing conclusions suggest the following recommendations which, if initiated, might significantly alter and improve public school education in Oklahoma and many other states:

1. Accreditation standards should be changed to provide for the accreditation of the total school system and accreditation should be mandatory.

This change of procedure to accreditation of the total system, rather than individual public schools, should strengthen State Education Agency relationships and participation in individual school programs. Many of the past problems related to the accreditation of individual schools have arisen because of the inequitable distribution of resources necessary for the accreditation of the secondary school. Often, this misdirection of resources has been at the expense of elementary education.

2. Levels of classification which exceed minimum standards should be applied to the total school system.

The adoption of this principle of accreditation should provide for the stimulation and recognition of quality on levels higher than the minimum. This element of the accreditation program should be designed to require progress and improvements on the part of all schools regardless of their previous attainments. There would be no financial inducements for meeting higher levels of classification. Prestige, recognition, and the desire to serve student needs in the best possible way are the primary incentives.

3. Accreditation should be determined by the effectiveness of a school district's comprehensive, continuous, short and long-range planning.

To be comprehensive, planning should be based upon broad and intensive school-community involvement. Planning should be continuous and appraisal procedures should be built into the plan to insure that the means selected are achieving the ends desired. A cyclical pattern of assessment - - - planning - - - implementation - - - reassessment should be established and recycled at intervals of not more than five years. Accountability should be built in as an integral, operational aspect of the total accreditation process.

4. Appropriate steps should be taken to appoint a State Accreditation Committee whose primary function would consist of an annual appraisal of accreditation standards and procedures.

The membership of this committee should be representative of secondary school principals, school superintendents,

classroom teachers, members of the staff of the State Department of Education and other professional educators and appropriate lay people appointed by the State Superintendent, subject to confirmation by the State Board of Education. Such a committee would meet once a year or more often if needed, would continue the appraisal of accreditation standards and would be prepared to recommend revision, modification, or expansion of the criteria as the needs emerged.

5. On-site visits to local school districts by a representative team of professional educators and appropriate lay people should be an integral phase of the accreditation process and should occur at intervals of not more than five years.

As a suggested new accreditation program is initiated in a State, local school districts are informed of the State program and process to be followed. The school district then plans and conducts its self-evaluation after which it notifies the State Education Agency that it is ready for an on-site visiting committee. Following the on-site visit an accreditation report is then prepared by the evaluation team recommending specific action by the State Board of Education. If action by the State Board is favorable, accreditation is provided. The school district is expected to then begin to think and plan for subsequent self-evaluation and external visits. To maintain accreditation the school district would be required to undergo a reevaluation within a five year period. School districts may be required to submit written reports during the interim years between visitations.

6. State Education Agencies should exercise leadership initiative by assisting local school districts in the development and implementation of a system of accountability. The concept of accountability should be closely allied with the accreditation process.

The State Education Agency can assist local school districts by developing, with the assistance of a representative committee, the criteria needed by local districts to evaluate their own organization, procedures, programs and progress. The State Agency should also evaluate state objectives, programs, and progress and make changes as necessary. The State Accreditation Committee should be involved in this responsible task.

7. The leadership role and functions of State Education Agencies should be modified or changed to meet the emerging demands for accountability in education and this may often call for higher levels of professional competence in the staff of State Education Agencies.

Models were presented in this study which would indicate that perceptible changes in leadership roles and functions were occurring in many State Education Agencies as evidenced by the new or revised programs of accreditation planned to incorporate, to varying degrees, the concept of accountability. State Agencies must have the vision and foresight to anticipate and prepare for bold new plans and methods for the organization, operation and financing of the educational program.

