

69-20,869

HARRIS, Gail Alice, 1935-
AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PREPARATION
PATTERNS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
OF SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN
MICHIGAN.

Michigan State University, Ed.D., 1969
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

© Copyright by
GAIL ALICE HARRIS

1969

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PREPARATION PATTERNS
AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MICHIGAN

By

Gail Alice Harris

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PREPARATION PATTERNS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MICHIGAN

By

Gail Alice Harris

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the present role and determine the specific administrative activities of directors of special education in Michigan through the utilization of a survey of all such personnel who were employed full-time during the 1966-67 school year. Included was information regarding:

1. The configuration of specific administrative activities typically performed by special education administrators, and how this varies from other administrators.
2. The variation between the administrative activities of local school directors of special education and intermediate school directors of special education.
3. Which major administrative areas are perceived by the directors and other administrators as being of more importance than others, and which major areas consume the most time.

4. How the academic preparation and previous professional experience patterns of special education administrators differ from those of other administrators.
5. The number of supervisory personnel assisting the special education administrators, and the types of special education programs they serve.

Procedure of Study

A survey form was mailed to all local and intermediate school district directors of special education who were employed full-time during the 1966-67 school year. The same survey form was sent to the local or intermediate superintendent, a local elementary and secondary principal in each school district represented by the special education directors in the study population. The study population included one hundred eighty-two school administrators.

The survey form consisted of three parts: (a) information regarding the respondent, (b) a check list of administrative activities, and (c) information regarding the school district.

The survey information was collated by data processing and hand tabulation techniques. It was then reviewed in terms of response numbers and percentages.

Major Findings of Study

The study resulted in the following major findings:

1. It was possible to define the general administrative role and the depth administrative role of directors of special education.
2. The administrative activities of intermediate directors of special education were most similar to those of intermediate superintendents; while the administrative activities of local directors of special education were most comparable to elementary and secondary principals.
3. All groups agreed they should ideally spend most of their time performing the activities in the major administrative area of Curriculum and Instruction.
4. Intermediate and local directors of special education reported they actually spend most of their time performing the activities in the major administrative areas of Staff Relations and Personnel Administration.
5. Directors of special education typically received academic major preparation in special education at the graduate level, thus differing from the other administrators in the study, who typically held graduate academic majors in administration.

6. Of the administrators in the study, the shortest tenure in their present positions was reported by local and intermediate directors of special education. They also had the least previous number of years professional experience.
7. Few special education curriculum supervisors were employed at the time of the study. Local school district supervisors typically served programs for the mentally handicapped, while intermediate school district supervisors typically served speech correction programs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals have contributed to the finalization of this dissertation. The writer is sincerely grateful and aware of those who have encouraged and assisted beyond the limits of professional duty. Specific thanks are extended to the following persons and agencies:

To Dr. Fred Vescoloni, for serving several years as Chairman of my doctoral committee.

To Dr. Charles Henley, for his assistance as Project Director for the dissertation study, and his enthusiasm regarding the potential professional contribution of the research findings.

To Dr. Clyde Campbell, Dr. Carl Gross and Dr. John Useem, committee members, who provided sound professional counsel and were outstanding examples of educational leaders in their respective specialties.

To my employers during the course of the doctoral program and the agencies they represent are due special thanks for their personal encouragement and professional assistance. They include Dr. Ira Polley, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, representing the Michigan

Department of Education; and Dr. Wilfred Webb, Superintendent of Hazel Park Public Schools.

The Data Processing Divisions of the Michigan Department of Education and Oakland Intermediate Schools deserve special appreciation for consultation and assistance in the survey form development and data processing.

The personal encouragement, interest and prodding of Dr. John Lee, Chairman, Division of Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation, Wayne State University, has been invaluable to the writer throughout the doctoral program.

The patient, careful and conscientious efforts of my typists, Mrs. Carolyn Piersma and Mrs. Ann Brown are appreciated.

And finally, acknowledgment and appreciation is extended to all those Michigan educators who participated as members of the study population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
The Growth of Special Education	1
The Complexity of Special Education	3
The Need for Special Education Coordination and Leadership.	10
A General Statement of the Purpose of the Study.	13
A Specific Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study.	14
Delimitations of the Study	16
Definitions of Terms	16
Organization of the Study	18
The Importance of the Study.	18
Summary	19
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	21
Preparation Patterns for Special Education Administrators.	21
Special Education Administration Role Studies.	25
General Administration Role Studies	32
Implications from the Literature for Needed Research.	35
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	37
The Study Population	37
Method of Collecting the Data	38
Developing the Survey Form	39
Collection of the Data	44

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION	47
Information Regarding the Subjects	47
Information Regarding the School Districts.	71
Ideal and Actual Time Ranking for Major Administrative Areas	78
Specific Administrative Activities of Directors of Special Education Compared to Other Administrative Groups.	91
Summary	111
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	112
Conclusions	112
Recommendations.	130
Summary	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY	136
APPENDIX	140
APPENDIX A. Survey Form	141
APPENDIX B. Raw Data Table	151

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Study Population	38
2. The Number and Percentage of Returned Survey Forms from the Six Adminis- trative Groups	48
3. Description of Respondents by Sex.	49
4. Description of Respondents by Age Groups	50
5. Description of Respondents by Salary Range.	52
6. Salary Range Variations of Directors of Special Education According to Size of District (More or Less Than 15,000 Pupils)	54
7. Description of Respondents by Highest Degrees Held.	56
8. Variations in Highest Degree Held by Directors of Special Education Accord- ing to Size of District (More or Less Than 15,000 Pupils)	57
9. Description of Respondents by Teaching Certificates Held	59
10. Description of Respondents by Their Undergraduate Majors	61
11. Description of Respondents by Their Graduate Majors.	62
12. Areas of Special Education Preparation for Which Directors of Special Education Are Eligible for State Temporary Approval	64

Table	Page
13. Number of Special Education Areas for Which Directors of Special Education Are Eligible for State Approval as Classroom Teachers (Special Service Areas Not Included)	66
14. Variations in Academic Preparation of Directors of Special Education According to Size of District (More or Less Than 15,000 Pupils)	67
15. The Professional Experiences of the Six Administrative Groups	68
16. Selected Professional Experience Variations Between Directors According to Size of District (More or Less Than 15,000 Pupils).	70
17. Pupil Membership Size of School Districts.	72
18. Length of Time District (A) Operated a Special Education Program; (B) Employed a Full-Time Special Education Director.	73
19. Number, Percent and Frequency Rank of Professional Personnel in Each Special Education Area	75
20. Range of Special Education Supervisors Employed.	77
21. Number of Programs Served by Supervisors in Specific Special Education Areas.	77
22. Ideal (I) Versus Actual (A) Time Spent by Major Administrative Areas with Rank Difference (D) Noted.	79
23. Rank Difference Between the Ideal Time Ranking of Intermediate Directors and Other Groups	83
24. Rank Difference Between the Actual Time Ranking of Intermediate Directors and Other Groups	84

Table	Page
25. Rank Difference Between the Ideal Time Ranking of Local Directors and Other Groups	85
26. Rank Difference Between the Actual Time Ranking of Local Directors and Other Groups	87
27. Ideal (I) and Actual (A) Rank Order of Time Consumed by Directors of Special Education in Major Administrative Areas According to Size of School District (More or Less than 15,000 Pupils). Rank Difference (D) is Indicated	88
28. Ideal (I) and Actual (A) Rank Order of Time Consumed by Directors of Special Education in Major Administrative Areas According to Length of Time District Has Employed a Director (More or Less Than Four Years). Rank Difference (D) is Indicated	90
29. The Special Education Administrative Role (50 Per Cent or More Positive Responses of Directors of Special Education for Specific Administrative Activities Compared to the Responses of the Other Administrative Groups).	93
30. Rank Order of Involvement at the Depth Role Level of Directors in Major Administrative Areas.	106
31. Fifty Per Cent Negative Responses of Directors of Special Education for Specific Administrative Activities Compared to the Responses of the Other Administrative Groups	109
32. Survey Form Administrative Activity Responses	152

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Growth of Special Education

Handicapped children, as defined by Title VI of Public Law 89-10, as amended, include those described as

. . . mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children, who by reason thereof require special education.

The numbers of these children have been estimated by various sources and differ considerably. The Michigan Board of Education stated that for every one thousand pupils one may generally find twenty-three who are mentally retarded, ten physically handicapped, six deaf or hard of hearing, one blind or partially-sighted, twenty emotionally or socially maladjusted, ten with special health problems and thirty-five with speech defects, or a total of 105 with handicapping conditions which may require special educational provisions.¹

Day classes and programs for handicapped children first made their appearance in this country during the

¹State Board of Education, "Organizing Educational Programs for Children with Handicaps," Circular No. 48, Revised, Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

latter part of the 19th century. A class for the deaf was instituted in Boston in 1869,² and was the first of the type of provision for handicapped children which is today known as special education. Other early classes for additional types of handicapped children which appeared in the years following included: (1) first class for the delinquent, New York, 1874, (2) first class for the mentally retarded, Providence, 1896, (3) first class for crippled, Chicago, 1899, and (4) the first class for the blind, Chicago, 1900.³

These early beginnings, however, were not followed by a rapid general expansion of provisions for handicapped children throughout the country. In general the movement remained basically a part of large city education programs with little movement into the more rural areas.⁴

In 1948, Martens estimated that the nation's entire special education effort was reaching only 442,000 pupils in 1,500 school districts. These children were served by

²Calvin Grieder, Truman Pierce, and William Rosenstengel, Public School Administration (2nd ed.; New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961).

³Ibid.

⁴U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Special Education for Handicapped Children, First Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, Washington, D. C., 1968, p. 40.

some 16,000 teachers and other specialized personnel. It was also estimated that this number of pupils constituted only approximately 10 per cent of those handicapped children in need of special education services.⁵

Since World War II, however, the growth pattern in this field has changed rapidly. The numbers served from 1948 to 1958 increased at a rate which was three times that of the rise in total public elementary and secondary school enrollment for the same period.⁶ By 1963, the total national enrollment in special programs had risen to 1,666,000,⁷ and in 1967 to approximately 2,500,000 pupils.⁸

The Complexity of Special Education

Accompanying this increase in numbers of handicapped pupils served in the public school programs of the nation, has been the development of a total program which is not

⁵Elise H. Martens, "Statistics of Special Schools and Classes for Exceptional Children, 1947-48," Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1946-48 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950).

⁶Romaine P. Mackie, Harold M. Williams, and Patricia M. Robbins, "Special Education Enrolments in Local School Systems: A Directory," Bulletin OE-35027, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1966.

⁷Romaine P. Mackie, "Special Education Reaches Nearly Two Million Children," School Life, XLVII (December, 1964), p. 8.

⁸United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, op. cit., p. 2.

to be exceeded in complexity by any other area of public education. The special education program of a local district may serve a wide variety of exceptional children, including: the blind, the partially sighted, deaf, hard of hearing, mentally retarded, crippled and otherwise physically handicapped, the speech impaired, children with emotional problems, children with specific learning disabilities and various combinations of these types of handicapping conditions.

Besides meeting state and national standards as a condition for receiving special grants, there are other factors which add to the complexity of administration of these programs. Such factors include: (1) the wide age range of pupils served, (2) the variety of handicapping conditions included, (3) rapid growth of the programs, (4) the necessity for inter-agency coordination and planning, (5) planning and providing special transportation arrangements for pupils, (6) interpreting this atypical program to general educators and the community, and (7) cooperating with other local school districts in operating programs which serve non-resident pupils.

The educational programs needed by these children will vary with the handicapping condition, and the types of provisions which have been developed to meet their needs encompass many facets,⁹ including diagnostic

⁹Michigan Department of Education, "Annual Report--Programs for the Mentally Handicapped--1965-66 School Year," Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

evaluation, individualized educational planning, specially prepared teachers, small teacher-pupil ratios, provision for integration with regular classes, ancillary services and counseling. Administrative approaches to special education, must, therefore, include working with many individuals and groups, many types of pupils, ancillary services and various related agencies.

Federal Involvement in Special Education

Nationally, large amounts of money are appropriated yearly for the education of handicapped pupils. For fiscal 1968, the Congress appropriated \$53,400,000 for educational improvement for the handicapped.¹⁰ It was distributed as follows:

Research	\$11,100,000
Training of Professional Personnel (including administrators)	24,500,000
Media Services and Captioned Films for the Deaf	2,800,000
Title VI, Elementary and Secondary Education Act	15,000,000

In addition, an estimated \$15 to \$24 million of the total appropriation for Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, will be available in 1968 for the Public Law 89-313 program of support to the states for state

¹⁰U. S. Office of Education, "Appropriations for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped," Washington, D. C., 1968.

operated and state supported schools for the handicapped. The total amount of federal funds appropriated for the improvement of educational programs for the handicapped for fiscal year 1968, therefore, was \$68.4 to \$77.4 million.

The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established in the United States Office of Education on January 12, 1967. The purpose of the Bureau is to administer and carry out programs and projects, relating to the education and training of the handicapped, including research and development projects,¹¹ as provided under Public Law 89-750. Also included under the provisions of this Act was the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children. This committee was appointed in July, 1967, and is composed of a group of individuals representing broad interests in the education of handicapped children.¹² The purposes of the advisory committee includes the review of the administration of the program administered by the Commissioner of Education with respect to handicapped children, including their effect in improving the educational attainment of such

¹¹U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, op. cit., p. 9.

¹²Ibid., p. 1.

children, and the development of recommendations for the improvement of such administration.¹³

The development of state special education plans was required for those states requesting grants under Title VI of Public Law 89-750. These plans provide assurance that any federal funds granted under this title will be expended to initiate, expand, or improve programs and projects, including pre-school programs and projects, designed to meet the special needs of handicapped children throughout the state.

Since 1960, as a result of congressional legislation, (Public Law 85-926, as amended) 32,000 professional personnel have been trained to serve handicapped children, resulting in over 70,000 persons prepared in this field of education.¹⁴ Thus, the federal government has become increasingly involved in the stimulation of special education programs, and this participation has added new dimensions to the administration of such programs at state and local levels.

¹³Samuel A. Kirk, "The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children," A Richer Future for Handicapped Children (Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, March, 1968), p. 481.

¹⁴U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, op. cit., p. 24.

State and Local Involvement
in Special Education

State and local school systems appropriate large sums of money annually for special educational programs for the handicapped. Act 21 of the Michigan Public Acts of 1968 appropriated \$30 million in state aid for the reimbursement of local and intermediate special education programs. The involvement of state departments of education in stimulating special education program growth is extensive and involves:¹⁵

1. Preparing the state budget for the education of exceptional children.
2. Helping in the passage of sound legislation and discouraging the passage of unsound legislation.
3. Distributing the appropriated state funds to local school districts on an equitable and legal basis.
4. Fostering and improving local programs.
5. Establishing standards for eligibility of children for special classes or services, teacher certification, and quality of education.
6. Recruiting teachers and cooperating in teacher education.
7. Encouraging in-service growth of teachers by providing for state workshops, conferences, and other in-service training programs.
8. Supervising educational programs in residential schools for the mentally retarded, blind and deaf.
9. Maintaining interagency relationships.
10. Preparing publications in a wide variety of areas for the guidance of local school systems.
11. Selecting and directing a corps of specialized assistants for the various programs of exceptional children.

¹⁵Samuel A. Kirk, Educating Exceptional Children (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962), p. 369.

12. Encouraging and sponsoring research on problems in the education of exceptional children.

The involvement of the state in the stimulation and control of special education programs results in a complexity of administrative activity at the intermediate and local school district levels.

Local School District Level.--Local school districts, as the operating unit, are highly involved in the administration of special education programs. There is, however, a variation in the offering of educational opportunity for the handicapped among local school districts. A recent study of school finance and educational opportunity in Michigan utilized the criteria of programs offered for mentally and physically handicapped children as a factor in judging educational opportunity.¹⁶ In every instance it was found that as the size of the district increases the likelihood of having these programs increases as well. Similar relationships were found between geographical regions and the availability of programs for the handicapped, with the more densely populated areas providing a larger number of special education programs.

Local school districts throughout the nation have consolidated into larger units which provide a more substantial financial and pupil population base for school

¹⁶J. Alan Thomas, "School Finance and Educational Opportunity in Michigan," Michigan School Finance Study (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1968), p. 33.

programs. One result of consolidation is the concentration of individual districts, making it possible to develop more appropriate special educational programs for handicapped children. This trend toward consolidation in Michigan has resulted in a reduction of the number of school districts from 2,854 in 1956-57 to 743 in 1966-67.¹⁷

The special education program in Michigan included 4,623 state approved special education teachers in the 1967-68 school year.¹⁸ This represented 3,071 special education classroom teachers and 1,652 special service personnel (school social workers, school diagnosticians or psychologists and speech correctionists) and illustrates the large number of professional personnel in special education in one state.

The Need for Special Education Coordination
and Leadership

The expanded federal, state and local special education programs have undoubtedly been a major factor in predicting an increased awareness of the need for appropriate special education leadership at the state and local levels.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 304.

¹⁸Letter, Jane Walline to Gail Harris, July 2, 1968, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan.

The United States Office of Education officially recognized the need for directors of special education, interpreting Public Law 85-926 in 1966 to include program development grants and scholarship provisions for persons preparing to become special education administrators.¹⁹ In the 1968 fiscal year, a total of fifteen special education administration program development grants had been awarded to universities.²⁰

One example of state recognition of the need for a special education director is found in the "Plan to Combat Mental Retardation in Michigan,"²¹ which stated:

It is desirable that a requirement be established for acquiring an appropriately trained special education coordinator or supervisor when a certain minimal number of special education programs exist in a local school district.

It is proposed that the Department of Education study local school special education programs in order to determine:

at what stage of development in the growth of a special education program a coordinator or supervisor should be hired,

what would be an appropriate formula for state and local participation for financial reimbursement for such a position,

what personal, professional, and academic requirements would be desirable criteria for such a position,

what rules and regulations would be necessary in order to create such a position.

The Planning Committee proposes State Aid for such a position.

¹⁹U. S. Office of Education, Federal Listing of Expenditures of Funds, Washington, D. C., 1967.

²⁰James R. Tompkins, "Program Development Concept," A Richer Future for Handicapped Children (Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1968), p. 548.

²¹Michigan Department of Mental Health, "Plan to

Also, in April of 1966, a Michigan Senate Education Committee Subcommittee recommended:²²

There should be reimbursement under the State Aid Act of full-time intermediate and local school district directors and coordinators of special education and other supervisory and consultant personnel for special education programs, subject to general rules and regulations established by the Department of Education.

