

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-20,846

HODSON, M. Diane, 1941-

COMPETENCIES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS AS
SEEN BY INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL DIRECTORS OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1975
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

COMPETENCIES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS
AS SEEN BY INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL DIRECTORS
OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

By

M. Diane Hodson

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Elementary and Special Education

1975

ABSTRACT

COMPETENCIES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS AS SEEN BY INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

By

M. Diane Hodson

The purpose of this study was to generate competency areas and competency statements which would be appropriate for use as rules for approval of Michigan special education directors and guidelines for the development of pre-service training programs to qualify persons as special education directors in Michigan. The need for the study was indicated by the emphasis placed on competency-based training programs for professional educators by the State of Michigan and by the lack of research designed to elicit from practicing administrators of special education their views as to the appropriate means for the initial development of specific competencies and as to the crucial competencies for inclusion in pre-service training programs. The study proposed to develop the first two steps in a series of four leading to the validation of competencies for inclusion in a pre-service training program for special education directors.

The review of the literature focused primarily on two major topics: 1) standards and recommended content for special education administration training programs and 2) role, tasks, functions and activities of administrators of special education. This review indicated that initial attempts have been made to describe through research

the activities or tasks of administrators of special education, but that little has been done to describe through research the competencies needed in pre-service training programs for these administrators.

The 15 competency areas and 79 competency statements, which were finally included in a questionnaire sent to the 144 approved directors of special education in Michigan, were derived from the literature review and from a preliminary study, conducted by this author, of the activities of six intermediate and local directors of special education in Michigan. The questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate for each competency statement: 1) whether the competency should initially be developed through a pre-service training program or on the job and 2) the importance of the competency to their functioning as a director of special education. Intermediate and local directors were given equal weighting in the analysis and reporting of the data.

Out of the 144 questionnaires sent, 105 (73 percent) were used in analyzing the data. A majority of directors recommended on the job initial development for 57 (72 percent) of the competencies and pre-service initial development for 22 (28 percent) of the competencies. No competency statements received an average rating of no importance (1.0-1.4) and little importance (1.5-2.4), 16 (20 percent) received an average rating of some importance (2.5-3.4), 62 (78 percent) received an average rating of very important (3.5-4.4) and 1 (1 percent) received an average rating of crucial (4.5-5.0). There was some variation between intermediate and local directors in preferences for initial development of competency statements and in average ratings of competency statements.

Selection of competency areas and statements for inclusion in proposed rules and guidelines for special education directors was made on the basis of two criteria: 1) average ratings of very important to crucial (3.5-5.0) and 2) percentages of preference for pre-service training of 41 percent - 100 percent. Of the 79 competency statements, 31 were identified for inclusion in the proposed guidelines for development of pre-service training programs, and of the 15 competency areas, 11 were identified for inclusion in the proposed rules for approval of special education directors in Michigan

To my father
H. O. Hodson
Who provided the inspiration and drive
Which made this possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the following people, this study would not have been possible:

Dr. Charles Henley, Michigan State University, my committee and dissertation adviser, who was always willing to listen and to give his invaluable advice, assistance and support when most needed.

Dr. J. Edwin Keller, Dr. William Sweetland and Dr. Richard Featherstone, Michigan State University, my committee members, who acted as real facilitators throughout my entire doctoral program.

Dr. David Haarer, Ingham Intermediate; Dr. Nicholas Fridsma, Holland Public Schools; Mr. Elton Mahan, Tuscola Intermediate; Mr. Joseph Clemente, Grand Haven Public Schools; Mrs. Joan Haverkate, Ionia Intermediate; and Dr. Edward Birch, Grand Rapids Public Schools; who all gave a great deal of time to my pilot study, without which effort, the competencies used in this study could not have been written.

The Michigan Special Education Directors who were willing to interrupt their very busy schedules to complete my questionnaire.

Dr. Velma Allen, Mr. Harold Weiner and Mr. Will Johnson, Michigan State University fellow graduate assistants and good friends, who gave tremendous moral support.

Mrs. Andrea McInenly, Michigan State University secretary, who helped me to meet impossible deadlines with her superior typing skills and willingness to put forth a great deal of extra effort.