If State Education Agencies are to assume the responsibility for leadership in education, traditional organizational

and operational concerns must be replaced by new leadership and service activities that are less bureaucratic, less regulatory, less bound by tradition and structures, and more concerned with planning, development and change. Different approaches to staffing appears obvious if this need is met.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Campbell, Ronald F., and Stroufe, Gerald E. Strengthening State Departments of Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1967.
- Coleman, James S., and Others. Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Colorado Department of Education. A School Improvement Process--Accreditation by Contract. Denver, Colorado, October, 1971.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools. Washington, D.C., 1960.
- Florida State Department of Education. Accreditation Standards. Tallahassee, Florida, 1971.
- Goodlad, John L. The Changing School Curriculum. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.
- Harris, Yeuell Y., and Seibert, Ivan N. The State Education Agency. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Handbook VII, 1970. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Michigan State Department of Education. The Common Goals of Michigan Education: Tentative. Lansing, Michigan, 1970.
- Michigan State Department of Education. Developing a New Role for the State Education Agency: The Michigan Experience. Lansing, Michigan, 1971.
- Michigan State Department of Education. A Position Statement on Education Accountability. Lansing, Michigan, 1972.
- Michigan State Department of Education. Program Objectives for Elementary School Subjects. Lansing, Michigan, 1971.

- Michigan State Department of Education. Some Components of Educational Evaluation. Lansing, Michigan, March, 1971.
- Michigan State Department of Education. Staff Position Paper Relative to the Instructional Specialists Program of the Department of Education. Lansing, Michigan, February, 1971.
- Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe L.; and Reller, Theodore. Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. State Accreditation of School Administrative Units in North Carolina. Raleigh, North Carolina, August, 1972.
- Rich, William B. Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools, The Responsibilities and Services of State Departments of Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin No. 36, 1960. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Roueche, John E.; Baker, George A.; and Brownell, Richard L. "Accountability in the Two Year College," in Accountability in American Education. Edited by Frank J. Sciara and Richard K. Jantz. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.
- Sciara, Frank J., and Jantz, Richard K. Accountability in American Education. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.
- Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York, N.Y.: Random House, 1970.
- Vlaanderen, Russell B., and Ludka, Arthur P. "Evaluating Education in a Changing Society," in Emerging State Responsibilities for Education. Edited by Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser. Denver, Colo.: Designing Education for the Future, 1969.
- Whyte, William Foote. Leadership and Group Participation. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1953.
- Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Articles and Periodicals

- Alioto, Robert F., and Jungherr, J. A. "Using PPBS to Overcome Taxpayers' Resistance," Phi Delta Kappan, (November, 1969), pp. 138-141.
- Bain, Helen. "Self-Governance Must Come First, Then Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, (April, 1970), p. 413.
- Barbee, Don. "Differentiated Staffing: Expectations and Pitfalls," TEPS Write-in Paper No. 1 on Flexible Staffing Patterns. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, March, 1969.
- Crowson, Robert L., and Wilbur, Thomas P. "Purposes of the Michigan Assessment of Education," ERIC Document ED-043-663, (March, 1970).
- Davies, Don. "The Relevance of Accountability." Journal of Teacher Education, (Spring, 1970), p. 128.
- Dochterman, Clifford L., and Beshar, Barron B. "Directions to Better Education." Improving State Leadership in Education, (Denver, Colorado., 1970), pp. 13-22.
- Fantini, Mario; Harris, Donald; and Nash, Samuel. "Options for Students, Parents, and Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan, (May, 1971), pp. 541-543.
- "Florida's Accountability Plan Focuses on the Nation's Principals." Nation's Schools, (November, 1970), pp. 54-55.
- Hendrickson, Lloyd. "Contract Teaching--A Reality." North Dakota Journal of Education, (October, 1970), pp. 26-27.
- Janssen, Peter A. "Education Vouchers." American Education, (December, 1970), pp. 9-11.
- "Large Majority Favors Teachers Accountability," Opinion Poll, Nation's Schools, (December, 1970), p. 33.
- Lessinger, Leon. "Accountability in Public Education." Today's Education, (May, 1970), pp. 52-53.
- Lopez, Felix M. "Accountability in Education." Phi Delta Kappan, (December, 1970), pp. 231-235.