The Michigan Legislature, in the State Aid Act of 1966 (Public Act 271), included a provision for reimbursement for directors and other supervisory and consultant personnel for special education programs, and authorized the Michigan Department of Education to establish standards for such positions. As a result of this action, Michigan reimbursed seventy-two directors of special education in 1966-67 and eighty-nine and a half in 1967-68.²³ A copy of the rules and regulations articulating the Michigan standard is appended to this study (see appendix). Similarly, other states have established standards for the reimbursement of directors of special education.

In summary, it is seen that the need for coordination and leadership for special educational programs

Combat Mental Retardation in Michigan," Progress Report, Lansing, Michigan, 1966, p. 69.

²²Michigan State Senate, "Report on Special Education in Michigan," Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

²³Letter, Jane Walline to Gail Harris, op. cit.

has been recognized at all levels. The national government has provided leadership and funds to disseminate to state and local school systems for the purpose of stimulating the development of special education programs. Accompanying such financial grants, are control factors which add to the complexity of administration. In addition, the United States Office of Education has provided funds to universities to develop preparation programs for special education administrators, and to provide individual grants to such persons.

State school systems have set specific standards for the operation of special education programs, thus further adding to the complexity of the administration of such programs. Logically, therefore, many states now provide reimbursement for local or intermediate school district directors of special education who have specific preparation in the administration of these growing, complex programs.

Through the employment of increasing numbers of directors of special education, it is apparent that local school systems have also recognized the increasing need for improved administration of special education programs.

A General Statement of the Purpose of the Study

Accompanying the increased numbers of administrators of special education has been a growing concern regarding the appropriate preparation patterns for this type of

position. In a 1967 conference presentation, Dr. Kenneth Blessing stated:²⁴

Current attention is now focusing upon the delineation of the major administrative and supervisory functions necessary for the effective operation of special education programs at the state, regional or local levels and on the major areas of knowledge necessary to competently carry out these basic functions. These are the current imperatives, and they appear to rate top priority in our deliberations in light of the anticipated impetus and thrust Title Six of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will be giving to special education across the nation.

It is the general purpose of this study to obtain information with regard to the specific nature of the position of director of special education in the belief that this type of data will be of value in the development of better state certificating standards and better college and university preparation programs for such personnel.

A Specific Statement of the Problem
and Purpose of the Study

At this time, there has been little research data regarding the specific administrative activities of special education administrators in comparison to the activities of other administrators. Because of the aforementioned factors which create a multi-faceted complexity to the administration of special education programs, and the increasing

²⁴ Kenneth Blessing, "Preparation for State Leadership Roles," Presentation, American Association on Mental Deficiency Conference, March 29, 1967, St. Louis, Missouri.

numbers of administrators assigned full-time to such roles, there is an increasing need for the information gained from this investigation.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the present role and determine the specific administrative activities of directors of special education in Michigan through the utilization of a survey of all such personnel who were employed full-time during the 1966-67 school year. Included was information regarding:

1. The configuration of specific administrative activities typically performed by special education administrators, and how this varies from other administrators.
2. The variation between the administrative activities of local school directors of special education and intermediate school directors of special education.
3. Which major administrative areas are perceived by the directors and other administrators as being of more importance than others, and which major areas consume the most time.
4. How the academic preparation and previous professional experience patterns of special education administrators differ from those of other administrators.

5. The number of supervisory personnel assisting the special education administrators, and the types of special education programs they serve.

Delimitations of the Study

This study is delimited in the following ways:

The study was restricted to the state of Michigan as the most practical method of making a comprehensive in-depth study of a total group within a defined geographical area. It may later serve as a comparison source for similar studies, utilizing special education administrative personnel from other states.

The mailed survey method of investigation was utilized in gathering the study data. Every effort was made to construct the survey form and all individual questions as clearly as possible through a careful refinement of the survey form and through pre-testing with a representative group.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were employed:

Special Education Director. A person employed by a local or intermediate school district to perform such duties as the development, organization and administration of special education programs; the planning and conducting of in-service education programs for employees in special

education; the development and maintenance of continuous evaluative procedures for special education programs; the provision of liaison with the school staff and the community; and the preparation of reports concerning special education programs.²⁵

Special Education Supervisor. A person employed by a local or intermediate school district in a supervisory or consultative capacity for the instructional phases of a specific area or areas of special education.²⁶

Intermediate School District. A corporate body, established by state school laws, which encompasses a local school district or districts, and provides specified services to those districts.²⁷ The intermediate district may also be known as the county school district.

Administrative Role. General functions concerned with the management of an educational program or area. For the purposes of this study, the Special Education Administrative Role is inclusive of those specific administrative activities within the ten major administrative areas which are performed by 50 per cent or more of the

²⁵Department of Education, "State-Aid for Special Education Directors and Supervisors," Michigan Board of Education, Lansing, Michigan, 1967.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Michigan State Board of Education, Michigan General School Laws (Lansing, Michigan, 1966).

special education directors who participated in this study.

Role Depth includes the specific administrative activities performed by 75 per cent or more of those in the responding groups.

Administrative Activities. Specific actions concerned with the management of an educational program or area.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter Two reviews the related literature; Chapter Three details the research procedures; Chapter Four presents and summarizes the survey responses; and Chapter Five provides the conclusions, implications and recommendations resulting from the investigation.

The Importance of the Study

This study was the most extensive investigation to date of administrative activities within an entire state, utilizing all full-time special education administrators. Its importance will be felt by its value and assistance to:

1. New directors in defining their roles.
2. Persons preparing to be directors in developing individual preparation patterns.
3. State departments of education in setting standards for the position of special education director.

4. School districts in determining what administrative activities are typically assigned to the special education director.
5. Superintendents and principals in a better understanding of the administrative activities typically assigned to their positions and to that of the director of special education.
6. Universities in developing a preparation pattern for the position of special education director, including appropriate practicum and internship provisions for those preparing to be employed at the federal, state, intermediate or local school level.

The study also specifies typical additional special education supervisory personnel who are employed to assist the director.

The study may also serve as a comparison base for other states where they do not have special education millage in intermediate districts; such millage having been a special education growth stimulating factor in Michigan.

Summary

This study was initiated in response to an urgent and timely need to define the specific professional activities of full-time special education administrators.

With the utilization of a survey which was sent to all full-time special education administrators in Michigan, it was possible to analyze these activities in comparison with other school administrative positions. The study presented herein describes the research procedures, analyzes the data and presents conclusions and recommendations which should be helpful to all school administrators and others who have a professional relationship to directors of special education, such as state departments of education and universities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature was reviewed relative to: (a) preparation patterns of special education administrators, (b) special education administrative role studies, and (c) general educational administration role studies. At the present time, there is a paucity of literature in the area of special education administration.

Preparation Patterns for Special Education Administrators

Van Miller²⁸ stressed the need for a common background in three areas for all administrators: (a) a sense of the task and purpose of education, (b) the structure and controls of education and of society, and (c) an understanding of leadership--power, influence, group processes, communication, and political strategy.

Several writers have emphasized that special education information should be included in preparation programs for special education administrators. In 1955, the United States Office of Education reported on a study of 1,625

²⁸Van Miller, The Public Administration of American School Systems (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965).

special educators regarding the competencies, experiences, professional preparation and personal characteristics which contributed to the success of directors and supervisors of special education in local school systems.²⁹

It was concluded that the special education administrative role required the professional to be cognizant of: (a) the physical, mental and emotional deviations of handicapped and gifted children; (b) the effects of handicaps on the family; (c) the specific agencies and community services available; (d) current trends in educational programs for exceptional children; and (e) major studies about each group of exceptional children.

Concern regarding the special education preparation of administrators was expressed by Milazzo and Blessing³⁰ after 23 per cent of 174 universities surveyed indicated they were offering special education administrative and supervisory preparation programs with little contact in special education. It was possible for students completing masters or specialists programs in special education administration to have had no special education teaching experience and but one year of training in the

²⁹U. S. Office of Education, Directors and Supervisors of Special Education in Local School Systems (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955).

³⁰Tony C. Milazzo and Kenneth R. Blessing, "The Training of Directors of Special Education Programs," Exceptional Children, Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (1964), 129-141.

total field of special education. It was also found that the emphasis in training at the masters level tended to concentrate in one area of exceptionality with little or no training in administration. It was generally concluded that more attention should be given to providing aspirants to leadership positions with a broader background of academic course work as well as training and internship experience in administration in special education. It was further reported that there should be closer cooperation between training institutions, state departments of education and local school systems concerning certification, internships, programs and needs in the total area of administration of special education.

Most sources reviewed recommended that the special education administrator be dually prepared in special education and general education administration. The American Association of School Administrators stated:³¹

Educational administrators . . . should be educated in the same core curriculum and program, but with provisions made to have specialized practical experiences and special study in areas designed to give them the specialized competencies peculiar to their job.

An exploratory study of ten directors of special education in 1960 by Clifford E. Howe³² recommended that

³¹American Association of School Administrators, Educational Administration in a Changing Community (Washington, D. C., 1958), p. 185.

³²Clifford E. Howe, Roles of the Local Special Education Director (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1960).

graduate training programs for directors of special education should provide some background in general education curriculum and administration, but that the major emphasis might well be on providing comprehensive knowledge of the major ideas and techniques in each area of exceptionality. Howe specified that such a training program would require a minimum of two years of graduate study.

Connor³³ has stated:

Special education administrators must be increasingly prepared for and conversant with the body of facts, attitudes and competencies that make up the field of general educational administration. Thus, the commonalities of the educational efforts fundamental to special education and regular education should at least equal the emphasis placed upon the specialized techniques, preparation and pride of various exceptional specialities. . . . Whatever their prior preparation or professional commitments, the instructional objectives and nature of the educational program for exceptional children take precedence in shaping administrative emphasis and decisions by all who head special education programs. Upon the base of instruction must be built the theory of special education administration which is destined to best meet the needs of exceptional children. . . . Thus, general school administrators who are entering special education must assimilate the complex methods and materials which make schooling for exceptional children so specialized. Without the latter type of preparation, general administrators are interlopers in the field of special education; without the former, special educators may be excellent teachers or other professionals, but they are seldom competent administrators.

³³Leo E. Connor, "Preliminaries to a Theory of Administration for Special Education," Exceptional Children, Vol. XXIX, No. 9 (May, 1963).

In referring to appropriate preparation relative to the role of the special education administrator, the Michigan Senate Education Subcommittee report concluded:³⁴

Much of the special knowledge (of handicapping conditions) which is considered necessary for special education personnel involved in actual daily contact with handicapped children and their parents, appears to also be necessary for the administrator of special education.

The cumulative implications of the literature is that the academic preparation of special education directors should include basic core information in general educational administration in concert with specialized information regarding more than one type of exceptionality and its effects. There are, however, no comprehensive listings of the administrative activities performed by special education directors which would specifically predicate the necessity of these required competencies.

Special Education Administration
Role Studies

It is generally agreed that the duties and responsibilities of special education directors vary greatly. In a presentation at a conference of the Council for Exceptional Children, Dean Fogle,³⁵ indicated a few factors which

³⁴Michigan State Senate, op. cit., pp. VII-B-1.

³⁵Dean Fogle, "Preparation of Administrators and Supervisors in Special Education--the View from School Administration" (presentation at Council for Exceptional Children Conference, St. Louis, Missouri, March 29, 1967).

contribute to the variation of the responsibilities and duties of special education administrators. They included:

1. The philosophy of the program.
2. The size of the program.
3. The density of area population.
4. The scope of the program.
5. The economic factors of the community.
6. The availability of supportive personnel.
7. The previous training and experience of the administrator.
8. The state rules and regulations.

Leo Connor³⁶ concurred: "An analysis of the duties of leaders of special education programs will reveal a diversity of time devoted to each of them." However, he did indicate eight main function categories which appear to be common to all school administrators. These categories were: planning and evaluation, personnel, business and buildings, auxiliary services, information and advice, coordination and direction, instruction and organization.

There have been a few studies within the last fifteen years which have indicated the broad administrative roles of directors of special education. In 1955, the United States Office of Education³⁷ study report concluded that

³⁶Leo Connor, Administration of Special Education Programs (New York: Teachers College, 1961), p. 22.

³⁷U. S. Office of Education, op. cit.

the functions of administration and supervision each consumed approximately one-third of the time of local directors and supervisors. The remaining third was divided almost evenly among the functions of in-service education, professional study and research, public relations, and direct services to exceptional children. Directors and supervisors ranked the relative importance of thirty-six areas of competency as related to their role. The major area of competency indicated was the ability to give leadership in directing and carrying on a special education program in keeping with community needs and resources.

Clifford Howe³⁸ reported wide differences among the directors included in his study, both as to how they perceived their jobs and as to the duties they performed. He classified them roughly into two groups, according to their attitudes regarding their positions. The first group felt there was nothing unique which would differentiate their functions from those of a regular administrator. The second group believed that the unique requirement was something which could probably best be labeled "content competency in various areas of special education." He found in general, that those individuals with the most comprehensive background in special education, both by virtue of training and experience, were

³⁸Howe, op. cit.

the ones who geared their work as directors to staff development and improvement of the quality of instruction within their system. Others, who had minimal training, seemed to confine themselves primarily to administrative details and to quantitative expansion of services.

The preparation and work performed by sixty-four directors and twenty-four supervisors of special education in the Great Lakes five state region was reviewed by Ellyn G. Lauber.³⁹ She utilized the survey method, with the survey items for the main part duplicating the items included in the 1955 study report by the United States Office of Education. She found a great gap between professional preparation and the work performed by special education directors and supervisors. Dr. Lauber stressed the need for further research as to needed special education administrative personnel and the responsibilities and roles of such personnel.

A work published by the Council for Exceptional Children⁴⁰ recently stated:

The responsibilities of the administrator of special education will vary with the size and

³⁹Ellyn G. Lauber, "Special Education Administration and Supervisory Personnel in Selected States" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962).

⁴⁰Council for Exceptional Children, Professional Standards for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children (Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1966).

type of program. In some cases, the administrator may have total responsibility for the administration and supervision of all special education. In others, he may be responsible for the administration of special education, but may delegate all or part of the responsibilities for supervision.

The same publication concluded that there are fifteen major competency areas necessary for special education administration. They are:

1. Understanding of total education process.
2. Knowledge of school organization and administrative practices.
3. Knowledge of various administrative provisions.
4. Knowledge of fiscal procedures.
5. Knowledge of curriculum development and methodology.
6. Knowledge of supervisory practices and theory and techniques of staff development.
7. Knowledge of psycho-educational and other diagnostic procedures.
8. Knowledge of personnel practices.
9. Knowledge and utilization of community organizations and resources.
10. Ability to identify, define, and influence the power structure both within and outside education.
11. Knowledge of public relations.

12. Knowledge of school law and legislative processes and their implementation.
13. Knowledge of school plant planning and utilization.
14. Knowledge of research techniques and procedures, and
15. Knowledge of professional responsibilities to the field.

Two studies researched problems encountered by directors of special education, and thus have been included in this review as related to the role of special education administrators. Richard J. Kothera⁴¹ requested eleven directors of special education in Kansas to record graphically or orally all the problems they dealt with in special education during four separate periods of one week each. A total of 815 problems were collected, compiled and fitted to the competencies as described in the United States Office 1955 report and to the ten major special education administrative problems as developed by the Wisland-Vaughan study.⁴² The purpose of Kothera's

⁴¹Richard J. Kothera, "A Criterion and Set of Reality Based Problems for Simulation in Special Education Administration" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1967).

⁴²Milton V. Wisland and Tony D. Vaughan, "Administrative Problems in Special Education," Exceptional Children, Vol. XXXI, No. 2 (1964), 87-89.

study was to establish 100 reality based problems in major categories for simulation in special education administration preparation.

Major categories under which problems were listed were: inter-staff relations, placement procedures, consultant to generalists, developing individualized programs, transportation problems, curriculum construction and coordination, inter-district relationships, budget and finance, policy formation, public relations, pupil identification and evaluation, pupil discipline, research, classroom and program supply, recruitment, parent counseling, general program development, in-service training and no category.

In a study of 263 special education administrators, Wisland and Vaughan⁴³ developed a list of the ten most significant problems encountered by special education administrators. They were: obtaining adequately prepared personnel, adequately providing for the multiply handicapped, helping parents understand their children, adequately providing for all types of exceptionality, having adequate time for research activities, counseling parents, developing various curriculas, initiating new programs and services to expand existing programs, obtaining adequate facilities and initiating new programs.

⁴³Ibid.

In summary, a review of the literature regarding special education administrative roles reveals general agreement that the role of directors varies greatly. Certain factors have been presented which might account for some of the variation. A few studies within the past fifteen years have generally indicated the role of directors of special education. However, there are no comprehensive studies of the specific administrative activities of this group of administrators.

General Administration Role Studies

In May of 1967, William Southworth⁴⁴ stated:

Constant change and increased workload are the lot of the superintendent. . . . Moreover, demands on the superintendent's time are increasing, in part because there is no real job description for the position, and no universally accepted limits to the demands that can be placed on him.

Thus, the lack of a specific job description is indicated also in other areas of administration. However, there is much more literature regarding the role of general education administrators than there is regarding special education administration.

It is widely accepted that the major function of educational administration is to provide the best possible

⁴⁴William Southworth, "The Superintendency: A Position in Flux," School Board Journal (May, 1967).

program of instruction for children and youth.⁴⁵ Other functions which contribute to the achievement of this end have been indicated, and include:⁴⁶ decision making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, coordinating and evaluating.

William J. Early⁴⁷ conducted a survey study of sixty administrators enrolled in a Michigan State University educational administration externship course to evaluate the course and suggest areas for improvement. The externs responded with activity areas which indicate a high degree of involvement. Providing for instructional leadership was the single activity which received the highest point value for the specific activity experienced, as well as for the effect of the experience by all externs. The study indicated that the general area of staff relations yielded the highest percentage of experiences for all externs. The area of curriculum and instruction was of the greatest value to the extern whose professional position encompassed the responsibilities of a specific

⁴⁵John A. Ramseyer et al., "Factors Affecting Educational Administration," School-Community Development Study (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1955), pp. 74-76.

⁴⁶Russell T. Gregg, "The Administrative Process," Administrative Behavior in Education, Russell Gregg and Roald Campbell (editors) (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).

⁴⁷William J. Early, "An Evaluation and Analysis of the Extern Program in Educational Administration at Michigan State University" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963).

building or educational program, and the area of pupil-personnel guidance had the greatest effect upon this extern. For externs with district-wide responsibilities the area of school board relations had both the greatest value and effect.