I wish to extend my heartfelt appreciation to all of these beautiful people who gave so much in my behalf.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Rationale	1
Background	3
History	3
Theoretical vs. Practical	8
Competency-Based Training Programs	12
Statement of Problem	15
Limitations	16
Definitions	17
Overview	17
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	19
Training Programs	19
Role, Tasks, Functions and Activities	33
Summary	42
III. DESIGN OF STUDY	44
Procedure	44
Derivation of Competency Areas	44
Derivation of Competency Statements	46
Questionnaire	47
Population	49
Methods of Data Reporting and Analysis	51
Summary	52
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	53
Questionnaire Returns	53
Description of Data	54
Initial Competency Development	54
Competency Ratings	56
Interrelationships	57
Results	62
Discussion	72
Summary	74

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
Summary	76
Recommendations	78
Proposed Rules for Approval	78
Proposed Guidelines for Pre-service Training Programs	88
In-service Training	86
General Discussion	86
Implications for Future Research	88
REFERENCES	89
APPENDICES	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of competency statements according to the preference for initial training	55
2. Variation between intermediate and local directors according to preference for pre-service training	55
3. Distribution of competency statements according to their average ratings	56
4. Variation between intermediate and local directors according to ratings of individual competency statements	57
5. Rank order of competency statements by rating with indication of percent of respondents choosing pre-service v. on the job for initial development of competencies	58
6. Method used to prioritize competency statements for inclusion in proposed state guidelines	61

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of Purpose

The major purpose of this study is to generate competency areas and competency statements which would be appropriate for use as rules for approval of special education directors and guidelines for the development of pre-service training programs to qualify persons as special education directors. The sub-purposes as related to this are:

1. to compile a list of broad competency areas related to the position of special education director.
2. to further define the competency areas by specific competency statements related to each area.
3. to determine the importance of each of the competency statements as related to the functioning of the special education director.
4. to determine the most appropriate means for the initial training of the competencies.

Rationale

First, much has been said about the necessity of special education administrators assuming a leadership role in education so that better programming for handicapped students can be accomplished. To produce competent special education administrative personnel, attention has been focused on the pre-service training programs in the hope that

better training programs will produce the leadership qualities desired in these professional personnel. However, while national accreditation standards and standards for program content have been specified by various groups, no attempt has been made, to date, to elicit from practicing administrators of special education their views as to the appropriate means for initially attaining the needed competencies and as to the crucial competencies for inclusion in a pre-service training program. Who, other than these practicing administrators as they face the day-to-day responsibilities of their position, could better make these judgments? As Henley (1967) stated:

It is obvious . . . that we cannot hope to incorporate all of these valuable areas into the required preparation program within a reasonable length of time.

The issue of the problem is not what is appropriate and of potential value. The issue is which of these experiences are crucial--which are most valuable--which are most applicable to a variety of situations. What is the "crucial core" which we feel must be a part of the preparation program.

Although we have each made our major selection of the crucial core, we would all admit, I believe, that this is only tentative--a place to begin--a point of departure. The real development and improvement must await the feedback from the field. From those who have experienced our programs we must ask: What was not necessary? What was needed that was not given? How can this effort be improved? As these questions are answered, our selected "core" will change and, hopefully, improve. (p. 11-12)

Second, the State of Michigan, as is true of other states around the nation, is attempting to define a set of competencies for each of the professional positions in education. These competencies are to be specified at two levels on a state-wide basis:

1. Broad competency areas, in specific areas of expertise, which will become a part of the rules for state approval of professional personnel under each area of expertise.

2. Specific competency statements, under each competency area, which will become the guidelines for the development of college and university pre-service training programs in each area of expertise.

To define these sets of competencies, special committees have been appointed by the Michigan Department of Education. However, while many hours have been expended by these committees, little progress in the accomplishment of their task has been made to date, particularly by the committee designated to define the competencies for administrators of special education. The conclusion of this author, after being the chairman of one of these committees and a member of two other committees, is that the accomplishment of this task is not feasible within a committee structure. The lack of time for a thorough review of the literature and a descriptive study of the type proposed by this author, leaves committees in the position of "reinventing the wheel."

Background

History

The concept of a full-time administrator of special education is still relatively new, historically. ". . . for a number of years following the turn of this present century, most of the school systems in the United States which made specific special educational provisions were able to administer and supervise these programs with a minimum of specially trained, supervisory help (Gearheart, 1967, p. 70)." As Kohl and Marro (1970) stated:

The administrator of special education is a relatively new position in education; in fact, many of the early administrators are still practicing. The Council of Administrators of Special

Education (CASE), which is an organization of these leaders, is barely twenty years old.