- McKinney, Floyd L., and Manneback, Alfred J. "Performance Objectives: Foundations for Evaluation." Agricultural Education Magazine, (June, 1970), pp. 301-302.
- Martin, Reed. "Performance Contracting: Making It Legal." Nation's Schools, (January, 1971), pp. 62-63.
- Mecklenburger, James, and Wilson, John. "The Performance Contract in Gary." Phi Delta Kappan, (March, 1971), pp. 406-411.
- Mehrens, William A. "National Assessment of Educational Progress." Childhood Education, (May, 1970), p. 31.
- Morphet, Edgar L., and Jesser, David L., eds. "The Emerging Role of State Education Agencies," pp. 145-147, Emerging State Responsibility for Education, Improving State Leadership in Education, (Denver, Colorado, October, 1970), 177 pp. ERIC Document, ED-047-409.
- Morphet, Edgar L.; Jesser, David L.; and Ludka, Arthur P. "Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education. Improving State Leadership in Education, (Denver, Colorado, 1971), p. 17.
- Morphet, Edgar L.; Jesser, David L.; and Ludka, Arthur P. "Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education." Improving State Leadership in Education, (Denver, Colorado, 1971), p. 86.
- Morris, John E. "Accountability: Watchword for the 70's." The Clearing House, (February, 1971), pp. 323-327.
- Nixon, Richard M. Education Message of 1970. As cited by Leon Lessinger, "Robbing Peter to Pay Paul: Accounting for our Stewardship of Public Education." Educational Technology, (January, 1971).
- Olivero, James L. "The Meaning and Application of Differentiated Staffing in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan, (September, 1970), pp. 34-40.
- Rasp, Alfred, Sr. "Accountability Through Accreditation--An Olympia-Eye View." Washington Education, (February, 1971), pp. 13-15.
- Rice, Arthur H. "Good Teachers Stand to Benefit from Accountability Plans." Nation's Schools, (December, 1970), p. 413.
- Snider, Glenn, and Hall, Donald J. "The Accountability Concept and Testing Programs." The Oklahoma Teacher, (November, 1971), 53:3, p. 23.

"Texarkana: The Second Year Around." Nation's Schools, (March, 1971), pp. 32-33.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Testing for Accountability." Nation's Schools, (December, 1970), pp. 37-39.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The State Departments of Education: Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on State Departments of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Printing Office, 1969.

Wagner, David E. "Do You Know Anything At All About How Well or How Much Your Teachers Teach?" The American School Board Journal, (August, 1970), p. 21.

Woodington, Donald D. "Accountability From the Viewpoint of a State Commissioner of Education." Phi Delta Kappan, (October, 1972), pp. 96-97.

Unpublished Material

Beggs, David W., and Others. "A Study of the Position of State Departments of Public Instruction Accrediting Agencies and Selected National Professional Organizations Concerning Experimentation and Innovation in Public Secondary Schools. Indiana University, September, 1967, 73p. ERIC Document, ED-017-968.

Huitt, R. E. "A Survey of Elementary School Accreditation Practices and Standards in the United States." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964.

Meade, Edward J., Jr. "Accountability and Governance in Public Education." Address to the Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 12, 1968.

Statler, E. S. "An Analysis of Current Secondary School Standards of State Agencies and Regional Accrediting Association." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Ohio State University, 1960.

APPENDIX A

STATE QUESTIONNAIRE

THE OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
STATE ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

S T A T E Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

In completing this questionnaire, please keep in mind that the term "accreditation" is defined here as a level of attainment which is achieved by a public school that either meets the recognition for, or exceeds the minimum requirements established by the state.

Please check or write in the appropriate response to each of the questions or statements given below. If an item is not applicable in your state, so indicate with (N/A).