Current literature emphasizes the leadership and integrative nature of educational administration.⁴⁸ Miller argued that administration is first and foremost communication. Morphet⁴⁹ expanded on the need to make an art of the process of mobilizing resources to work through problems, stating that the administrator must work effectively with the staff, the board of education, citizens committees, the representatives of the mass media of communication, and with the representatives of the various power groups in the society. According to Morphet, the administrator must be able to assist these groups in developing a program that will lead to the fuller achievement of the goals of education; in short, he must enlist, energize, facilitate, but not dominate.

School administrative roles have thus been broadly defined by several writers. Early's study⁵⁰ attempted to

⁴⁸Van Miller, The Public Administration of American School Systems (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965), pp. 473-5.

⁴⁹Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 150.

⁵⁰Early, op. cit.

define more precisely the administrative activities of educational administrators.

Implications from the Literature
for Needed Research

The literature indicates that special education administrators should receive academic preparation in both special education and general educational administration. A few role studies have been accomplished regarding special education administration, and several writers have presented information regarding the competencies required for general educational administration. Yet there is no comprehensive specific listing of the administrative activities typically performed by special education administrators. This study meets a distinct need in special education administration research, by providing:

1. An examination of all currently employed full-time directors of special education in a total state, for the purpose of determining specific administrative activities.
2. A comparison of the administrative activities of special education directors with those of superintendents and principals employed in the same school systems.
3. A determination of the administrative activities which special education administrators have primary responsibility for effectuating.

4. A definition of the number and variety of professional persons supervised by special education administrators.
5. A specification of the supervisory positions which typically assist the director of special education.
6. A comparison of the administrative activities of directors of special education at the local level with those of the director of special education at the intermediate level.
7. A comparison of the administrative activities of directors of special education in larger districts with those in smaller districts.

In addition, this study indicates other areas of special education administration which require further research. The total study makes an important contribution to the field of special education administration.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The Study Population

In order to properly investigate the areas of concern, the study population was selected to include all full-time directors of special education in the state of Michigan who were employed in the public schools during the 1966-67 school year. In addition, other administrative personnel were selected from the school systems served by these special education directors for the purpose of comparing differences in administrative roles and isolating those activities which appeared to make up the expected duties of a director of special education. The administrative positions selected for comparison with the position of director of special education were those of the superintendent and principal. Although it was recognized that other types of administrative positions exist in most school systems, the positions of superintendent and principal were selected as being the most consistent in their defined roles and therefore the most appropriate for comparison purposes. At the intermediate school district level, the comparison position was limited to that of

the superintendent due to the fact that the position of principal does not occur at that level. In selecting the particular principal for the study from each local district, the decision was made to consistently survey the elementary and secondary principal having the largest number of staff in the district.

The total population selected for study is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--The study population.

Group	Number
Intermediate school district directors of special education	26
Intermediate superintendents of schools	26
Local school district directors of special education	55
Local school district superintendents of schools	55
Local school district elementary principals	55
Local school district secondary principals	55

Method of Collecting the Data

The method of collecting the data utilized a mailed questionnaire to each of the individuals in the study population. The names of the local and intermediate district directors of special education were obtained

from a mailing list of such persons developed by the Michigan Department of Education. The names of the persons in the four other administrative positions were obtained from the Michigan Education Directory.³⁷

Developing the Survey Form

When this study was initiated, it was the theory of the writer that while the administrative activities of directors of special education were deemed by previous writers (indicated in Chapter II) to vary greatly, it would be possible, through careful investigation, to identify a specific group of such activities which typically are performed by these administrators.

Furthermore, it was felt that certain identifiable factors might account for the variation of administrative activities among the directors of special education. The factors which might be responsible for the variation would include those descriptive of the program to be administered, including age, size, location and composition of the program. The other factors to be studied related directly to the special education administrator, including his previous professional experience and academic preparation.

In order to define the administrative activities of directors of special education, it was decided to include

³⁷Michigan Education Directory and Buyers Guide, 1966-67 (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Education Association Directory, 1967).

in this survey study a broad and general check list of known administrative activities in education with an additional category labeled "Other" for the respondents to write in any omitted areas. In developing the survey, various materials were reviewed which listed administrative activities in education^{38,39,40} and consultation occurred with university personnel in the Michigan State University College of Education. Of the various administrative activity lists, the material developed by Early (see appendix) appeared to be the most inclusive. Dr. Early had reviewed several listings of administrative activities in the process of developing his final document. This listing was therefore selected as the basis for the development of the administrative activity items utilized in this study. Early's listing was carefully reviewed, some items omitted, and other items were adjusted to more clearly develop the purpose of this study. Several items were added as a result of consultation with university personnel and other professional colleagues, the writer's experience and the review of the literature.

The items which were added to Early's listing of administrative activities were as follows:

³⁸Council for Exceptional Children, op. cit.

³⁹U. S. Office of Education, op. cit.

⁴⁰Early, op. cit.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Item</u>
Curriculum and Instruction	Writing articles for professional journals. Initiating new programs. Keeping aware of state school laws.
Personnel Administration	Recommending tenure appointments.
Finance	Requesting and administering federal funds.
Business Management & Practices	Arranging to serve non-resident pupils.
School Plant	Determining plant utilization for non-educational purposes. Determining remodeling needs of school facilities. Determining physical location of classes.
Auxiliary Services	Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician program. Supervising or coordinating school nurse program. Supervising or coordinating school social worker program. Supervising or coordinating speech correction program.
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	Counseling of students and parents.
Community Relations	Making speeches at state and national conferences. Arranging student teaching and internship experiences with universities. Meeting with legislators regarding school issues. Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Item</u>
Staff Relations	Representing school board in professional negotiations with teachers. Interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators.

Thus, twenty items were added to the revision of Early's listing of administrative activities. Further refinement of the survey form occurred after a pre-test was administered to seven persons, one in each of the six groups studied, plus an additional intermediate director of special education. These refinements included rearranging the order of survey form sections, clarifying the language in a few instances, and changing the numerical significance in the rank order areas so that "0" represented "least" rather than "most." No additional items were added to the listing of possible administrative activities as a result of the pre-test.

The data processing section of the Michigan Department of Education provided many valuable suggestions in the development of the final survey form regarding appropriate styling of the form for ease of tabulation and summarization of the information through data processing techniques.

The final survey form (see appendix) consisted of three parts:

1. Information regarding the respondent--including professional experiences, academic preparation,

age, sex, salary and other relevant factors, was obtained in order to describe and compare the administrators in each of the six groups.

2. A check list of administrative activities for the purpose of specifying the constellation of administrative activities performed by each of the groups studied. This section was divided into ten major administrative areas. These ten major areas were further divided into specific administrative activities. There was a total of 113 specific administrative activities listed. The ten major areas, number of specific items under each, and an example of a specific administrative activity are:

Major Area	Number of Specific Activities	Example
Curriculum & Instruction	15	Developing curriculum for total school or specialized area
Personnel Administration	12	Preparing criteria for personnel selection
Finance	12	Preparing a budget
Business Management & Practice	10	Developing a systematic control of records and funds
School Plant	15	Selecting a school architect
Auxiliary Services	12	Evaluating transportation needs

Major Area	Number of Specific Activities	Example
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	6	Planning and evaluating a guidance and testing program
Community Relations	14	Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities.
Staff Relations	9	Arranging for and/or conducting staff meetings
School Board Relations	8	Recommending items for the school board agenda

3. Information regarding the school district-- including questions about the population size of the district, scope and age of the special education program, and tenure of a special education director in the particular district. The purpose of this section was to provide a basis for comparisons of administrative activities in light of the school district variations specified above.

Collection of the Data

After the refinement of the pre-test, consultation with the doctoral committee chairman, project director and the data processing consultants, the finalized survey form was sent to the study population in late June of 1967. A cover letter (see appendix) requested the completed survey forms to be returned within ten days.

Four weeks later, follow-up letters and phone calls were directed to those individuals who had not yet returned the survey form.

The group of intermediate school district directors of special education returned the forms more promptly and in a higher percentage (100 per cent) than any of the other groups, followed by the local school district directors of special education. The elementary principals, followed by the secondary principals, returned the forms later than the others. This is probably due to the fact that most elementary principals are typically employed on a shorter yearly contract than the other administrators studied. Perhaps the faster return, in higher percentages, by both groups of directors of special education also indicated a greater degree of interest in the results of this study, since it applies more directly to them.

In order to obtain a clearer picture of the specific administrative activities of directors of special education, it was important to include only administrators who were assigned full-time to such a role, and whose survey responses would not include those activities which were necessitated by additional role assignments. The survey form requested them to check their full-time position.

When the survey forms were returned, the responses of four local school district directors of special

education indicated they were not assigned full-time to that role, but were specifically assigned other responsibilities as well within the school system. In order to maintain the investigation procedure as described, all forms from these four districts were discarded. Thus, a total of sixteen from the original study population were deleted, leaving a revised total survey population of 272 administrators.

All twenty-six or 100 per cent of the intermediate school district directors of special education returned the completed survey forms. Ninety-three per cent or fifty-one of the local school district directors of special education responded. The returned responses of the four other administrative groups ranged from 49 to 69 per cent. The investigation population was judged to be adequate, especially for the two groups of directors of special education.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION

Information Regarding the Subjects

The 182 returned surveys represented the groups and numbers as indicated in Table 2.

The response from the total population sample of 272 represented 100 per cent of the intermediate district directors of special education; 93 per cent of the local school directors of special education; and other response percentages ranging from 49 to 69 per cent.

Males represented 89 per cent of the total respondents, with only 11 per cent females (see Table 3). The groups with the highest percentage of females were the local directors of special education (20 per cent) and the elementary principals (19 per cent). There were no female local superintendents in the study population and only one female intermediate superintendent.

Since the female constituency of the total study population was so small, it was not considered advisable to make comparisons of any administrative groups by sex differences.

TABLE 2.--The number and percentage of returned survey forms from the six administrative groups.

Group	Name of Group	Number of Surveys Sent	Number of Surveys Returned	Per Cent Returned
1	Intermediate District Directors of Special Education	26	26	100
2	Intermediate District Superintendents	26	18	69
3	Local School Directors of Special Education	55	51	93
4	Local School Superintendents	55	29	53
5	Local District Elementary Principals	55	27	56
6	Local District Secondary Principals	<u>55</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>49</u>
Total	Six Groups	272	182	Average 67%

TABLE 3.--Description of respondents by sex.

Group	Total Number	Males		Females	
		No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Edu- cation	26	23	88	3	12
Intermediate Superinten- dents	18	17	94	1	6
Local Directors of Special Education	51	41	80	10	20
Local Superin- tendents	29	29	100	0	0
Elementary Principals	27	22	81	5	19
Secondary Principals	31	29	93	2	7
Total	182	161	89%	21	11%

While most (87 per cent) of the administrators were over thirty-six years of age and primarily in the thirty-six-forty-five year age range, the highest percentage (31 per cent) of administrators under thirty-six years of age were intermediate directors of special education. In contrast, all but one of the intermediate superintendents were over fifty years of age (see Table 4).

TABLE 4.--Description of respondents by age groups.

Group	Total Number	Below 36		36-45		46-50		Over 50	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Education	26	8	31	13	50	2	8	3	11
Intermediate Superintendents	18	0	0	1	6	0	0	17	94
Local Directors of Special Education	51	8	15	25	49	9	18	9	18
Local Superintendents	29	1	3	7	24	2	7	19	66
Elementary Principals	27	6	22	9	33	3	11	9	34
Secondary Principals	31	0	0	14	45	9	29	8	26
Total	182	23	13	69	38	25	14	65	35

Only one administrator (an intermediate director) was under thirty years old. No intermediate superintendents or secondary principals checked the below thirty-six year age category. The largest percentage of administrators in this category were intermediate directors of special education (31 per cent), followed by elementary principals (22 per cent) and local directors of special education (15 per cent).

The salary range for each of the groups studied was varied, with the exception of local superintendents. All local superintendents received over \$16,000. The salary was over \$13,000 for a majority of each of the other groups in the study population (see Table 5).

More intermediate (total of 54 per cent) and local (45 per cent) directors of special education reported a salary range of \$13,000 to \$15,999 than any other range. The total salary range reported by local directors was more inclusive of the possible responses than that of the intermediate directors. No intermediate director checked the \$5,000 to \$9,999 salary range, while 4 per cent of the local directors checked this category. Only one other group in the study checked the \$5,000 to \$9,999 minimum salary range category, with one secondary principal, representing 3 per cent. However, a higher percentage (14 per cent) of local directors than intermediate directors (11 per cent) of special education reported a salary over \$16,000.

TABLE 5.--Description of respondents by salary range.

Group	Total Number	\$5,000 to \$9,999		\$10,000 to \$12,999		\$13,000 to \$15,999		Over \$16,000		No Response	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Education	26	0	0	9	35	14	54	3	11	0	0
Intermediate Superintendents	18	0	0	3	17	5	27	9	50	1	6
Local Directors of Special Education	51	2	4	19	37	23	45	7	14	0	0
Local Super- intendents	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	100	0	0
Elementary Principals	27	0	0	12	44	14	52	1	4	0	0
Secondary Principals	31	1	3	4	13	15	50	10	32	1	2
Total	182	3	1	47	24	71	38	59	35	2	2

Comparisons were made regarding the salary range of intermediate and local directors according to school districts with more or less than 15,000 pupils. Local and intermediate directors in smaller districts typically received less salary than the directors in larger districts (see Table 6).

A salary in the range of \$10,000 to \$12,999 was reported by 50 per cent of the local directors and 83 per cent of the intermediate directors of special education in districts with less than 15,000 pupil membership. A majority (65 per cent) of both groups of directors in districts with more than 15,000 pupil membership reported a salary in the \$13,000 to \$15,999 range.

The local directors (6 per cent) of special education in districts with less than 15,000 pupil membership were the only directors who reported a salary in the \$5,000 to \$9,999 range.

The academic backgrounds of the six groups were reviewed. Information was obtained regarding highest degrees held (with comparisons of directors in large and small districts), teaching certificates held, undergraduate and graduate majors, and the special education preparation of directors of special education (with comparisons of directors in large and small districts) (see Tables 7 through 13).

TABLE 6.--Salary range variations of directors of special education according to size of district (more or less than 15,000 pupils).

Districts	Total Number	\$5,000 to \$9,999		\$10,000 to \$12,999		\$13,000 to \$15,999		Over \$16,000		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<u>Local</u>										
Under 15,000	34	2	6	17	50	12	35	3	9	
Over 15,000	17	0	0	2	12	11	65	4	23	
<u>Intermediate</u>										
Under 15,000	6	0	0	5	83	1	17	0	0	
Over 15,000	20	0	0	4	20	13	65	3	15	

The highest degree held by most administrators was at the master's level. The group with the largest number of doctorates (41 per cent) was the local superintendents. All administrators had completed academic requirements beyond the baccalaureate level. The least variation in highest degree held was reported by intermediate superintendents and elementary principals, with almost all respondents having the master's degree.

The highest degrees held by local and intermediate directors were very similar. All directors held degrees higher than the baccalaureate level. Most directors (77 per cent intermediate and 78 per cent local) reported the master's degree as the highest degree held. However, 15 per cent of the intermediate and 16 per cent of the local directors held degrees at the doctorate level.

In comparing the highest degrees held by local and intermediate directors according to the size of the district (more or less than 15,000), it was found that more local (33 per cent compared to 6 per cent) and intermediate directors (20 per cent compared to 0 per cent) in the larger districts have doctorate degrees (see Table 8).

A higher percentage of local (85 per cent) and intermediate (100 per cent) directors of special education in districts with less than 15,000 pupil membership reported the master's degree as the highest degree held, while the directors in larger districts held higher

TABLE 7.--Description of respondents by highest degrees held.

Group	Total Number	Highest Degree Held							
		BA		MA		Education Specialist		Doctorate	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Education	26	0	0	20	77	2	8	4	15
Intermediate Superintendents	18	0	0	16	89	1	5.5	1	5.5
Local Directors of Special Education	51	0	0	40	78	3	6	8	16
Local Superintendents	29	0	0	16	55	1	4	12	41
Elementary Principals	27	0	0	26	96	0	0	1	4
Secondary Principals	31	0	0	26	84	4	13	1	3
Total	182	0	0	144	80	11	6	27	14

TABLE 8.--Variations in highest degree held by directors of special education according to size of district (more or less than 15,000 pupils).

Group	Number	BA		MA		Education Specialist		Doctorate	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Local Directors</u>									
Under 15,000	33	0	0	28	85	3	9	2	6
Over 15,000	18	0	0	12	67	0	0	6	33
<u>Intermediate Directors</u>									
Under 15,000	6	0	0	6	100	0	0	0	0
Over 15,000	20	0	0	14	70	2	10	4	20
Total	77	0	0	60	78	5	7	12	15

percentages of degrees beyond the master's level (local directors 33 per cent compared to 15 per cent; intermediate directors 30 per cent compared to 0 per cent).

Only two groups contained any administrators who did not possess a teaching certificate: two local (4 per cent) and two intermediate (8 per cent) directors of special education. This is probably because some were formerly school diagnosticians for which a teaching certificate is not always required (see Table 9). Not surprisingly, most (63 per cent) elementary principals held elementary teaching certificates and most (74 per cent) secondary principals held secondary teaching certificates. Most (83 per cent) intermediate superintendents possessed a life teaching certificate. More (58 per cent) of the intermediate directors of special education held secondary rather than elementary (26 per cent) certificates. More (43 per cent) of the local directors of special education held elementary rather than secondary (37 per cent) certificates. The range of certificates held by local directors of special education was greater than the range indicated by intermediate directors.

Undergraduate majors in secondary education were more prevalent for intermediate directors of special education (40 per cent), intermediate superintendents (79 per cent), local superintendents (73 per cent) and

TABLE 9.--Description of respondents by teaching certificates held.

Group	Total Number	No Certificate		Special or Life		Elementary		Secondary	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Education	26	2	8	2	8	7	26	15	58
Intermediate Superintendents	18	0	0	15	83	0	0	3	17
Local Directors of Special Education	51	2	4	8	16	22	43	19	37
Local Superintendents	29	0	0	16	55	5	17	8	28
Elementary Principals	27	0	0	8	30	17	63	2	7
Secondary Principals	31	0	0	8	26	0	0	23	74
Total	182	4		57		51		70	
Average %			2		36		25		37

secondary principals (81 per cent), or four of the six groups included in this study. The greatest variation in undergraduate majors was indicated by local directors of special education. Most (61 per cent) elementary principals majored in elementary education at the undergraduate level as shown in Table 10.