The development of this position has, in some ways, emulated the development of the position of the elementary school principal who began as a supervising teacher, then developed into a full-time administrator. Many of the early special education administrators were involved with direct services to exceptional children before the position developed to its current administrative status; in fact, some special education administrators in smaller programs still provide part-time direct services. (p. xi)

The slow recognition of the need for this position can be found in the slow growth of publicly-supported services for exceptional children. As Gearheart (1967) notes, ". . . prior to 1900, nearly all school programs for handicapped or gifted children were private in nature (p. 3)." While public school programs were beginning to be developed between 1900 and 1930, with a substantial growth between 1930 and the late 1960's, the real explosion in numbers of exceptional children served has been as a result of numerous court cases in the late 1960's and early 1970's. These cases, Wolf v. The Legislature of the State of Utah, Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania, Mills v. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia, etc., have focused on the denial of any educational services and/or of appropriate educational services for handicapped children by public school systems. As a result of these cases, many states have been directed by the courts to provide free public education to all handicapped children and other states have passed mandatory special education laws to avoid similar legal action.

The recent rapid growth of special programs for exceptional children has refocused attention on the need for knowledgeable leadership of these programs. As Gearheart (1967) states, ". . . without first-rate local leadership, the system falters and produces inferior results. Good

special education programming does not 'just happen'--it requires good leadership (p. 71)." In 1966, the Michigan legislature recognized this need for special education leadership by a provision for reimbursement in the State Aid Act (Public Act 271) "for directors and other supervisory personnel of special education programs," and by the authorization given to the Michigan Department of Education "to establish standards for such positions" (Harris, 1969, p. 22).

The development of training programs, specifically designed to prepare administrators of special education, has had an even slower growth. Henderson (1970) in his article "Preparation of Administrators and Supervisors of Special Education" summarized the early history of training in special education administration:

The preparation of administrators and supervisors of special education began with a course at Teachers College, Columbia University in New York, in 1906. A few other universities followed suit, and added a single course--usually to be taken as an elective when something more suitable was not available that semester. (p. 381)

Thus, we found ourselves a few years ago with the need and opportunity to prepare some administrators and supervisors, but lacking the programs to effect the pre-service preparation in even the strongest special education departments of our largest universities. Even with the impetus of PL 85-926, with each state having two graduate fellowships to prepare "leadership personnel for the mentally retarded," university programs just did not change dramatically. However, with the extension of PL 85-926 to all areas of the handicapped by the amendments contained in PL 88-164, a separate category of administration and supervision programs was established, with a special ad hoc committee developed to evaluate proposals for funding. The first committee--wisely, I believe--took the stand that programs of preparation for administrators should not be a stepchild of the institution's program, but must represent an identifiable program of study at the advanced graduate level with a qualified, experienced staff member devoting his major efforts to that program exclusively. (pp. 382-383)

As was pointed out in the latter statements by Henderson, there was concern that, not only should university training programs be initiated, but also that some type of standards for the development of these programs be established. The study by Mackie and Engel (1955) involved directors and supervisors of special education in twenty-four states. These administrators were asked to rate the relative importance of various competencies contained in a list compiled by the Office of Education staff. In addition, a committee of experts, persons experienced in teacher preparation and state and local administration, was also asked to produce a list of competencies for special education administrators. Fifteen competencies were identified as extremely important as a result of the survey and eleven competency areas were identified by the committee of experts. Both sets of competencies derived were very broad in nature.

Following the study by Mackie and Engel, Gallagher (1959) reported that:

At the 1957 Council for Exceptional Children convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., two important papers were presented . . . which brought into focus problems of advanced graduate training in special education. The Division on Teacher Education established a committee to study this problem, and James Gallagher was appointed chairman. This committee was directed to attack important questions such as

What standards might be proposed for universities interested in developing advanced graduate training in special education?

Should there be differential training programs established to prepare students for positions in specific job areas of special education such as teacher training, administration and research.
(p. 104)

This committee reported some specific recommendations for curriculum content for all three areas; teacher training, administration and research, with much overlap between the three areas. A few

additional specific requirements for coursework in administration were recommended for those persons preparing in the area of special education administration.

At the 1962 annual meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), a committee was appointed to study several questions, two of which are of importance to this study: 1) "What the training and experience of state directors (of special education) should include," and 2) "The extent to which these requirements are being met in college and university programs accepting students under Public Law 85-926" (Milazzo and Blessing, 1964, p. 129). The committee felt that the guidelines proposed for special education training programs would apply to preparation of both state and local administrators. Their focus was primarily on criteria for accreditation and on levels of leadership training rather than on specific content of the curriculum to be offered.