1. Accreditation of public schools is a function of the state education agency. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

2. If your answer to the previous statement is "no," what agency, if any, should perform this function? _____

3. Do the regional accrediting association standards:

- a. Encourage or influence the state department to require higher standards _____
- b. Serve as a minimum for state standards _____
- c. Have no noticeable effect on the state accreditation program _____

4. State accreditation is:

	Not required for	Voluntary for	Required for
Total System	_____	_____	_____
High School	_____	_____	_____
Jr. High	_____	_____	_____
Elementary	_____	_____	_____

- a. State department professional education personnel only. _____
- b. State and local professional education personnel only. _____
- c. Local school faculty and staff only. _____
- d. Local school faculty, staff, and community representatives. _____
- e. All of the above. _____
- f. Others (please specify). _____

16. If the answer is YES to the previous question, what is the frequency with which an "on site" evaluation, inspection, or visitation of the local school is conducted? _____

17. What agency, group, committee, commission or division is responsible for the review and revision of accreditation standards? _____

18. Indicate the representation of the above group.
(check all which apply)

- a. State education agency personnel _____
- b. Administrators _____
- c. Public school teachers _____
- d. College or university personnel _____
- e. Professional education organizations _____
- f. Laymen _____

19. How often does the above group meet? _____

20. To what agency or person of the state department of education does this group report? _____

21. Has legislation dealing with the concept of "educational accountability" been enacted in your state? YES _____ NO _____

5. A school must become accredited in order to receive state aid. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

6. Accreditation is provided on an annual basis. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

7. If not annual for how long is accreditation provided?

8. The legal authority to accredit public schools is established by state statute. YES _____ NO _____

9. If the answer is YES to the previous statement, to which of the following agencies is this authority delegated?

- a. State Department of Education _____
- b. State Board of Education _____
- c. Chief State School Officer _____
- d. Others (please specify) _____

10. Are levels or classes of accreditation provided?
YES _____ NO _____

11. If levels or classes are provided, indicate what they are.

12. The level or classification of accreditation applies to:

- a. Total system _____
- b. Elementary _____
- c. Junior High _____
- d. High School _____

13. Check each item which is an objective of the state accreditation process.

- a. Stimulate growth and improvement in local school systems. _____
- b. Certify eligibility of school districts to receive state financial aid. _____
- c. To insure legal operation of the local school system or school _____
- d. Insure a uniform minimum level of education in all public school districts. _____
- e. Provide for the general guidance and direction of schools throughout the state. _____
- f. Encourage experimentation and innovation. _____
- g. Encourage self-evaluation by local school districts. _____
- h. To incorporate the concept of Educational Accountability into accreditation process. _____
- i. Other objectives. _____

14. Accreditation, when conferred, means that the state education agency: (Check each item that is applicable)

- a. Officially accepts and acknowledges the legal operation of the school system. _____
- b. Officially sanctions the operation of the school or school system. _____
- c. Certifies that the school meets all legal requirements. _____
- d. Endorses the quality of the school's program. _____
- e. Certifies that the school system meets, or exceeds, minimum state standards. _____

15. Does the state education agency require an evaluation, inspection, or visitation of the local school as a part of accreditation procedures?

YES _____ NO _____ If "YES" indicate by checking each of the following which performs this function.

22. Has the state education department or agency been vested with responsibility for implementing any state program of public school accountability?

YES _____ NO _____ Comments _____

23. Has any attempt been made to incorporate the concept of "accountability" into the accreditation process?

YES _____ NO _____

If "YES" briefly describe, or attach materials which will describe any plans which are being contemplated or implemented.

APPENDIX B

EDUCATORS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE REFINEMENT
OF THE STATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. Kenneth Elsner
Assistant Superintendent
Edmond Public Schools
Edmond, Oklahoma

Dr. Lewis Eubanks
Assistant Superintendent
Midwest City Public Schools
Midwest City, Oklahoma

Dr. O. D. Johns
Professor of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Dr. Richard Jungers
Professor of Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Dr. Milton Lehr
Professor of Education
Northwestern State College
Alva, Oklahoma

Dr. Major McClure
Professor of Education
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

Dr. Dale Mullins
Dean of Education
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma

Dr. Jack Parker
Professor of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Dr. Lederle Scott
Executive Secretary
Oklahoma Education Association
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dr. Roy Troutt
College of Liberal Studies
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT USED IN VALIDATING THE PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITATION

SELECTED PRINCIPLES FOR STATE ACCREDITATION
OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

There is considerable variance among the State Departments of Education as to what constitutes an optimal set of standards for the accreditation of public schools. The purpose of this inquiry is to determine if there are certain accreditation standards and practices that are judged to be characteristic of a good state accreditation program.