Three of the four intermediate directors of special education who reported undergraduate majors other than education majors specified the area of psychology, while the fourth reported an undergraduate major in marketing. This represented 12 per cent of the administrative group, while a total of 28 per cent of the local directors of special education reported undergraduate majors not in the college of education. However, this occurred where they reported more than one major, including one in the college of education. The other undergraduate major of local directors of special education was most typically in psychology or social studies.

Administration was the graduate major for 51 per cent of the respondents, with the majority (from 68 per cent to 83 per cent) of all groups except directors of special education indicating this as their graduate major. Local (47 per cent) and intermediate (53 per cent) directors of special education tended to major in special education at the graduate level (see Table 11).

TABLE 10.--Description of respondents by their undergraduate majors.

Group	Total Number		Undergraduate Majors ^a							
			Elementary Education		Special Education		Secondary Education		Other	
	In Group	Majors	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Education	26	33	5	15	11	33	13	40	4	12
Intermediate Superintendents	18	19	3	16	1	5	15	79	0	0
Local Directors of Special Education	51	60	10	17	17	28	16	27	17	28
Local Superintendents	29	34	6	18	0	0	25	73	3	9
Elementary Principals	27	28	17	61	1	4	6	21	4	14
Secondary Principals	31	31	2	6	1	3	25	81	3	10
Total	182	205	43	21	31	15	100	49	31	15

^aSome responses indicated more than one major.

TABLE 11.--Description of respondents by their graduate majors.^a

Group	Total Number		Elementary Education		Special Education		Secondary Education		Adminis- tration		Other	
	in Group	Majors	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Intermediate Directors of Special Education	26	36	0	0	19	53	1	3	8	22	8	22
Intermediate Superintendents	18	18	0	0	0	0	2	11	15	83	1	6
Local Directors of Special Education	51	64	2	3	30	47	4	7	18	28	10	15
Local Superintendents	29	37	2	5	0	0	5	13.5	25	68	5	13.5
Elementary Principals	27	31	6	19	2	7	1	3	21	68	1	3
Secondary Principals	31	36	0	0	0	0	7	19	27	75	2	6
Total	182	222	10	5	51	23	20	9	114	51	27	12

^aSome responses indicated more than one major.

It is apparent that specialization in their administrative area began at the undergraduate level for all groups in this study except administrators of special education, who tended to emphasize special education at the graduate level. Undergraduate special education majors were held by 33 per cent of the intermediate directors of special education, but 53 per cent of this group held graduate special education majors (some had majored in special education at both undergraduate and graduate levels). This same pattern exists for local directors of special education, with 28 per cent reporting undergraduate special education majors, compared to 47 per cent indicating graduate special education majors. The relatively recent growth of special education may account for the later preparation in the basic area of education to be administered. The "other" graduate majors reported by intermediate directors of special education were typically guidance and counseling, and for local directors of special education, the "other" majors were typically psychology.

The literature⁴¹ presents a need for directors of special education to be academically prepared in more than one special education area in addition to administration. Table 12 indicates the areas of special

⁴¹U. S. Office of Education, "Directors and Supervisors of Special Education in Local School Systems," op. cit.

TABLE 12.--Areas of special education preparation for which directors of special education are eligible for state temporary approval.^a

Special Education Area	Local Directors (Total-51)		Intermediate Directors (Total-26)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Blind	3	6	3	12
Deaf	4	8	3	12
Orthopedically Handicapped	6	12	2	8
Mentally Handicapped	26	51	13	50
Emotionally Disturbed	11	22	5	19
School Social Work	6	12	4	15
School Diagnostician (Psychology)	18	35	10	38
Speech Correction	11	22	5	19

^aSome are prepared in more than one special education area.

education preparation of directors of special education. The highest percentages of local (51 per cent) and intermediate (50 per cent) directors were prepared in the area of the mentally handicapped, followed by school diagnostician preparation (35 per cent and 38 per cent respectively).

The lowest per cent (9 per cent) of directors of special education are those who were prepared in the area of the blind.

Local directors of special education were prepared in an average of 1.6 areas of special education, while intermediate directors were prepared in an average of 1.7 areas of special education, neither group representing the amount of preparation recommended by the literature.

Since many of the special education programs to be administered are classroom programs, the directors were asked to indicate the number of special education classroom programs for which they would be eligible for state approval as teachers. The largest percentage (48 per cent) of both local and intermediate directors were eligible for approval in only one special education classroom program. A total of 10 per cent were not eligible for state approval for any special education classroom teaching and 8 per cent were eligible for more than three special education areas of teaching (see Table 13).

A total of 29 per cent of both groups of directors held academic majors in special education plus administration as indicated in Table 14. However, no intermediate directors in smaller districts (under 15,000) were dually prepared in special education and administration. There were no other major differences found

TABLE 13.--Number of special education areas for which directors of special education are eligible for state approval as classroom teachers (special service areas not included).

Number of Special Education Areas	Total		Local Directors		Intermediate Directors	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	8	10	6	12	2	8
One	37	48	24	47	13	50
Two	13	18	8	16	5	19
Three	12	16	8	16	4	15
More Than Three	7	8	5	9	2	8
Total Number	77		51		26	

in this area of inquiry according to comparisons of large and small districts. Most (52 per cent) directors had academic preparation only in special education, and not in the area of administration.

The total average number of years of professional experiences in education for all groups ranged from 14.6 to 32 years (see Table 15). Both groups of superintendents had more average years of professional experience than the other four groups (intermediate, 32 years; local, 28.6 years). Both groups of directors of special education had the fewest average number of years previous professional experience and also the smallest average

TABLE 14.--Variations in academic preparation of directors of special education according to size of district (more or less than 15,000 pupils).

Group	Number	Academic Major Preparation								
		Special Education Major, No Administration		Administration Major, No Special Education		Special Education Plus Administration		Other (i.e., General Education)		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<u>Local Directors</u>										
Under 15,000	33	17	51	4	12	10	31	2	6	
Over 15,000	18	9	50	3	17	5	28	1	5	
<u>Intermediate Directors</u>										
Under 15,000	6	4	66	1	17	0	0	1	17	
Over 15,000	20	10	50	2	10	7	35	1	5	
Total	77	40	52	10	13	22	29	5	6	

TABLE 15.--The professional experiences of the six administrative groups.

	Intermediate Directors of Special Education	Intermediate Superin- tendents	Local Directors of Special Education	Local Superin- tendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Total Years Employed in Education						
Range	6-35	20-43	3-33	11-43	6-42	12-41
Average	15	32	14.6	28.6	20.3	20
Total Years Employed in Michigan						
Range	6-30	6-43	2-30	6-43	6-42	1-41
Average	14	31	14	24	20.3	18.5
Total Years Employed Out of Michigan						
Range	0-10	1-14	0-16	0-25	0-2	0-18
Average	1	1	1	4.7	0	1.7
Number of Years in Present Position						
Range	1-15	1-32	1-17	1-21	1-17	1-20
Average	4	14	4	9	6.5	4.6
Number of Years as a General Education Administrator						
Range	0-9	4-38	0-12	5-41	1-27	1-40
Average	1	17	1.6	21	8	8
Number of Years as a Special Education Administrator						
Range	1-15	0-12	1-18	0-28	0-6	0-3
Average	4	2	5	4.6	.4	0
Number of Years as an Elementary Teacher						
Range	0-12	0-16	0-10	0-9	0-21	0-3
Average	1	2	2	1.3	5	0
Number of Years as a Secondary Teacher						
Range	0-7	0-23	0-12	0-17	0-19	0-24
Average	1	5	1.7	5	3	8
Number of Years as a Special Education Teacher						
Range	0-9	0-12	0-11	0-0	0-18	0-17
Average	3	1/2	3	0	1.3	.6
Total Years Employed in a Special Service						
Range	0-13	0-0	0-30	0-0	0-0	0-17
Average	3	0	2.3	0	0	.8

number of years in their present position and as a general professional education administrator. The average number of years as a special education administrator for both groups of directors was four years. While the total average number of years of professional employment for the four other groups ranged from 20 to 32, the average for intermediate directors was 15 years, and for local directors was 14.6 years. Local superintendents reported an average of 4.6 years as special education administrators, which may be accounted for by their role before a full-time director of special education was employed in their school district.

Selected professional experiences were compared among directors of special education in larger and smaller districts (with more/less than 15,000) in Table 16. Intermediate directors in smaller districts had a lesser number of years in their present positions (two and a half years), in teaching in a special education classroom (one year) and in total years of employment (eleven years). However, they had, in general, spent more years in a special service area than the others.

Directors in larger local and intermediate districts reported a greater average number of years total professional employment than directors in smaller districts (intermediate, sixteen years compared to eleven years; and local, nineteen years compared to fourteen years).

TABLE 16.--Selected professional experience variations between directors according to size of district (more or less than 15,000 pupils).

Group	Number	Total Years Employed		Years in Present Position		Years Teaching Special Education		Years in a Special Service	
		Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average
<u>Local Directors</u>									
Less than 15,000	18	5-33	14	1-17	4	0-11	3	0-15	2
More than 15,000	33	8-34	19	1-18	5	0-9	3	0-30	3
<u>Intermediate Directors</u>									
Less than 15,000	6	6-17	11	1-6	2 1/2	0-7	1	0-12	4
More than 15,000	20	7-35	16	1-15	4 1/2	0-9	3	0-13	3

The typical administrator in this study is a male, with a master's degree, over fourteen years professional experience, with at least five years teaching experience, at least four years in his present position, with a salary over \$13,000, and is over thirty-six years of age. The undergraduate majors of all but two groups were in secondary education, with local directors having majored in special education and elementary principals in elementary education. The graduate majors of all of the administrators except special education directors were in administration, with special education directors majoring in special education at the graduate level, more typically in the area of the mentally handicapped.

The foregoing information has described the study population in terms of sex, age, salary, professional preparation and experience. Other factors will now be reviewed which are descriptive of the school districts represented by the local and intermediate directors of special education.

Information Regarding the School Districts

Data regarding the size of the school districts served by the directors of special education is presented in Table 17. This information is arranged in six groups according to total district pupil membership. Thirty-six per cent of the local directors were employed in districts

TABLE 17.--Pupil membership size of school districts.

Pupil Size Range	Group			
	Intermediate Directors		Local Directors	
	No.	%	No.	%
1-5,000	0	0	5	10
5,001 to 10,000	2	8	18	36
10,001 to 15,000	4	15	11	22
15,001 to 25,000	5	19	10	20
25,001 to 40,000	5	19	4	8
Over 40,000	10	39	2	4
Total Number	26		50 ^a	

^aOne respondent did not complete this item.

serving from 5,001 to 10,000 pupils, while 54 per cent were employed in districts serving more than 10,000 pupils, including 4 per cent in districts over 40,000. The median school size served was in the 10,001 to 15,000 range.

Intermediate directors generally tended to serve larger population groups as would be expected inasmuch as intermediate districts are composed of several local districts. Although 39 per cent of the intermediate

directors indicated they were employed by districts of over 40,000 pupils, 53 per cent were serving districts with from 10,001 to 40,000 in school membership. The median school size served by intermediate directors was in the 15,001 to 25,000 pupil membership range.

A majority of both local (80 per cent) and intermediate (61 per cent) districts indicated they had operated some type of special education program for over seven years (see Table 18). All local districts had operated a special education program for over four years. No districts had operated a program for one year only.

TABLE 18.--Length of time district (A) operated a special education program; (B) employed a full-time special education director.

Time	Program Operated				Director Employed			
	Local		Intermediate		Local		Intermediate	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One year only	0	0	0	0	10	19.5	2	8
2-3 years	0	0	2	8	6	12	6	23
4-7 years	8	16	8	31	10	19.5	9	35
Over 7 years	41	80	16	61	23	45	9	35
No Response	2	4	0	0	2	4	0	0

The length of time the district had employed a director of special education represented a more recent development than the initiation of the special education program as presented in Table 18. A full-time director was employed in 19.5 per cent of the local districts for one year only. Almost one-third (31 per cent) of the intermediate districts had employed a director for less than four years, while over two-thirds (70 per cent) of these districts had employed a director for four years or more. A higher percentage of local districts (45 per cent) than intermediate districts (35 per cent) had employed a director for more than seven years.

The seventy-seven local and intermediate districts represented in this study employed a total of 2,966 special education professional personnel, with 2,510 at the local district level and 456 at the intermediate district level (Table 19). Thus, the local districts employed five times as many professional personnel as the intermediate districts.

In considering the programs served by the directors of special education, it is interesting to note the similarity between the rank order by percentage of professional personnel in each special education area as found in the intermediate and local districts.

In the local districts surveyed, the largest group of professionals was found to be in the area of mental

TABLE 19.--Number, percent and frequency rank of professional personnel in each special education area.

Area	Total			Local			District Intermediate		
	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank
Blind	97	3	7.5	84	3	8	13	3	6.5
Deaf	163	5	6	148	6	5.5	15	3	6.5
Orthopedic	218	7	5	191	8	4	27	6	5
Retarded	1191	34	1	1077	43	1	114	25	2
Disturbed	117	3	7.5	109	4	7	8	2	8
Social Work	337	13	3	258	10	3	79	17	3
Diagnostic	215	11	4	142	6	5.5	73	16	4
Speech Correction	628	24	2	501	20	2	127	28	1
Total	2966	100%		2510	100%		456	100%	

retardation (43 per cent) with speech correction second (20 per cent). These areas are just reversed in the intermediate district programs with speech correction first with 28 per cent of the personnel and mental retardation second with 25 per cent. School social workers ranked third in both groups (local, 10 per cent and intermediate 17 per cent). Diagnosticians ranked fourth in the intermediate districts (16 per cent) and 5.5 in the local districts (6 per cent). The remaining areas are all within one rank for both types of districts with the exception of the area of the blind which was ranked 6.5 in the intermediate districts and eight in the local districts.

It appears that the rank order of frequency of these various personnel types reveals more similarity in the configuration of professional persons in these two types of settings than might have been expected.

The number of special education supervisors employed was reviewed, and is presented in Tables 20 and 21. A majority of the local (75 per cent) and intermediate (65 per cent) districts employed no supervisors. A larger percentage (34 per cent compared to 20 per cent) of the supervisors were employed at the intermediate district level. No intermediate and only one local district employed more than six supervisors. Most (62 per cent) of the local district supervisors served the speech correction programs (34 per cent), and programs for the

TABLE 20.--Range of special education supervisors employed.

Number Range	Total		Local Districts		Intermediate Districts	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Zero	55	71	38	75	17	65
One to Three	12	16	7	14	5	19
Four to Six	6	8	2	4	4	16
Seven to Ten	1	1	1	2	0	0
Over Ten	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	3	4	3	5	0	0
Total	77	100%	48	100%	26	100%

TABLE 21.--Number of programs served by supervisors in specific special education areas.

Type of Program	Total		Local Districts		Intermediate Districts	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mentally Handicapped	14	27	8	28	6	27
Speech Correction	13	25	10	34	3	14
Physically Handicapped	10	20	5	17	5	23
Emotionally Disturbed	7	14	3	11	4	18
School Social Work	4	8	2	7	2	9
Psychological Services	3	6	1	3	2	9
Total	51	100%	29	100%	22	100%

mentally handicapped (28 per cent). The intermediate district supervisors served primarily the programs for the mentally handicapped (27 per cent) and the physically handicapped (23 per cent). Few supervisors were employed for psychological services (6 per cent total) or school social worker programs (8 per cent total).

Ideal and Actual Time Ranking
for Major Administrative
Areas

In obtaining information regarding the specific nature of the position of director of special education, two general approaches were utilized. The first was to determine the actual ranking of time consumed versus an ideal ranking by the directors as compared to the other administrative groups in each of ten major areas of educational administration. The second approach was to determine which specific administrative activities within the ten major areas were usually performed by each of the groups of directors of special education.

The administrators were asked to respond to the ten major administrative areas in terms of a rank order (from nine to zero, with nine equivalent to "most") of the ideal amount of their time which should be consumed in each area as opposed to the actual time estimated as being spent in each area. Table 22 represents the responses of each of the six administrative groups. This section was

TABLE 22.--Ideal (I) versus actual (A) time spent by major administrative areas with rank difference (D) noted.

Major Area	Average Rank Difference	Intermediate Director			Intermediate Superintendent			Local Director			Local Superintendent			Elementary Principal			Secondary Principal		
		I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D
Curriculum and Instruction	1.8	9	5	4	9	5	4	9	8	1	9	7	2	9	9	0	9	9	0
Personnel Administration	1.3	8	8	0	8	7	1	8	9	1	5	8	3	8	6	2	8	7	1
Finance	2.0	3	7	4	3	6	3	2	4	2	4	4	0	0	2	2	0	1	1
Business Management	1.2	2	4	2	5	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	0
School Plant	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	3	4	1
Auxiliary Services	0.8	1	2	1	2	2	0	5	6	1	0	1	1	4	3	1	4	3	1
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	1.3	4	1	3	1	1	0	6	5	1	3	0	3	6	7	1	6	6	0
Community Relations	1.0	5	6	1	7	4	3	4	3	1	7	6	1	5	5	0	5	5	0
Staff Relations	1.5	7	9	2	4	8	4	7	7	0	8	9	1	7	8	1	7	8	1
School Board Relations	2.0	6	3	3	6	9	3	3	0	3	6	5	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Average Rank Difference				2			2			1.2			1.4			1			.6

Note: 9 equals "most," and 0 "least."

placed after the listing of specific administrative activities in the survey form to facilitate an understanding of the specific content of the major area on the part of the respondents.

With the exception of both groups of principals, the range of responses of ideal and actual rank order was great (often from 0-9) among the respondents within the groups. The responses of elementary and secondary principals indicated general role interpretation agreement. All groups agreed that ideally most of their time should be spent in the major area of Curriculum and Instruction. However, only two groups (elementary and secondary principals) were actually spending most of their time (represented by a "9" ranking) in Curriculum and Instruction. Two groups only (intermediate directors and superintendents) were spending the least amount of actual time in the ideal area of least time, for both, the area of School Plant.

The least difference between ideal and actual time rankings was expressed by secondary principals (.6 average), and the greatest average difference (2.0) was reported by intermediate directors of special education and intermediate superintendents.

The intermediate directors and intermediate superintendents ideally would like to spend much more time in Curriculum and Instruction (4 rank difference). Local superintendents would like to spend less time (3 rank

difference) in the major administrative area of Personnel Administration. Intermediate directors and intermediate superintendents would like to spend less time in Finance (4 and 3 point rank difference respectively). Intermediate directors and local superintendents would ideally spend more time in the area of Pupil-Personnel Guidance (3 rank difference each). Intermediate superintendents would ideally spend more time in Community Relations (3 rank difference) and less time in Staff Relations (4 rank difference). Intermediate and local directors would both ideally spend more time in the area of School Board Relations, while intermediate superintendents would ideally spend less time in this area (3 point rank difference for all).

Three and four point rank differences between ideal and actual were indicated by intermediate superintendents in five areas, and by intermediate directors in four areas, representing the highest variation between ideal and actual time spent in each of the major administrative areas of all of the groups.

The ideal and actual time rankings of local directors were compared with those of intermediate directors. The greatest "ideal" ranking variation occurred in the area of Auxiliary Services, with the local directors ranking it higher by 4 ranks. The greatest variation in "actual" time rankings of intermediate and local directors occurred

in the areas of Auxiliary Services and Pupil-Personnel Guidance, with local directors ranking both higher (4 ranks each).

There were no "ideal" time ranking variations between local and intermediate directors in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction, Personnel Administration and Staff Relations; while in "actual" time rankings, one point rank variations occurred in Personnel Administration and School Plant.

The "ideal" time ranking responses of intermediate directors were more like those of local superintendents (with a 10 point rank difference) and least like elementary and secondary principals (with a 16 point rank difference for each) (see Table 23). The "actual" time rankings of intermediate directors were more like intermediate and local superintendents (12 point rank difference with each) and least like elementary (30 point rank difference) and secondary principals (28 point rank difference) (see Table 24).

Moreover, the "ideal" time ranking responses of local directors were more like elementary and secondary principals (10 point rank difference for each) and least like intermediate and local superintendents (note 22 point rank difference for each in Table 25). The "actual" time ranking responses for local directors were most like secondary principals (16 point rank difference) and

TABLE 23.--Rank difference between the ideal time ranking of intermediate directors and other groups.

Area	Total	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Curriculum and Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel Administration	3	0	0	3	0	0
Finance	8	0	1	1	3	3
Business Management	4	3	1	0	0	0
School Plant	7	0	0	1	3	3
Auxiliary Services	12	1	4	1	3	3
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	10	3	2	1	2	2
Community Relations	5	2	1	2	0	0
Staff Relations	4	3	0	1	0	0
School Board Relations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	66	12	12	10	16	16

TABLE 24.--Rank difference between the actual time ranking of intermediate directors and other groups.

Area	Total	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Curriculum and Instruction	13	0	3	2	4	4
Personnel Administration	5	1	1	0	2	1
Finance	18	1	3	3	5	6
Business Management	9	1	2	1	3	2
School Plant	11	0	1	2	4	4
Auxiliary Services	7	0	4	1	1	1
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	16	0	4	1	6	5
Community Relations	7	2	3	0	1	1
Staff Relations	5	1	2	0	1	1
School Board Relations	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	108	12	26	12	30	28

TABLE 25.--Rank difference between the ideal time ranking of local directors and other groups.

Area	Total	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Curriculum and Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel Administration	3	0	0	3	0	0
Finance	8	1	1	2	2	2
Business Management	8	1	4	1	1	1
School Plant	7	0	0	1	3	3
Auxiliary Services	14	4	3	5	1	1
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	10	2	5	3	0	0
Community Relations	9	1	3	3	1	1
Staff Relations	4	0	3	1	0	0
School Board Relations	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	76	12	22	22	10	10

least like intermediate directors (26 point rank difference) and intermediate superintendents (28 point rank difference, see Table 26). The actual time ranking for the administrative activities of local directors differed more than did the intermediate directors ranking from other administrative roles and dramatizes the difference between the actual role of the intermediate and local director of special education.

The ideal and actual rank order of time which the directors consumed in the ten major areas was reviewed according to the size of the school district (more or less than 15,000 pupils) and the length of time the district had employed a full-time director of special education (more or less than four years). Greater differences in the rankings occurred among intermediate directors in large and small districts than among their counterparts in the local district (Table 27).

The largest rank difference (22 rank points) between ideal and actual time consumed in the major administrative areas was reported by directors in the smaller intermediate districts, followed by directors in the larger intermediate districts (10 point difference). The least variation (4 rank points) between ideal and actual time ranking was indicated by local directors of special education in districts with less than 15,000 pupil membership, indicating the least frustration between ideal

TABLE 26.--Rank difference between the actual time ranking of local directors and other groups.

Area	Total	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Curriculum and Instruction	9	3	3	1	1	1
Personnel Administration	9	1	2	1	3	2
Finance	10	3	2	0	2	3
Business Management	5	2	1	1	1	0
School Plant	9	1	1	1	3	3
Auxiliary Services	19	4	4	5	3	3
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	16	4	4	5	2	1
Community Relations	11	3	1	3	2	2
Staff Relations	7	2	1	2	1	1
School Board Relations	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	112	26	28	24	18	16

TABLE 27.--Ideal (I) and actual (A) rank order of time consumed by directors of special education in major administrative areas according to size of school district (more or less than 15,000 pupils). Rank difference (D) is indicated.

Major Area	Total Rank Difference	Local District						Intermediate District					
		-15,000 Pupils			15,000+ Pupils			-15,000 Pupils			15,000+ Pupils		
		I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D
Curriculum and Instruction	6	9	9	0	9	8	1	9	6	3	7	5	2
Personnel Administration	2	8	8	0	8	9	1	8	9	1	9	9	0
Finance	8	3	4	1	3	2	1	2	5	3	4	7	3
Business Management	11	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	8	7	1	3	2
School Plant	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auxiliary Services	2	5	5	0	6	6	0	3	2	1	3	2	1
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	7	6	6	0	5	4	1	6	1	5	2	1	1
Community Relations	3	4	3	1	4	5	1	5	4	1	6	6	0
Staff Relations	0	7	7	0	7	7	0	7	7	0	8	8	0
School Board Relations	4	2	1	1	1	0	1	4	3	1	5	4	1
Total	44			4			8			22			10

Note: 9 equals "most" and 0 "least."

and actual use of time. Intermediate directors in large and small districts would ideally spend less time (3 rank points) in the area of Finance. Intermediate directors in smaller districts would ideally spend much less time (7 rank points) in the area of Business Management, more time in Pupil-Personnel Guidance (5 point rank difference) and Curriculum and Instruction (3 point rank difference). Directors in larger local and intermediate districts spent more actual time (2 rank points more each) in Community Relations than did directors representing smaller districts. Intermediate directors in larger districts ranked ideally and actually the amount of time in Curriculum and Instruction two or more points below the other groups.

Directors in both local and intermediate districts which have employed a director for more than four years expressed greater agreement between ideal and actual time spent in the major administrative areas, with a total of only 8 point rank differences noted.

The greatest difference between ideal and actual amounts of time consumed was expressed by intermediate directors in districts where a director was employed less than four years in the area of Business Management, with ideal being 6 rank points less (Table 28). This same group had the largest (16) rank point difference between ideal and actual amounts of time spent in the major administrative areas.

TABLE 28.--Ideal (I) and actual (A) rank order of time consumed by directors of special education in major administrative areas according to length of time district has employed a director (more or less than four years). Rank difference (D) is indicated.

Major Area	Local District Director						Intermediate Director					
	-4 Years			4+ Years			-4 Years			4+ Years		
	I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D	I	A	D
Curriculum and Instruction	9	8	1	9	8	1	9	8	1	8	5	3
Personnel Administration	8	9	1	8	9	1	8	9	1	9	9	0
Finance	3	3	0	3	3	0	4	2	2	6	7	1
Business Management	0	2	2	2	4	2	1	7	6	2	3	1
School Plant	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auxiliary Services	4	6	2	6	6	0	2	3	1	3	2	1
Pupil-Personnel Guidance	6	5	1	5	5	0	3	1	2	1	1	0
Community Relations	5	4	1	4	2	2	6	4	2	5	6	1
Staff Relations	7	7	0	7	7	0	7	6	1	7	8	1
School Board Relations	2	1	1	1	0	1	5	5	0	4	4	0
Total			10			8			16			8

Note: 9 equals "most" and 0 "least."

Specific Administrative Activities of
Directors of Special Education
Compared to Other
Administrative
Groups

The respondents were asked to indicate if they perform, delegate or have no responsibility for performing specific administrative activities within the ten major administrative areas.

The special education administrative role was defined for the purposes of this study as those specific items within the ten major administrative categories, which were performed by 50 per cent or more of the special education directors who participated in this study. A second criterion entitled "Role Depth," was defined as those items which were reported as being performed by 75 per cent or more of those in the responding groups.

Some seventy-two specific administrative activities out of a total possible 113 are usually performed by 50 per cent or more of the local and/or intermediate directors of special education, and therefore meet the criterion for special education administrative roles.

Fifty-eight (51 per cent) of the items met the administrative role criterion for local directors and sixty-nine (61 per cent) met this criterion for intermediate directors.

These specific administrative activities of directors of special education encompass all ten major administrative areas.

Table 29 presents those items which meet the special education administrative role criterion for directors of special education, and the percentage of participation by each administrative group with regard to these specific administrative activities. A discussion of each major administrative area follows the table.

Area of Curriculum and Instruction

The special education administrative role in this area includes twelve of the possible fifteen specific administrative activities (80 per cent). The percentage of these items at the administrative role level (50 per cent or more) and the role depth level (75 per cent or more) of participation for the various groups are as follows:

TABLE 29.--The special education administrative role (50 per cent or more positive responses of directors of special education for specific administrative activities compared to the responses of the other administrative groups).

Major Area	Intermediate Directors of Special Education	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors of Special Education	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION						
1. Developing curriculum for total school or specialized area.	69	11	88 ^a	21	78	87
2. Improving and changing curriculum	69	17	88 ^a	34	93	87
3. Selecting textbooks and instructional material.	46	11	63	17	67	42
4. Providing for instructional supervision and consultation	62	33	86 ^a	31	89	87
5. Providing leadership at staff meetings.	100 ^a	56	92 ^a	62	100	97
6. Consulting with classroom teachers.	62	22	84 ^a	14	100	94
7. Evaluating the instructional program.	69	28	86 ^a	55	96	94
8. Evaluating individual teaching.	54	11	75 ^a	7	100	87
9. Developing an inservice education program for teachers.	77 ^a	33	86 ^a	24	78	58
10. Promoting the use of community resources in the instructional program.	69	22	76 ^a	45	85	48
11. Initiating new programs.	100 ^a	67	96 ^a	79	85	84
12. Keeping aware of state school laws.	100 ^a	94	96 ^a	90	67	84
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION						
13. Preparing criteria for personnel selection.	100 ^a	61	90 ^a	69	41	71
14. Conducting personnel interviews.	100 ^a	67	96 ^a	45	67	84
15. Selecting personnel for employment.	92 ^a	72	92 ^a	52	63	84
16. Orienting personnel.	92 ^a	33	86 ^a	48	96	84
17. Developing schedules and work loads for professional personnel	81 ^a	28	84 ^a	31	89	74
18. Developing schedules and work loads for non-professional personnel.	65	44	55	10	63	39
19. Evaluating teaching personnel	88 ^a	39	88 ^a	14	96	90
20. Evaluating nonteaching personnel.	77 ^a	44	61	3	67	68
21. Suspending or dismissing employees.	81 ^a	83	59	90	48	58
22. Assigning personnel to a specific facility.	88 ^a	50	92 ^a	45	48	55
23. Recommending tenure appointments.	88 ^a	67	83 ^a	69	92	90
FINANCE						
24. Preparing a budget.	88 ^a	83	88 ^a	66	44	55
25. Administering a budget.	88 ^a	78	90 ^a	62	59	68
26. Preparing financial statements for the board.	65	39	39	31	7	13
27. Preparing financial data for citizens advisory groups	73	61	27	38	4	10
28. Formulating and evaluating salary schedules.	81 ^a	89	28	79	12	13
29. Preparing and completing state reports.	85 ^a	56	90 ^a	28	23	45
30. Computing per pupil costs and other statistical data.	50	33	44	21	4	3
31. Requesting and administering federal funds.	58	33	34	38	12	16
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND PRACTICES						
32. Organizing and coordinating purchase practices	50	50	34	10	12	6
33. Studying equipment and supply needs	85 ^a	28	78 ^a	14	73	58
34. Analyzing school district expenditures.	65	78	10	66	8	0
35. Arranging to serve non-resident pupils.	77 ^a	39	72	17	15	16
SCHOOL PLANT						
36. Planning for buildings and equipment with the architect.	62	44	42	55	46	55
37. Planning for buildings and equipment with the staff.	73	44	58	62	62	74
38. Determining remodeling needs of school facilities.	50	50	50	41	69	71
39. Determining physical location of classes.	54	22	54	24	81	74

AUXILIARY SERVICES

40. Evaluating transportation needs.	62	33	78 ^a	31	19	6
41. Developing transportation plans.	46	17	58	7	15	0
42. Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician program.	77 ^a	6	88 ^a	3	19	6
43. Supervising or coordinating school social worker program.	77 ^a	6	80 ^a	3	31	23
44. Supervising or coordinating speech correction program.	73	6	88 ^a	3	27	16

PUPIL-PERSONNEL GUIDANCE

45. Developing procedures for reporting to parents	54	11	64	34	85	74
46. Counseling of students and parents.	31	11	60	10	92	61

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

47. Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities.	92 ^a	67	56	93	62	68
48. Interpreting and presenting school policies to the community.	92 ^a	94	84 ^a	97	100	87
49. Developing and administering a community relations program.	73	83	52	69	62	39
50. Preparing news releases.	92 ^a	89	42	62	58	48
51. Conducting and utilizing research concerning educational problems of the school and community.	69	50	50	55	58	48
52. Using community resources in the school program.	65	11	64	31	81	48
53. Participating in parent school organizations.	77 ^a	50	82 ^a	66	100	68
54. Making speeches at state and national conferences.	62	44	66	86	35	42
55. Conducting individual parent conferences.	50	11	84 ^a	31	88	81
56. Arranging student teaching and internship experiences with universities.	88 ^a	22	68	41	77	65
57. Meeting with legislators regarding school issues.	85 ^a	94	42	93	19	19
58. Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs.	96 ^a	89	80 ^a	76	12	26

STAFF RELATIONS

59. Arranging for and/or conducting staff meetings.	92 ^a	61	98 ^a	72	100	94
60. Encouraging staff participation in professional organizations.	100 ^a	78	94 ^a	62	77	74
61. Encouraging staff participation in community activities.	96 ^a	67	92 ^a	72	88	87
62. Other fringe benefits for staff.	88 ^a	89	38	62	23	29
63. Defining the duties and responsibilities of the staff.	100 ^a	72	96 ^a	76	100	90
64. Developing and utilizing a staff newsletter.	65	39	22	28	62	45
65. Interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators.	100 ^a	78	98 ^a	79	46	55

SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONS

66. Recommending items for the school board agenda.	96 ^a	94	64	97	19	55
67. Preparing written and oral reports for the board of education.	100 ^a	94	90 ^a	97	54	71
68. Recommending policy to the board of education.	96 ^a	100	61	93	30	48
69. Administering board policy.	100 ^a	94	78 ^a	97	89	77
70. Aiding the board to distinguish between policy and executive function.	65	100	24	97	11	32
71. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to meet and work with the staff.	81 ^a	89	39	86	19	45
72. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to appear before the public.	50	78	10	86	37	19

^aDepth role level (with 75 per cent or more participation).

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	92%	33%
Intermediate Superintendents	25%	8%
Local Directors	100%	91%
Local Superintendents	33%	17%
Elementary Principals	100%	83%
Secondary Principals	83%	75%

It is apparent that in this area, the special education administrative role is much more like that of a principal than that of a superintendent. It is also apparent that the local director is considerably more involved in this area in depth than is the intermediate director. The local director is involved with 91 per cent of these items on the role depth criterion (75 per cent) as compared with 33 per cent for the intermediate director.

Area of Personnel Administration

The special education administrative role included eleven of the twelve possible items in this area (91 per cent). The percentage of these eleven items at the administrative role and the depth role levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	91%
Intermediate Superintendents	55%	9%
Local Directors	100%	73%
Local Superintendents	36%	9%
Elementary Principals	73%	36%
Secondary Principals	91%	45%

Both intermediate and local directors met the administrative role criterion on all items in this area. Secondary principals were most like the directors with 91 per cent followed by elementary principals with 73 per cent.

On the depth role criterion, the directors continued to compare more favorably with the principals than with the superintendents. The only item with which the intermediate and local superintendents reached the depth role criterion was that of "suspending or dismissing employees."

Area of Finance

The special education administrative role included eight of the thirteen possible items in this area (61 per cent). The percentage of these eight items at the

administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	50%
Intermediate Superintendents	63%	37%
Local Directors	38%	37%
Local Superintendents	38%	12%
Elementary Principals	13%	0%
Secondary Principals	13%	0%

The intermediate directors met the administrative role criterion for 100 per cent of the eight items, while the local directors met the criterion for only 63 per cent of the items. In this area, the intermediate directors were more like intermediate superintendents, and the local directors more like local superintendents. Both groups of principals showed very little involvement in the area of Finance.

The intermediate directors met depth role criterion for half of the items, while both local directors and intermediate superintendents reached only the 37 per cent level. Both groups of principals showed 0 per cent of participation at the depth role level.

Area of Business Management
and Practices

The special education administrative role included four of the ten possible items in this area (40 per cent). The percentage of these four items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	50%
Intermediate Superintendents	50%	25%
Local Directors	50%	25%
Local Superintendents	25%	0%
Elementary Principals	25%	0%
Secondary Principals	25%	0%

The intermediate directors met the administrative role criterion for 100 per cent of the four items, while the local directors reported only 50 per cent, as did the intermediate superintendents.

At the depth role criterion, the intermediate directors represented the highest percentage for all of the groups with 50 per cent. The intermediate superintendents and local directors both reached 25 per cent,

but for different items, while the three other groups did not reach the depth criterion at all.

Area of School Plant

The special education administrative role included four of the fifteen possible items in this area (26 per cent). The percentage of these four items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	0%
Intermediate Superintendents	25%	0%
Local Directors	75%	0%
Local Superintendents	50%	0%
Elementary Principals	75%	25%
Secondary Principals	100%	0%

The intermediate directors met the administrative role criterion for 100 per cent of the four items, while the local directors met the criterion for 75 per cent of the items. On this criterion, the intermediate directors appeared more like secondary principals, and the local directors compared with elementary principals.