As you complete this inquiry, please keep in mind that the term "accreditation" is defined here as a level of attainment which is achieved by a public school that either meets or exceeds the minimum requirements established for accreditation.

This inquiry has two parts. The first part deals with principles for accreditation; the second part seeks opinions pertaining to accreditation practices. Following each item listed below, indicate YES or NO if you believe the item would be characteristic of a good state accreditation program. Additional space is provided for any comments you may wish to make.

PART ONE

1. Accreditation shall be voluntary on the part of local public schools and school systems. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

2. The allocation of state financial aid to a local school district should not be contingent upon that schools attainment of accredited status. YES _____ NO _____ Comments _____

3. Levels of accreditation should be employed by the state education agency in accreditation of schools or school systems. YES _____ NO _____ Comments _____

4. Accreditation should apply to the total school system. YES _____ NO _____ Comments _____

5. Reevaluation, through self-study and visiting committees, should occur at least once each five year period with annual reports submitted during the interim years to the State Department of Education. YES _____ NO _____ Comments _____

6. Standards for accreditation should be formulated by the state education agency in close collaboration with various segments of the organized education profession and appropriate laymen. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

7. Standards for accreditation should be both qualitative and quantitative in nature. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

8. State accreditation standards should be reviewed annually by a representative body of professional educators and laymen and the recommendations of this body should be presented directly to the state board of education for action. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

PART TWO

9. State education agencies should rely entirely on regional accrediting agencies for the accreditation of public schools and not accredit schools which do not meet regional accreditation standards. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

10. State education agencies, if their accreditation standards are appropriate, should have complete responsibility for the accreditation of all public schools. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

11. Regional accrediting agencies should accredit the total school system rather than only segments of the school system. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

12. The application of accreditation procedures should be characterized by less rigidity and the exercise of greater discretionary action on the part of local schools.

YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

13. Accountability for the quality of public school education should be a "shared" responsibility between the state and local education agencies. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

14. The major responsibility for incorporating "accountability" into public school education should rest with the state department of education as a part of the accreditation process.

YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

15. The concept of "accountability" should be a basic part of the accreditation process since the local school or school system should demonstrate that it is satisfactorily achieving its appropriately identified and developed education objectives. YES _____ NO _____

Comments _____

APPENDIX D

EDUCATORS WHO SERVED AS JURORS IN VALIDATING
THE PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITATION

Dr. B. Dean Bowles, Associate Professor
Department of Educational Administration
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Gordon Cawalti, Superintendent
Tulsa Public Schools
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Dr. Floyd T. Christian, Commissioner
Florida State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Jack Culbertson, Executive Director
University Council for Educational Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Dr. W. R. Goodson, Executive Secretary
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Byron W. Hansford, Executive Secretary
Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Richard Hargrove, Professor of Education
Lamar State University
Beaumont, Texas

Dr. John Marvel, President
Adams State University
Alamosa, Colorado

Dr. Walter D. Talbot, State Superintendent
Utah State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dr. J. Lloyd Trump, Associate Secretary
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Morris Wallace, Chairman
Department of Education
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas

APPENDIX E

LETTERS OF INQUIRY AND TRANSMITTAL

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Oklahoma Education Association

323 East Madison, Oklahoma City 73105

December 9, 1971

Dear

The Accreditation Committee of the Oklahoma Association of Secondary School Principals, in cooperation with the Oklahoma State Department of Education is currently involved in the revision of our accreditation standards and procedures. We are attempting to obtain from the various State Departments of Education information on their respective accreditation standards and programs of accountability. Furthermore, we would be extremely interested in the results of any current research undertaken in this area as well as any plans you may have regarding revision of the accreditation process.