On the depth role criterion, the only group which was included was the elementary principals because of their high involvement with one item: "Determining physical location of classes."

Area of Auxiliary Services

The special education administrative role included five of the twelve possible items in this area (42 per cent). The percentage of these five items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	80%	40%
Intermediate Superintendents	0%	0%
Local Directors	100%	80%
Local Superintendents	0%	0%
Elementary Principals	0%	0%
Secondary Principals	0%	0%

The intermediate directors met the administrative role criterion for only 80 per cent of the items, while the local directors reported 100 per cent. This area is

more unique to the special education directors than any of the other major areas since all other groups reported 0 per cent participation at this level.

On the depth role criterion, the local directors appeared highly involved with 80 per cent participation, while the intermediate directors dropped to 40 per cent.

Area of Pupil-Personnel
Guidance

The special education administrative role included two of the six possible items in this area (33 per cent). The percentage of these items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	50%	0%
Intermediate Superintendents	0%	0%
Local Directors	100%	0%
Local Superintendents	0%	0%
Elementary Principals	100%	100%
Secondary Principals	100%	0%

The administrative role criterion was met by 100 per cent of the local directors, and only 50 per cent of the intermediate directors. The high involvement of the principals should be noted.

On the depth role criterion, the only group to be included was the elementary principals, again with 100 per cent participation.

Area of Community Relations

The special education administrative role included twelve of the fourteen possible items in this area (85 per cent). The percentage of these twelve items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	58%
Intermediate Superintendents	67%	42%
Local Directors	83%	33%
Local Superintendents	75%	42%
Elementary Principals	75%	42%
Secondary Principals	42%	17%

The administrative role criterion was met by 100 per cent of the intermediate directors and 83 per cent of the local directors. Secondary principals reported the least involvement in this area.

On the depth role criterion, the intermediate directors reported the highest depth involvement with 58 per cent. The local director reported only 33 per cent depth involvement, a lower percentage than all but one of the other groups.

Area of Staff Relations

The special education administrative role included seven of the nine possible items in this area (89 per cent). The percentage of these items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	85%
Intermediate Superintendents	86%	43%
Local Directors	71%	71%
Local Superintendents	86%	28%
Elementary Principals	71%	57%
Secondary Principals	71%	43%

The administrative role criterion was met by 100 per cent of the intermediate directors of special education, with both groups of superintendents being the next highest with 86 per cent. At this level of involvement, the local director, with 71 per cent appeared most like both groups of principals.

On the depth role criterion level, however, the local and intermediate directors reported higher involvement than the other groups (71 per cent and 85 per cent respectively).

Area of School Board Relations

The special education administrative role included seven of the nine possible items in this area (89 per cent). The percentage of these items at the administrative role and the depth role criterion levels for all administrative groups was:

<u>Group</u>	<u>50 Per Cent Participation (Adm. Role)</u>	<u>75 Per Cent Participation (Depth Role)</u>
Intermediate Directors	100%	71%
Intermediate Superintendents	100%	100%
Local Directors	57%	28%
Local Superintendents	100%	100%
Elementary Principals	29%	14%
Secondary Principals	43%	14%

The administrative role criterion was met by 100 per cent of the intermediate directors and both groups of superintendents. Lowest participation was reported by elementary principals.

On the depth role criterion, both groups of superintendents reported 100 per cent, while the intermediate directors maintained a high participation level of 71 per cent. The local directors appear more like both groups of principals on the depth role criterion level.

Table 30 clearly indicates that the roles of intermediate and local directors vary considerably from each other. At the depth criterion level, the local directors are much more involved (58 per cent more) in the area of Curriculum and Instruction. There is also a 40 per cent difference in the area of Auxiliary Services, with local directors being more highly involved than intermediate directors at the depth role criterion level. Another great contrast in roles is apparent in the area of School Board Relations, with intermediate directors reporting a 43 per cent greater depth involvement.

Referring again to Table 29 on page 93, two items at the depth role level for both intermediate and local directors of special education were performed by less than 50 per cent of all other groups in the study. They were:

TABLE 30.--Rank order of involvement at the depth role level of directors in major administrative areas.

Major Area	Depth Criterion Level		
	% Intermediate Director	% Local Director	% Difference
Curriculum and Instruction	33	91	58
Personnel Administration	91	73	18
Finance	50	37	13
Business Management	50	25	25
School Plant	0	0	0
Auxiliary Services	40	80	40
Pupil-Personnel	0	0	0
Community Relations	58	33	25
Staff Relations	85	71	14
School Board Relations	71	28	43

1. Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician programs.
2. Supervising or coordinating school social worker programs.

Both of the above items were in the major area of Auxiliary Services.

Five items at the depth role level for both intermediate and local directors of special education were performed by less than 50 per cent of both intermediate and local superintendents:

1. Developing an inservice education program for teachers (major area of Curriculum and Instruction).
2. Orienting personnel.
3. Developing schedules and work loads for non-professional personnel.
4. Evaluating teaching personnel.

(The above three items were in the area of Personnel Administration.)

5. Studying equipment and supply needs (major area of Business Management and Practices).

The following two items at the depth role level for the directors were performed by less than 50 per cent of both groups of principals:

1. Preparing and completing state reports (major area of Finance).
2. Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs (major area of Community Relations).

The administrators were requested to respond to those administrative items which were not usually performed in the course of their responsibilities. Forty-two of the 113 possible administrative activities were not usually performed by 50 per cent or more of the local or intermediate directors of special education. They were as noted in Table 31.

There was only one negative response by the directors at the 50 per cent or more level in the major area of Curriculum and Instruction, and none in the major area of Personnel Administration, as reported in Table 31.

Local directors of special education reported higher percentages of negative responses than intermediate directors in the major area of Finance, with three items at the 75 per cent or more level compared to none at this negative response level for intermediate directors. This was also true in the major area of Business Management, with four items listed at the 75 per cent or more level of negative response for local directors and no items reported at this level for intermediate directors. Both of these areas (Finance and Business Management) received a low negative response from the superintendents.

Both groups of directors of special education responded at the 75 per cent or more negative level to only six items, as indicated by the asterisks in Table 31. In addition, intermediate directors responded at this negative

TABLE 31.--Fifty per cent negative responses of directors of special education for specific administrative activities compared to the responses of the other administrative groups.

Major Area	Groups (in percent)					
	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>						
1. Writing articles for professional journals.	50	33	37	14	63	52
<u>FINANCE</u>						
2. Preparing financial statements for the board.	19	0	55	3	81	65
3. Preparing financial data for citizens advisory groups.	19	0	63	3	85	71
4. Investigating insurance rates and coverage	50	6	88 ^a	7	89	94
5. Formulating and evaluating salary schedules.	15	0	62	7	85	81
6. Preparing a payroll.	50	6	76 ^a	10	62	81
7. Designating a system of financial accounting.	50	6	84 ^a	10	92	94
8. Requesting and administering federal funds.	35	11	60	0	88	74
<u>BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND PRACTICES</u>						
9. Developing a systematic control of records and funds	38	6	64	7	85	65
10. Developing a system of inventory of fixed assets and appraisal	27	6	76 ^a	7	85	87
11. Organizing and coordinating purchase practices.	27	6	56	7	85	84
12. Preparing specifications for bids and for purchasing.	50	17	78 ^a	7	85	77
13. Processing of bids	58	17	94 ^a	7	92	84
14. Analyzing school district expenditures.	27	0	86 ^a	7	92	94
<u>SCHOOL PLANT</u>						
15. Selecting a school architect.	92 ^a	22	94 ^a	14	100	94
16. Evaluating existing sites and facilities.	50	17	60	7	88	74
17. Determining the specifications of the new building.	46	22	52	7	85	45
18. Planning for buildings and equipment with the architect.	31	28	52	0	54	39
19. Planning for buildings and equipment with the students.	81 ^a	56	72	17	62	45
20. Planning for buildings and equipment with the community.	54	28	72	0	54	48
21. Evaluating building and site plans.	54	17	62	7	73	52
22. Consulting during construction.	62	28	68	7	73	42
23. Supervising building maintenance program.	62	33	88 ^a	10	46	35
24. Recommending the amount of insurance coverage.	81 ^a	28	94 ^a	14	100	97
25. Determining plant utilization for non-educational purposes.	69	28	88 ^a	10	42	48

AUXILIARY SERVICES

26. Employing transportation personnel.	73	33	80 ^a	7	92	97
27. Operating and maintaining school buses.	85 ^a	61	86 ^a	7	92	97
28. Developing regulations governing school bus operation.	81 ^a	50	74	7	81	94
29. Preparing bids for purchasing of school buses.	85 ^a	61	88 ^a	10	96	97
30. Administering cafeteria program.	88 ^a	67	92 ^a	14	62	55
31. Supervising or coordinating school nurse program.	88 ^a	44	54	3	65	68

PUPIL-PERSONNEL GUIDANCE

32. Planning and evaluating a guidance and testing program.	81 ^a	56	52	0	38	3
33. Administering a guidance and testing program.	81 ^a	56	58	3	23	3
34. Determining the content of pupil cumulative records	62	44	50	3	27	0

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

35. Providing for an adult education program.	77 ^a	50	82 ^a	3	81	61
36. Meeting with legislators regarding school issues.	15	0	52	3	81	77

STAFF RELATIONS

37. Recommending sick leave provisions and other fringe benefits for staff.	12	0	60	7	73	61
38. Developing and utilizing a staff newsletter.	19	11	60	7	31	48
39. Representing school board in professional negotiations with teachers.	65	33	82 ^a	3	85	58

SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONS

40. Aiding the board to distinguish between policy and executive function.	31	0	69	3	81	68
41. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to meet and work with the staff.	19	0	53	3	70	55
42. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to appear before the public.	50	6	84 ^a	3	52	81

^aNegative responses at the 75 per cent or higher level.

level to five more items, and local directors to five more separate items.

Summary

Much information has been reported herein as a result of the survey which was sent to the six groups of administrators in school districts which employ a full-time director of special education in Michigan. This chapter presented facts descriptive of the population sample, the school districts and programs represented and the administrative activities of local and intermediate directors of special education, local and intermediate superintendents, and elementary and secondary principals. Variations between the administrative activities of the six groups were noted.

The ten major administrative areas were described by each of the six groups in terms of ideal and actual rankings of time ascribed to each.

Chapter Five will present inferences, recommendations and conclusions resulting from the summary and analysis of the information gained in this investigation.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major purpose of this study was to obtain information regarding the specific nature of the position of director of special education in the belief that this type of data would be of value in the development of better state certificating standards and better college and university preparation programs for such personnel. Information was also obtained regarding the nature of the six administrative groups studied and the school districts they represented.

Conclusions

The Respondents

1. The typical intermediate director of special education in this study population may be described as a male, between 36-45 years of age, receiving a salary in the \$13,000 to \$15,999 range, with a secondary teaching certificate, a master's degree, a secondary

education undergraduate major, a special education graduate major in the area of the mentally handicapped, no major in administration, with four years experience in his present position, five years teaching experience and with a total of fifteen years professional employment. He was a member of the youngest administrative group represented in the study.

2. The typical intermediate superintendent of schools in the study population may be described as a male, over 50 years of age, receiving a salary over \$16,000, with a master's degree, a life teaching certificate, a secondary education undergraduate major, a graduate major in administration, with fourteen years in his present position, seven and one-half years teaching experience and with a total of thirty-two years professional experience.
3. The typical local director of special education was a male, between 36-45 years of age, receiving a salary between \$13,000 and \$15,999, with a master's degree, an elementary teaching certificate, with both undergraduate and graduate majors in special education (the area of the mentally handicapped), with no major in administration, with four years experience in his present

position, six and one-half years teaching experience, and with a total of fourteen and one-half years professional employment.

4. The typical local school district superintendent in this study may be described as a male, over fifty years of age, receiving over \$16,000 in salary, with a master's degree, a life teaching certificate, a secondary education undergraduate major, a graduate major in administration, with nine years in his present position, 6.3 years teaching experience and with a total of twenty-eight and one-half years professional employment.
5. The typical elementary principal in this study was a male, over fifty years of age, receiving a salary between \$13,000 and \$15,999, with a master's degree, an elementary teaching certificate, an elementary education undergraduate major, a graduate major in administration, with 6.5 years in his present position, 9.3 years teaching experience and 20.3 years of professional experience.
6. The typical secondary principal in this study was a male, between thirty-six and forty-five years of age, receiving a salary between \$13,000 and \$15,999, with a master's degree, a secondary

teaching certificate, an undergraduate major in secondary education, a graduate major in administration, with four and one-half years in his present position, eight and one-half years teaching experience and twenty years of professional experience.

The Schools and Programs
Represented

1. The median school district size served by intermediate directors of special education in Michigan was in the 15,001 to 25,000 pupil membership range.
2. The median school district size served by local directors of special education in Michigan was in the 10,001 to 15,000 pupil membership range.
3. Seventy-five per cent of the local school districts did not employ any special education supervisors, while 65 per cent of the intermediate districts employed none.
4. The intermediate district supervisors served primarily the programs for the mentally handicapped, followed by services to programs for the physically handicapped; while local district supervisors served primarily speech correction programs, followed by services to programs for the mentally handicapped.

5. Five times as many special education personnel providing direct services to students were employed at the local school district level than at the intermediate district level.
6. More teachers of the mentally handicapped (43 per cent) were employed in local schools than any other type of special education personnel, followed by speech correction personnel. The order of most frequently employed personnel was simply reversed at the intermediate district level.
7. Most districts (80 per cent at the local district level and 61 per cent at the intermediate district level) had operated a special education program for more than seven years.
8. Most districts (64.5 per cent of the local districts and 70 per cent of the intermediate districts) had employed a director of special education for over four years.

Ideal Versus Actual Time Rankings

Information was obtained regarding the ideal and actual amounts of time spent by each of the six administrative groups in the ten major administrative areas under which the 113 specific administrative activities were classified.

1. All groups agreed they should ideally spend most of their time performing the activities in the major administrative area of Curriculum and Instruction.
2. The ideal time ranking responses of intermediate directors were more like those of local superintendents and least like those of elementary and secondary principals.
3. The ideal time ranking responses of local directors of special education were more like elementary and secondary principals, and least like intermediate and local superintendents.
4. Intermediate directors in smaller districts showed much more variation between ideal and actual roles than did the other directors.
5. Intermediate directors who had been in their present position for less than four years showed much more difference between ideal and actual role rankings than did the other directors.
6. Local directors showed less difference between ideal and actual roles than did intermediate directors.
7. All groups considered the least variation between actual and ideal time spent was in the major area of School Plant.

8. All groups considered the most variation between actual and ideal time spent was in the major areas of Finance and School Board Relations.
9. The actual time ranking responses of intermediate directors were more like those of intermediate and local superintendents and least like those of elementary and secondary principals.
10. The actual time ranking responses of local directors of special education were more like those of secondary principals and least like those of intermediate directors of special education and intermediate superintendents.

The Special Education
Administrative Role

The following administrative activities were performed by 50 per cent or more of the special education administrators and are therefore considered to be a part of the special education administrative role:

Major Area: Curriculum and Instruction

1. Developing curriculum for total school or specialized area.
2. Improving and changing curriculum.
3. Selecting textbooks and instructional material.

4. Providing for instructional supervision and consultation.
5. Providing leadership at staff meetings.
6. Consulting with classroom teachers.
7. Evaluating the instructional program.
8. Evaluating individual teaching.
9. Developing an inservice education program for teachers.
10. Promoting the use of community resources in the instructional program.
11. Initiating new programs.
12. Keeping aware of state school laws.

Major Area: Personnel Administration

13. Preparing criteria for personnel selection.
14. Conducting personnel interviews.
15. Selecting personnel for employment.
16. Orienting personnel.
17. Developing schedules and work loads for professional personnel.
18. Developing schedules and work loads for non-professional personnel.
19. Evaluating teaching personnel.
20. Evaluating non-teaching personnel.
21. Suspending or dismissing employees.
22. Assigning personnel to a specific facility.
23. Recommending tenure appointments.

Major Area: Finance

24. Preparing a budget.
25. Administering a budget.
26. Preparing financial statements for the board.
27. Preparing financial data for citizens advisory groups.
28. Formulating and evaluating salary schedules.
29. Preparing and completing state reports.
30. Computing per pupil costs and other statistical data.
31. Requesting and administering federal funds.

Major Area: Business Management and Practices

32. Organizing and coordinating purchase practices.
33. Studying equipment and supply needs.
34. Analyzing school district expenditures.
35. Arranging to serve non-resident pupils.

Major Area: School Plant

36. Planning for buildings and equipment with the architect.
37. Planning for buildings and equipment with the staff.
38. Determining remodeling needs of school facilities.
39. Determining physical location of classes.

Major Area: Auxiliary Services

40. Evaluating transportation needs.
41. Developing transportation plans.
42. Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician program.
43. Supervising or coordinating school social worker program.
44. Supervising or coordinating speech correction program.

Major Area: Pupil-Personnel Guidance

45. Developing procedures for reporting to parents.
46. Counseling of students and parents.

Major Area: Community Relations

47. Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities.
48. Interpreting and presenting school policies to the community.
49. Developing and administering a community relations program.
50. Preparing news releases.
51. Conducting and utilizing research concerning educational problems of the school and community.
52. Using community resources in the school program.

53. Participating in parent school organizations.
54. Making speeches at state and national conferences.
55. Conducting individual parent conferences.
56. Arranging student teaching and internship experiences with universities.
57. Meeting with legislators regarding school issues.
58. Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs.

Major Area: Staff Relations

59. Arranging for and/or conducting staff meetings.
60. Encouraging staff participation in professional organizations.
61. Encouraging staff participation in community activities.
62. Recommending sick leave provisions and other fringe benefits for staff.
63. Defining the duties and responsibilities of the staff.
64. Developing and utilizing a staff newsletter.
65. Interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators.

Major Area: School Board Relations

66. Recommending items for the school board agenda.

67. Preparing written and oral reports for the board of education.
68. Recommending policy to the board of education.
69. Administering board policy.
70. Aiding the board to distinguish between policy and executive function.
71. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to meet and work with the staff.
72. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to appear before the public.

The following items were marked negatively by 50 per cent or more of both local and intermediate directors of special education, and are, therefore, definitely not considered a part of the special education administrative role:

Major Area: Finance

1. Investigating insurance rates and coverage.
2. Preparing a payroll.
3. Designating a system of financial accounting.

Major Area: Business Management and Practices

4. Preparing specifications for bids and for purchasing.
5. Processing of bids.

Major Area: School Plant

6. Selecting a school architect.
7. Evaluating existing sites and facilities.

8. Planning for buildings and equipment with the students.
9. Planning for buildings and equipment with the community.
10. Evaluating building and site plans.
11. Consulting during construction.
12. Supervising building maintenance program.
13. Recommending the amount of insurance coverage.
14. Determining plant utilization for non-educational purposes.

Major Area: Auxiliary Services

15. Employing transportation personnel.
16. Operating and maintaining school buses.
17. Developing regulations governing school bus operation.
18. Preparing bids for purchasing of school buses.
19. Administering cafeteria program.
20. Supervising or coordinating school nurse program.

Major Area: Pupil-Personnel Guidance

21. Planning and evaluating a guidance and testing program.
22. Administering a guidance and testing program.
23. Determining the content of pupil cumulative records.

Major Area: Community Relations

24. Providing for an adult education program.

Major Area: Staff Relations

25. Representing school board in professional negotiations with teachers.

Major Area: School Board Relations

26. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to appear before the public.

Special Education Depth
Role

Using the role depth criterion, which refers to those administrative activities performed by 75 per cent or more of the administrators, the following list of activities from Table 29 show high involvement by both intermediate and local directors of special education.

Major Area: Curriculum and Instruction

1. Providing leadership at staff meetings.
2. Developing an inservice education program for teachers.
3. Initiating new programs.
4. Keeping aware of state school laws.

Major Area: Personnel Administration

5. Preparing criteria for personnel selection.
6. Conducting personnel interviews.

7. Selecting personnel for employment.
8. Orienting personnel.
9. Developing schedules and work loads for professional personnel.
10. Evaluating teaching personnel.
11. Assigning personnel to a specific facility.
12. Recommending tenure appointments.

Major Area: Finance

13. Preparing a budget.
14. Administering a budget.
15. Preparing and completing state reports.

Major Area: Business Management and Practices

16. Studying equipment and supply needs.

Major Area: Auxiliary Services

17. Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician program.
18. Supervising or coordinating school social worker program.

Major Area: Community Relations

19. Interpreting and presenting school policies to the community.
20. Participating in parent school organizations.
21. Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs.

Major Area: Staff Relations

22. Arranging for and/or conducting staff meetings.
23. Encouraging staff participation in professional organizations.
24. Encouraging staff participation in community activities.
25. Defining the duties and responsibilities of the staff.
26. Interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators.

Major Area: School Board Relations

27. Preparing written and oral reports for the board of education.
28. Administering board policy.
29. Developing and providing opportunities for the board to meet and work with the staff.

In addition to the preceding list, the following items show role depth involvement by the local directors only:

Major Area: Curriculum and Instruction

1. Developing curriculum for total school or specialized area.
2. Improving and changing curriculum.
3. Providing for instructional supervision and consultation.

4. Consulting with classroom teachers.
5. Evaluating the instructional program.
6. Evaluating individual teaching.
7. Promoting the use of community resources in the instructional program.

Major Area: Auxiliary Services

8. Evaluating transportation needs.
9. Supervising or coordinating speech correction program.

Major Area: Community Relations

10. Conducting individual parent conferences.

In addition to the combined list for both groups of directors, the following items show role depth involvement by intermediate directors only:

Major Area: Personnel Administration

1. Evaluating nonteaching personnel.
2. Suspending or dismissing employees

Major Area: Finance

3. Formulating and evaluating salary schedules

Major Area: Business Management

4. Arranging to serve non-resident pupils.

Major Area: Community Relations

5. Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities.
6. Preparing news releases.
7. Arranging student teaching and internship experiences with universities.
8. Meeting with legislators regarding school issues.

Major Area: Staff Relations

9. Recommending sick leave provisions and other fringe benefits for staff.

Major Area: School Board Relations

10. Recommending items for the school board agenda.
11. Recommending policy to the board of education.

Two items at the depth role level (major area of Auxiliary Services) for both intermediate and local directors of special education were performed by less than 50 per cent of all other groups in the study. They were:

1. Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician programs.
2. Supervising or coordinating school social worker programs.

Five items at the depth role level for both intermediate and local directors of special education were performed by less than 50 per cent of both intermediate and local superintendents. They were:

1. Developing an inservice education program for teachers.
2. Orienting personnel.
3. Developing schedules and work loads for non-professional personnel.
4. Evaluating teaching personnel.
5. Studying equipment and supply needs.

The following two items at the depth role level for the directors were performed by less than 50 per cent of the elementary and secondary principals:

1. Preparing and completing state reports.
2. Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs.

Recommendations

For School Districts

1. Since larger districts appear to be able to hire better qualified directors of special education, this may have some implications which would encourage the consolidation of school districts.

2. If the director of special education is not prepared in special education classroom areas, an appropriately prepared supervisor should be employed to coordinate curriculum development. More supervisors, whose primary function is curriculum coordination and enrichment, should be employed at the local district level since the larger number of special education classrooms are operated locally.
3. Since the building principals were not highly involved in interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators, an inservice education program for principals is recommended. The purpose of the inservice education program would be to familiarize principals with special education so they might participate more fully in the interpretation process.
4. The inservice education of local school directors of special education should stress greater skills in the activities in the major administrative area of Community Relations.
5. Since there are more male administrators than females, the selection may be partly based on society's image of the male in the dominant role. It is recommended that recruitment procedures for administrative positions be reviewed in terms of seeking the most highly qualified personnel for the role, regardless of sex.

For State Departments
of Education

1. State approved special education administrators at both the local and intermediate district levels should be prepared in general professional education administration and in more than one area of special education. Since the administrative activities cover both classroom programs and itinerant special service programs, the special preparation should include at least one classroom area and one special service area, in addition to administration.
2. An administration internship supervised experience is particularly important for intermediate directors of special education, due to the high level of frustration between their actual and ideal ranking of time spent in the major administrative areas.
3. The position of assistant director of special education should be developed on an experimental basis with intensive role analysis at both local and intermediate district levels. This may help to alleviate the frustration of directors regarding actual and ideal amounts of time spent in major administrative areas.

For Universities

1. Preparation programs for special education administrators should emphasize the development of skills related to the performance of those activities included in the special education administrative role. Intensive preparation should occur in those areas included in the depth role.

2. An appropriate supervised internship should be required for special education administrators.

Persons preparing to be intermediate directors of special education should intern with outstanding intermediate directors of special education. Potential local directors should intern with outstanding local directors of special education.

Included in the special education internship placement should be contact with superintendents for intermediate directors and with principals and superintendents for local directors.

It is suggested that a related university seminar be provided during the internship experience.

3. An introductory special education course should be required for all teachers. This would assist all educators in an understanding of special education and lead to earlier specialization for some in a special education area.

This could then result in more special education directors majoring at the graduate level in administration, if their special education preparation were completed at the undergraduate level.

4. Special education preparation programs should include more than one special education area. Special education administrators should also be required to complete a major in professional educational administration.

For Further Research

Any major investigation usually discovers additional areas which might require further research, this one being no exception. There are three major areas for additional research and one minor area.

1. A study of the position of special education supervisor is needed to explore: (a) the number of classes which should have the services of a full-time supervisor, (b) the role of the supervisor at the intermediate district and local district levels, and also at the elementary and secondary levels.
2. A study of the possible role of an assistant director of special education, since there was considerable variation between actual and ideal

amounts of time spent by the directors in the major administrative areas.

3. A study of the reasons for the disproportionately large amount of actual and ideal time spent by the intermediate superintendents in the area of School Board Relations is needed.
4. A minor area which would require further investigation is the reason why only 10 per cent of the secondary principals are providing for an adult education program, and why this group is not highly involved in the promotion of community resources in the instructional program.

Summary

This study has presented information which will assist school districts, universities and state departments of education in a concerted effort to achieve better directors of special education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators. Educational Administration in a Changing Community. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1958.
- Blessing, Kenneth. "Preparation for State Leadership Roles." Presentation at American Association on Mental Deficiency Conference, St. Louis, Missouri, 1967.
- Connor, Leo. Administration of Special Education Programs. New York: Teachers College, 1961.
- Connor, Leo E. "Preliminaries to a Theory of Administration for Special Education." Exceptional Children, Vol. XXIX, No. 9 (May, 1963).
- Council for Exceptional Children. Professional Standards for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children. Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1966.
- Department of Education. "State-Aid for Special Education Directors and Supervisors." Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Board of Education, 1967.
- Early, William J. "An Evaluation and Analysis of the Extern Program in Educational Administration at Michigan State University." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Fogle, Dean. "Preparation of Administrators and Supervisors in Special Education--the View from School Administration." Presentation at Council for Exceptional Children Conference, St. Louis, Missouri, 1967.
- Grieder, Calvin; Pierce, Truman; and Rosenstengel, William. Public School Administration. 2nd Ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961.

- Howe, Clifford E. "Roles of the Local Special Education Director." Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1960.
- Kirk, Samuel A. Educating Exceptional Children. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962.
- Kirk, Samuel A. "The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children." A Richer Future for Handicapped Children. Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, March, 1968.
- Kothera, Richard J. "A Criterion and Set of Reality Based Problems for Simulation in Special Education Administration." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1967.
- Lauber, Ellyn G. "Special Education Administration and Supervisory Personnel in Selected States." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Mackie, Romaine P. "Special Education Reaches Nearly Two Million Children." School Life, XLVII (December, 1964).
- Mackie, Romaine P.; Williams, Harold M.; and Robbins, Patricia M. "Special Education Enrollments in Local School Systems: A Directory." U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin OE-35027, Washington, D. C., 1966.
- Martens, Elise H. "Statistics of Special Schools and Classes for Exceptional Children, 1947-48." Biennial Survey of Education in the U. S., 1946-48. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1950.
- Michigan Department of Education. "Annual Report-- Programs for the Mentally Handicapped--1965-66 School Year." Lansing, Michigan, 1966.
- Michigan Department of Mental Health. "Plan to Combat Mental Retardation in Michigan." Progress Report. Lansing, Michigan, 1966.
- Michigan State Board of Education. Michigan General School Laws. Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

- Michigan State Senate. "Report on Special Education in Michigan." Lansing, Michigan, 1966.
- Milazzo, Tony C.; and Blessing, Kenneth R. "The Training of Directors of Special Education Programs." Exceptional Children, Vol. XXXI, No. 3 (1964), 129-141.
- Miller, Van. The Public Administration of American School Systems. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965.
- Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe L.; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Southworth, William. "The Superintendency: A Position in Flux." School Board Journal (1967).
- State Board of Education. "Organizing Educational Programs for Children with Handicaps." Circular No. 48, Revised. Lansing, Michigan, 1966.
- Thomas, J. Alan. "School Finance and Educational Opportunity in Michigan." Michigan School Finance Study. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1968.
- Tompkins, James R. "Program Development Concept." A Richer Future for Handicapped Children. Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1968.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Special Education for Handicapped Children. First Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, Washington, D. C., 1968.
- U. S. Office of Education. "Appropriations for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped." Washington, D. C., 1968.
- U. S. Office of Education. "Directors and Supervisors of Special Education in Local School Systems." Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1955.
- Wisland, Milton V.; and Vaughan, Tony D. "Administrative Problems in Special Education." Exceptional Children, Vol. XXXI, No. 2 (1964), 87-89.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

June 20, 1967

Dear Administrator,

Your assistance is requested in a careful review of the administrative activities of directors of special education. In order to determine which administrative activities are performed by special education directors, the enclosed survey is being sent to selected administrators in local and intermediate school systems where special education directors are employed. The results will be utilized in my doctoral dissertation and generally shared wherever possible with professional groups, while still maintaining confidentiality of individual information.

The Michigan Department of Education has indicated an interest in this study.

I personally hope you will complete the survey and return it to me at the Michigan Department of Education within ten days if at all possible. It is imperative for the study that you respond regarding your own role in the school system. Thank you for your cooperation and help.

Sincerely,

Miss Gail A. Harris

GAH/sdo

Enclosure

(Do not fill in)

Please return within ten days to: Miss Gail A. Harris, Special Education Consultant
Michigan Department of Education, Lansing

Name of Person Completing Form _____
Official Title _____
School District _____

Please check your full-time position:

- 4. (1) Intermediate School District Superintendent
- (2) Intermediate District Director of Special Education
- (3) Local School District Superintendent
- (4) Local School Director of Special Education
- (5) Elementary Principal
- (6) Secondary Principal

Please check:

Sex:

- 5. (1) Male
- (2) Female

Age:

- 6. (1) Under 30 years
- (2) 30-35 years
- (3) 36-40 years
- (4) 41-45 years
- (5) 46-50 years
- (6) over 50 years

PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF COMPLETED SCHOOL YEARS IN EACH SECTION BELOW.
COUNT THE 1966-67 SCHOOL YEAR AS ONE COMPLETED YEAR. INDICATE FULL-TIME
ROLES ONLY. IF A ONE DIGIT ANSWER IS GIVEN, PRECEDE BY "0" IN THIS SECTION.
PLACE ONE DIGIT ONLY IN EACH SPACE.

- | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---|
| 7- 8 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | a. in present position |
| 9-10 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | b. in administration of general education |
| 11-12 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | c. in administration of special education |
| 13-14 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | d. in teaching regular elementary grades |
| 15-16 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | e. in teaching a special education class (Please indicate areas of handicapped taught, i.e. mentally handicapped- |
| 17-18 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | f. in teaching secondary level regular classes. |
| 19-20 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | g. in a special education service area, i.e. diagnostic services |
| 21-22 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | h. total years employed in education in Michigan |
| 23-24 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | i. total years employed in education out of Michigan |
| 25-26 | <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u> | j. total years employment in professional education, both in-state and out-of-state. |

Please check only highest degree held:

- 27 (1) BA
- (2) MA
- (3) ED.S.
- (4) ED.D. or PH.D.

Please check teaching certificate presently held:

- 28 (1) Special
- (2) Life
- (3) Elementary Provisional
- (4) Secondary Provisional
- (5) Elementary Permanent
- (6) Secondary Permanent
- (7) None

Please check your undergraduate majors:

- 29 (1) Elementary Education
- 30 (2) Special Education or Special Services - Major Area: _____
- 31 (3) Secondary Education - Subject Area: _____
- 32 (4) Other, please indicate _____

Please check your graduate majors:

- 33 (1) Elementary Education
- 34 (2) Special Education or Special Services - Major Area: _____
- 35 (3) Secondary Education - Subject Area: _____
- 36 (4) Administration
- 37 (5) Other - Please indicate _____

Please check your salary range:

- 38 (1) \$5,000 to \$9,999
- (2) \$10,000 to \$12,999
- (3) \$13,000 to \$15,999
- (4) Over \$16,000

INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION ONLY ARE TO RESPOND TO THIS NEXT ITEM. (#'s 39-46). ALL OTHERS PROCEED TO ITEM #47.

Please check all special education or special service area(s) for which you would be eligible for temporary or full approval from the Michigan Department of Education:

- 39 (1) Blind and Partially Sighted
- 40 (2) Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- 41 (3) Orthopedically Handicapped
- 42 (4) Mentally Handicapped
- 43 (5) Emotionally Disturbed
- 44 (6) School Social Worker
- 45 (7) School Diagnostician for the Mentally Handicapped
- 46 (8) Speech Correctionist

ALL PERSONS SHOULD COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES WITHIN MAJOR AREAS. PLEASE CHECK THE ONE APPROPRIATE BEST ANSWER AS FOLLOWS:

"1" = If you have responsibility for the activity. Responsibility would refer to an activity in which you are actually directly involved, even if it is a shared responsibility.

"2" - If you have delegated this activity to a Consultant or Supervisor and are not directly involved.