I should also mention that this information will be used as supportive data for a doctoral study now being conducted by the undersigned.

Any assistance you can give us in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bill E. Martin

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Oklahoma Education Association

323 East Madison, Oklahoma City 73105

October 2, 1972

Dear

The State Accreditation Committee of the Oklahoma Association of Secondary School Principals, under the auspice of the Oklahoma State Department of Education, has authorized an inquiry into the accreditation procedures as practiced by the State Departments of Education. A questionnaire has been prepared and will be sent to each of the State Departments of Education soliciting information relative to the various aspects of state accreditation of public schools.

In order to appropriately assess or evaluate the data received in response to the aforementioned questionnaire, a set of principles for state accreditation of public schools will be devised which, hopefully, will be characteristic of a good state accreditation program. In our opinion the principles for accreditation should first be subjected to the judgement and validation by a panel of educators who are noted for their expertise in the area of public school accreditation.

The purpose of this letter is to request that you, as one who is eminently qualified, serve on a panel of twelve jurors to judge the validity of selected principles for state accreditation. After you have considered this request would you please indicate your decision on the attached form and return it in the self-addressed envelope?

Should you agree to serve on this panel you will be mailed the principles for accreditation along with instructions for judging their appropriateness. In most cases direct, one-word responses will be all that is required with additional space provided for other comments.

I should also mention that this information will be used as supportive data for a doctoral study now being conducted by the undersigned.

I sincerely hope that we will receive from you an affirmative response.

With best regards,

Bill E. Martin, Chairman
State Accreditation Committee

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Oklahoma Education Association

323 East Madison, Oklahoma City 73105

October 30, 1972

Dear

Attached is the instrument relating to the accreditation of public schools which you kindly consented to judge. Please bear in mind that these principles were selected to investigate specific aspects of the accreditation process, rather than the broad spectrum of accreditation standards.

Our estimated completion data for this study is February, 1973, at which time we plan to have ready a set of recommendations for the improvement of the Oklahoma state accreditation standards and procedures for presentation to the Oklahoma State Board of Education.

I should also mention that this information will be used as supportive data for a doctoral study now being conducted by the undersigned.

Your interest and participation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bill E. Martin, Chairman
State Accreditation Committee

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Oklahoma Education Association

323 East Madison, Oklahoma City 73105

December 22, 1972

Dear

The State Accreditation Committee of the Oklahoma Association of Secondary Principals and the Oklahoma State Department of Education have authorized this inquiry into the approval and accreditation policies and procedures of State Departments of Education.

The purpose of this inquiry is to gather data which will facilitate an analysis of current approval or accreditation standards and to aid in the identification of promising trends and practices now being used or contemplated by state education agencies. It is hoped that this inquiry will assist in the development of a set of recommendations designed to improve the accreditation standards of the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Your previous response in sending materials related to our study was most helpful and is greatly appreciated. Your kind offer to be of further assistance has prompted this request.

You, or members of your staff, can make an important contribution to our work by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it at your earliest convenience. Since we believe this survey may be contributive we will gladly send you a copy of the results.

I should also mention that this information will be used as supportive data for a doctoral study now being conducted by the undersigned.

Thank you for your help, it is truly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bill E. Martin, Chairman
State Accreditation Committee

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Oklahoma Education Association

323 East Madison, Oklahoma City 73105

October 24, 1972

Dear

Attached is the questionnaire relating to accountability and accreditation of public schools which you kindly consented to scrutinize. As I explained to you during our telephone conversation, the questionnaire, when perfected, will be sent to each State Department of Education. Data generated in response to the questionnaire will be used by the OASSP Accreditation Committee to support recommendations for the improvement of the accreditation process in Oklahoma. I should also mention that the questionnaire will be used as supportive data for a doctoral dissertation now being undertaken by the undersigned.

Your interest and assistance in this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bill E. Martin, Chairman
State Accreditation Committee