"3" - If you have no responsibility for this activity.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION * (MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE AREA)

Check (✓) if you have responsibility for doing each:

	I	I	I have no	
	do:	delegate:	responsibility for:	
47	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Developing curriculum for total school or specialized area.
48	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Improving and changing curriculum
49	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Selecting textbooks and instructional material
50	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Providing for instructional supervision or consultation
51	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Providing leadership at staff meetings
52	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Consulting with classroom teachers
53	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Evaluating the instructional program
54	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Evaluating individual teaching
55	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Developing an inservice education program for teachers
56	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Developing an effective class scheduling plan
57	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Promoting the use of community resources in the instructional program.
58	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	writing articles for professional journals
59	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Initiating new programs
60	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Keeping aware of state school laws
61	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Other please indicate _____

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION (Major Administrative Area)

	I	I	I have no	
	do:	delegate:	responsibility for:	
62	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Preparing criteria for personnel selection
63	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Conducting personnel interviews
64	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Selecting personnel for employment
65	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Orienting Personnel
66	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Developing schedules and work loads for professional personnel
67	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Developing schedules and work loads for non-professional personnel
68	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Evaluating teaching personnel
69	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Evaluating non-teaching personnel
70	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Suspending or dismissing employees
71	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Assigning personnel to a specific facility
72	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Recommending tenure appointments.
73	<u> (1) </u>	<u> (2) </u>	<u> (3) </u>	Other please indicate _____

FINANCE (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibility for:	
74	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing a budget
75	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Administering a budget
76	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing financial statements for the board
77	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing financial data for citizens advisory groups.
78	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Investigating insurance rates and coverage
80	(Card One Complete)			
4	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Formulating and evaluating salary schedules
5	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing and completing state reports
6	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Computing per pupil costs and other statistical data
7	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing a payroll
8	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Designating a system of financial accounting.
9	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Requesting & administering federal funds
10	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND PRACTICES (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibilities for:	
11	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing a systematic control of records and funds
12	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing a system of inventory of fixed assets and appraisal
13	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Organizing and coordinating purchase practices
14	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Studying equipment and supply needs
15	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Storing, receiving, distributing & inventorying of supplies.
16	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing specifications for bids and for purchasing
17	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	processing of bids
18	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Analyzing school district expenditures
19	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Arranging to serve non-resident pupils
20	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

SCHOOL PLANT (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibilities for:	
1	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Selecting a school architect
2	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Evaluating existing sites and facilities
23	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Determining the specifications of the new bldg.
24	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Planning for buildings and equipment with the architect
25	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Planning for buildings and equipment with the staff
26	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Planning for buildings and equipment with the students
27	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Planning for buildings and equipment with the community.
28	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Evaluating building and site plans
29	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Consulting during construction
30	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Supervising building maintenance program
31	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Recommending the amount of insurance coverage
32	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Determining plant utilization for non-educational purposes
33	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Determining remodeling needs of school facilities
34	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Determining physical location of classes
35	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

AUXILIARY SERVICES (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibility for:	
36	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Evaluating transportation needs
37	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing transportation plans
38	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Employing transportation personnel
39	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Operating and maintaining school buses
40	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing regulations governing school bus operation
41	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing bids for purchasing of school buses
42	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Administering cafeteria program
43	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Supervising or coordinating school diagnostician program
44	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Supervising or coordinating school nurse program
45	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Supervising or coordinating school social worker program
46	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Supervising or coordinating speech correction program
47	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

PUPIL * PERSONNEL GUIDANCE (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibility for:	
48	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Planning & evaluating a guidance & testing program
49	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Administering a guidance and testing program
50	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Determining the content of pupil cumulative records
51	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing procedures for reporting to parents
52	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Counseling of students & parents
53	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other Please indicate _____

COMMUNITY RELATIONS (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibility for:	
54	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities
55	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Interpreting and presenting school policies to the community
56	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing and administering a community relations program
57	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing news releases
58	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Conducting and utilizing research concerning educational problems of the school and community
59	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Providing for an adult education program
60	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Using community resources in the school program
61	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Participating in parent school organizations
62	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Making speeches at state and national conferences
63	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Conducting individual parent conferences
64	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Arranging student teaching and internship experiences with universities
65	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Meeting with legislators regarding school issues
66	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs
67	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

STAFF RELATIONS (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibility for:	
68	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Arranging for and/or conducting staff meetings
69	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Encouraging staff participation in professional organizations
70	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Encouraging staff participation in community activities
71	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Recommending sick leave provisions and other fringe benefits for staff
72	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Defining the duties and responsibilities of the staff
73	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing and utilizing a staff newsletter
74	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Representing school board in professional negotiations with teachers
75	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators
76	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONS (Major Administrative Area)

	I do:	I delegate:	I have no responsibility for:	
77	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Recommending items for the school board agenda
78	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Preparing written and oral reports for the board of education
80	(Card Two Complete)			
4	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Recommending policy to the board of education
5	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Administering board policy
6	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Aiding the board to distinguish between policy and executive function
7	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing and providing opportunities for the board to meet and work with the staff
8	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Developing and providing opportunities for the board to appear before the public
9	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	Other please indicate _____

PLEASE RANK FROM ZERO TO NINE THE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES IN IDEAL ORDER OF TIME THEY SHOULD CONSUME. "9" IS THE ACTIVITY WHICH SHOULD CONSUME THE MOST TIME, AND "0" IS THE ACTIVITY WHICH SHOULD CONSUME THE LEAST OF YOUR TIME.

- 10 _____ a. Curriculum and Instruction
- 11 _____ b. Personnel Administration
- 12 _____ c. Finance
- 13 _____ d. Business Management and Practices
- 14 _____ e. School Plant
- 15 _____ f. Auxiliary services
- 16 _____ g. Pupil-Personnel Guidance
- 17 _____ h. Community Relations
- 18 _____ i. Staff relations
- 19 _____ j. School board relations

PLEASE RANK FROM ZERO TO NINE THE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES IN ORDER OF THE TIME THEY ACTUALLY CONSUME, WITH "9" BEING THE ACTIVITY WHICH CONSUMES THE MOST TIME, AND "0" ACTUALLY CONSUMING THE LEAST OF YOUR TIME.

- 20 _____ a. Curriculum and Instruction
- 21 _____ b. Personnel Administration
- 22 _____ c. Finance
- 23 _____ d. Business Management and Practices
- 24 _____ e. School Plant
- 25 _____ f. Auxiliary Services
- 26 _____ g. Pupil-Personnel Guidance
- 27 _____ h. Community Relations
- 28 _____ i. Staff relations
- 29 _____ j. School board relations

THE REMAINING PORTIONS OF THIS FORM ARE TO BE COMPLETED ONLY BY THE DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.

Please check the size of your school district, regarding public school membership:

- 30 _____ (1) 1 to 5,000 school membership
- _____ (2) 5,001 to 10,000
- _____ (3) 10,001 to 15,000
- _____ (4) 15,001 to 25,000
- _____ (5) 25,001 to 40,000
- _____ (6) 40,001 and up

Indicate the number of professional personnel directly employed by your school system during the 1966-67 school year in the following areas. Fill in blanks to left of your response with "0", and put one digit only in each space.

- 31-33 _____/_____/_____/_____ Blind and Partially Sighted
- 34-36 _____/_____/_____/_____ Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- 37-39 _____/_____/_____/_____ Orthopedically Handicapped
- 40-42 _____/_____/_____/_____ Mentally Handicapped
- 43-45 _____/_____/_____/_____ Emotionally disturbed
- 46-48 _____/_____/_____/_____ School Social Worker
- 49-51 _____/_____/_____/_____ School Diagnostician for the Mentally Handicapped
- 52-54 _____/_____/_____/_____ Speech Correctionist

Please check regarding the number of full time special education and special services supervisors who are employed by you

- 55 _____ (1) Zero Please list special education areas
- _____ (2) One to three they supervise: _____
- _____ (3) four to six _____
- _____ (4) seven to ten _____
- _____ (5) more than ten _____

check the number of years state approved special education and special services have been operated by your school district.

- 56 _____ (1) One year
- _____ (2) two to three years
- _____ (3) four to seven years
- _____ (4) more than seven years

Check the number of years a director of special education has been employed full-time by your school system:

- 57 (1) One Year
 (2) two to three years
 (3) four to seven years
 (4) more than seven years

58 Card Three Complete

Thank you for completing this form.

APPENDIX B

TABLE 32.--Survey form administrative activity responses.

Items From Survey	Response ^a	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Card 1 Item: 47	1	18	2	45	6	21	27
	2	5	12	4	23	2	3
	3	3	3	1	0	3	0
48	1	18	3	45	10	25	27
	2	7	15	3	10	1	1
	3	1	0	2	0	1	1
49	1	12	2	32	5	18	13
	2	9	12	13	23	6	15
	3	5	3	3	1	3	1
50	1	16	6	44	9	24	27
	2	10	11	5	20	2	1
	3	0	0	0	1	1	2
51	1	26	10	47	18	27	30
	2	0	8	2	11	0	0
	3	0	0	1	0	0	0
52	1	16	4	43	4	27	29
	2	7	13	6	25	0	1
	3	3	1	1	0	0	0
53	1	18	5	44	16	26	29
	2	5	11	4	13	1	1
	3	3	2	2	0	0	0
54	1	14	2	38	2	27	27
	2	4	12	8	26	0	1
	3	8	4	3	1	0	2
55	1	20	6	44	7	21	18
	2	6	11	6	22	1	5
	3	0	0	0	0	4	7
56	1	4	3	23	0	24	22
	2	8	8	20	26	2	7
	3	12	5	5	3	1	1
57	1	18	4	39	13	23	15
	2	7	11	6	16	3	13
	3	1	3	2	0	1	2
58	1	10	6	22	18	8	9
	2	1	3	3	4	1	2
	3	13	6	19	4	17	16
59	1	26	12	49	23	23	26
	2	0	6	1	5	1	3
	3	0	0	0	0	3	1
60	1	26	17	49	26	18	26
	2	0	1	0	3	3	1
	3	0	0	0	0	6	3
61	1	4	1	3	1	1	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
62	1	26	11	46	20	11	22
	2	0	6	1	9	1	3
	3	0	1	1	0	14	5
63	1	26	12	49	13	18	26
	2	0	6	0	16	1	1
	3	0	0	0	0	6	3

TABLE 32.--Continued.

Items From Survey	Response	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
<u>Card 1</u>							
<u>Item:</u>							
64	1	24	13	47	15	17	26
	2	1	5	2	12	2	0
	3	1	0	1	1	6	4
65	1	24	6	44	14	26	26
	2	2	12	5	15	0	3
	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
66	1	21	5	43	9	24	23
	2	5	13	7	19	0	5
	3	0	0	0	0	2	2
67	1	17	8	28	3	17	12
	2	6	10	12	25	4	9
	3	3	0	9	1	5	9
68	1	23	7	45	4	26	28
	2	1	11	2	24	0	1
	3	2	0	3	1	0	1
69	1	20	8	31	1	18	21
	2	3	9	7	26	2	6
	3	3	0	11	1	6	3
70	1	21	15	30	26	13	18
	2	0	1	2	1	2	2
	3	4	0	17	1	11	10
71	1	23	9	47	13	13	17
	2	2	8	1	15	3	2
	3	1	0	1	1	9	10
72	1	23	12	42	20	25	28
	2	0	5	1	8	0	0
	3	3	0	5	1	0	2
73	1	2	0	1	1	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
74	1	23	15	45	19	12	17
	2	0	3	2	8	0	4
	3	3	0	3	2	14	9
75	1	23	14	46	18	16	21
	2	1	4	1	9	0	2
	3	2	0	3	2	10	7
76	1	17	7	20	9	2	4
	2	4	11	1	19	2	5
	3	5	0	28	1	22	20
77	1	19	11	14	11	1	3
	2	2	7	2	17	2	5
	3	5	0	32	1	23	22
78	1	9	9	2	2	1	0
	2	4	8	2	25	1	1
	3	13	1	45	2	24	29

TABLE 32.--Continued.

Items From Survey	Response	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
<u>Card 2</u>							
<u>Item:</u>							
4	1	21	16	14	23	3	4
	2	1	2	2	4	1	1
	3	4	0	31	2	22	25
5	1	22	10	45	8	6	14
	2	3	8	4	20	4	9
	3	1	0	0	1	16	7
6	1	13	6	22	6	1	1
	2	4	12	5	20	0	2
	3	9	0	19	2	25	27
7	1	0	5	7	1	6	3
	2	13	12	3	25	4	2
	3	13	1	38	3	16	25
8	1	1	15	5	6	1	0
	2	12	2	0	20	1	1
	3	13	1	42	3	24	29
9	1	15	6	17	11	3	5
	2	2	9	0	18	0	2
	3	9	2	30	0	23	23
10	1	2	0	0	0	1	0
	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
	3	2	0	0	0	1	2
11	1	9	9	16	4	4	8
	2	7	8	1	23	0	2
	3	10	1	32	2	22	20
12	1	10	9	10	2	3	1
	2	8	7	1	25	1	2
	3	7	1	38	2	22	27
13	1	13	9	17	3	3	2
	2	6	8	2	24	1	2
	3	7	1	28	2	22	26
14	1	22	4	39	4	19	18
	2	3	13	4	23	1	6
	3	1	1	6	2	6	5
15	1	9	1	19	1	19	8
	2	13	16	15	26	5	15
	3	4	1	15	2	2	6
16	1	9	7	9	3	1	1
	2	4	5	1	24	2	5
	3	13	3	39	2	22	24
17	1	8	8	1	3	0	1
	2	3	6	0	22	0	2
	3	15	3	47	2	24	26
18	1	17	14	5	19	2	0
	2	2	4	0	8	0	1
	3	7	0	43	2	24	29
19	1	20	7	36	5	4	5
	2	4	9	2	19	0	2
	3	2	2	11	3	22	23

TABLE 32.--Continued.

Items From Survey	Response	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
Card 2 Item: 20	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
	3	1	0	1	0	3	1
21	1	1	10	1	19	0	0
	2	0	1	0	5	0	1
	3	24	4	47	4	26	29
22	1	10	13	18	20	3	7
	2	1	1	0	7	0	0
	3	13	3	30	2	23	23
23	1	11	9	20	13	4	14
	2	2	3	1	14	0	2
	3	12	4	26	2	22	14
24	1	16	8	21	16	12	17
	2	2	3	1	13	0	1
	3	8	5	26	0	14	12
25	1	10	8	29	18	16	23
	2	0	3	1	11	0	0
	3	7	5	18	0	10	7
26	1	4	3	7	10	9	15
	2	1	3	4	11	0	1
	3	21	10	36	5	16	14
27	1	10	8	12	18	11	15
	2	0	3	0	9	0	0
	3	14	5	36	0	14	15
28	1	10	10	17	19	7	14
	2	1	3	0	3	0	0
	3	14	3	31	2	19	16
29	1	8	9	14	12	7	16
	2	2	2	0	14	0	1
	3	16	5	34	2	19	13
30	1	7	4	2	4	14	10
	2	3	7	2	22	0	9
	3	16	6	44	3	12	11
31	1	5	11	0	7	0	0
	2	0	1	1	17	0	0
	3	21	5	47	4	26	30
32	1	7	8	2	10	14	9
	2	0	3	1	15	1	6
	3	18	5	44	3	11	15
33	1	13	9	25	12	18	22
	2	2	2	2	14	0	2
	3	11	5	22	3	8	5
34	1	14	4	27	7	21	23
	2	0	4	3	19	0	4
	3	12	7	17	3	5	3
35	1	1	0	0	2	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	1	0	2	0	1	0

Items From Survey	Response	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
<u>Card 2</u>							
<u>Item:</u>							
36	1	16	6	39	9	5	2
	2	4	7	2	18	1	0
	3	6	4	8	2	20	28
37	1	12	3	29	2	4	0
	2	5	9	7	25	1	2
	3	9	5	12	2	21	28
38	1	6	3	8	2	1	0
	2	1	6	0	25	1	0
	3	19	6	40	2	24	30
39	1	3	1	3	1	1	0
	2	1	3	1	26	1	0
	3	22	11	43	2	24	30
40	1	3	3	10	3	4	1
	2	2	4	0	23	0	0
	3	21	9	37	2	21	29
41	1	3	2	2	2	0	0
	2	1	2	1	24	1	0
	3	22	11	44	3	25	30
42	1	1	2	2	1	8	7
	2	2	1	0	24	2	6
	3	23	12	46	4	16	17
43	1	20	1	44	1	5	2
	2	4	15	0	28	2	6
	3	2	1	5	0	19	22
44	1	2	0	19	0	7	6
	2	0	9	2	28	2	3
	3	23	8	27	1	17	21
45	1	20	1	40	1	3	7
	2	3	14	0	28	2	3
	3	3	2	10	0	16	20
46	1	19	1	44	1	7	5
	2	4	14	4	28	2	4
	3	3	2	2	0	17	21
47	1	3	0	10	1	2	0
	2	0	0	0	4	1	0
	3	2	0	1	0	2	1
48	1	2	1	20	5	11	19
	2	3	6	4	24	4	11
	3	21	10	25	0	10	1
49	1	1	1	13	1	15	9
	2	3	6	6	26	4	21
	3	21	10	29	1	6	1
50	1	4	2	21	5	18	21
	2	5	7	3	22	1	10
	3	16	8	25	1	7	0
51	1	14	2	32	10	22	23
	2	8	5	4	18	1	7
	3	3	10	14	0	3	1
52	1	8	2	30	3	24	19
	2	12	8	12	25	1	11
	3	5	7	8	0	1	1

TABLE 32.--Continued.

Items From Survey	Response	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
<u>Card 2</u>							
<u>Item:</u>							
53	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	2	0	1	0	0	0
54	1	24	12	28	27	16	21
	2	1	4	2	2	2	2
	3	1	2	17	0	8	8
55	1	24	17	42	28	26	27
	2	0	1	0	1	0	2
	3	2	0	7	0	0	2
56	1	19	15	26	20	16	12
	2	2	2	1	6	1	7
	3	5	1	22	2	8	11
57	1	24	16	21	18	15	17
	2	1	2	5	10	2	8
	3	1	0	23	1	9	6
58	1	18	9	25	16	15	15
	2	5	6	2	12	3	8
	3	3	1	20	0	8	8
59	1	3	2	4	5	3	3
	2	2	5	1	23	1	9
	3	20	9	41	1	21	19
60	1	17	2	32	9	21	15
	2	6	7	6	20	4	13
	3	3	6	11	0	1	3
61	1	20	9	41	19	26	21
	2	2	4	4	10	0	4
	3	3	4	4	0	0	5
62	1	16	8	33	25	9	13
	2	0	5	0	0	0	0
	3	7	4	14	3	17	16
63	1	13	2	42	9	23	25
	2	8	6	6	19	3	5
	3	5	9	2	1	0	1
64	1	23	4	34	12	20	20
	2	1	10	2	13	0	6
	3	2	3	11	3	6	5
65	1	22	17	21	27	5	6
	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
	3	4	0	26	1	21	24
66	1	25	16	40	22	3	8
	2	0	2	0	4	0	3
	3	1	0	10	1	23	20
67	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
68	1	24	11	49	21	26	29
	2	2	7	0	6	0	1
	3	0	0	1	2	0	1

TABLE 32.--Continued.

Items From Survey	Response	Intermediate Directors	Intermediate Superintendents	Local Directors	Local Superintendents	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals
<u>Card 2</u>							
<u>Item:</u>							
69	1	26	14	47	18	20	23
	2	0	2	0	7	2	1
	3	0	1	3	4	4	7
70	1	25	12	46	21	23	27
	2	0	3	1	4	1	2
	3	1	1	2	3	2	2
71	1	23	16	19	18	6	9
	2	0	2	0	8	1	3
	3	3	0	30	2	19	19
72	1	26	13	48	22	26	28
	2	0	5	0	4	0	1
	3	0	0	1	1	0	2
73	1	17	7	11	8	16	14
	2	3	7	5	17	2	2
	3	5	2	30	2	8	15
74	1	9	8	7	20	4	12
	2	0	2	0	7	0	1
	3	17	6	41	1	22	18
75	1	26	14	49	23	12	17
	2	0	4	0	6	1	3
	3	0	0	0	0	13	11
76	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
77	1	25	17	32	28	5	17
	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
	3	1	0	16	1	19	14
78	1	26	17	45	28	14	22
	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
	3	0	0	5	0	11	9
<u>Card 3</u>							
<u>Item:</u>							
4	1	25	18	31	27	8	15
	2	0	0	1	1	1	0
	3	1	0	17	1	16	16
5	1	26	17	40	28	24	24
	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
	3	0	0	8	0	2	6
6	1	17	18	12	28	3	10
	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
	3	8	0	35	1	22	21
7	1	21	16	20	25	5	14
	2	0	1	1	3	2	0
	3	5	0	27	1	19	17
8	1	13	14	5	25	10	6
	2	0	1	0	3	2	0
	3	13	1	43	1	14	25
9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	1	0	3	1	0	0

^a(1="I Do," 2="I Delegate," 3= "I Have No Responsibility For.")