In 1966, CEC published the work of a special committee which had been established to further study the question of professional standards. The Professional Standards Project Report: "Professional Standards for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children" dealt specifically with curriculum content as well as other topics. It indicated fifteen areas of knowledge and the administrative and supervisory functions dependent upon these knowledges, which areas of knowledges were recommended for inclusion in programs for the preparation of administrators and supervisors of special education.

This report, however, is seen by many as only a beginning. Some of the criticisms leveled at the report of the standards committee

point to a few of the major issues still being debated in the development of these training programs:

The knowledges listed in this paper (Professional Standards Project Report) are too broad in scope for any one administrator to be thoroughly proficient in; however, it is essential for a special education administrator to be familiar with all the knowledges and to be able in a short time to refer to the area in depth. (Catalina, 1969, p. 20)

I do not want to be unfair, but maybe something has crept in there (Professional Standards Project Report) that is not intended, but I think it might reflect a major policy. That is, the repeated use of the word "knowledge" as if knowledge produces administrators. Knowledge per se, cognitive knowledge, very seldom does produce. It does undergird. But, I think our studies indicate rather clearly that it does not produce administrators. (Haskew, 1969, p. 19)

In such circumstances, programs of special education administration are apt to be pedagogically oriented; the curriculum may consist simply of overviews of the several areas of exceptionality and some electives, augmented by a few situationally oriented courses in special education administration and an internship. In any case, it is unlikely that this type of program will nurture the kind of research that could be generated from the perspectives of organization theory. (Willower, 1970, p. 592)

The first two criticisms are clear and need no further discussion at this point. However, the third criticism involves a major issue related to this study which requires discussion in greater depth.

Theoretical vs. Practical

Despite Willower's feelings that management theory and theory of other disciplines, so necessary to the development of educational leaders, has largely been left out of training programs for special education administrators, the prevalent cry heard in the halls and classrooms of institutions for educators is "give me something practical--I can't use all of this theory junk!" And nowhere is this heard

more strongly than in preparation programs for special education administrators. These trainees, who realize that they are about to be faced with a myriad of complicated tasks, about which they know little or nothing, often vent their extreme frustration over having to sit in classes dealing with social systems, management theory, decision-making processes and organizational climates.

As Connor (1970) reported in his article on "Preparation Programs for Special Education Administrators," "universities which prepare general school administrators have recently shifted from the study of how to be an administrator to the study of administration. The science, the technology and the research findings concerning administration are being stressed, with a consequent de-emphasis on the art, traditional functions, and recognized characteristics and practices of successful administrators. The emerging trend is the substitution of scholarship for know how (p. 370)."

It is this apparent de-emphasis of the art of administration which is so frustrating for trainees of special education administration. Gearheart (1967) reported that:

It is likely that a majority of special education administrators spend one-fourth to one-half of their time on what might be called general administrative duties and responsibilities. Among the tasks involved here we might find the director of special education reviewing requisitions for curriculum material or equipment, preparing the budget for the following year, getting the wheels in motion for preparation of reimbursement claims, meeting with the superintendent's cabinet, meeting with the director of elementary education regarding additional class space needs for next year, consulting with parents or with visiting educators, meeting with the architects relative to special education needs in a building being planned, meeting with university officials regarding staff needs or the undergraduate training programs, interviewing teacher applicants,

meeting with state officials about proposed legislation, determining class placement for children or any of a hundred similar day-to-day responsibilities. (p. 73)

The question that must ultimately arise is "why does the director spend so much of his time in these kinds of tasks?" (And this author believes that Gearheart is being conservative in his estimates of time involvement in these kinds of tasks.) Is it because of the quantity of the tasks or is it because the special education administrator has never been trained to do the tasks, much less do them effectively and efficiently within a given theoretical framework.

This author is not proposing the elimination of administrative theory in the training of special education administrators, but is rather asking for the teaching of the practical application of theory to the daily administrative tasks to produce a more effective and efficient administrator. As is typical with all fads in education, we tend to see a pendulum effect. Various concepts or approaches are set up on a bi-polar basis and when one is in, the other is out. Seldom do we try to see how the two concepts or approaches might work together to provide a better program.

Certainly we recognize the need for the application of scientific method to administration problems. "The director which we prepare today will need to provide leadership in objective study of tomorrow's problems (Henderson, 1970, p. 399)." Or as Ackerman and Geer (1968) state it:

The future depends upon the administrator who is able to break away from the present. This person might be called the "creative administrator"....one who is able to see the present status only in relationship to its primitive base for the future. This person must plan and develop emergent programs. He must

take the germ of an idea, put it in a pilot project form, effect the administrative innovation, evaluate it, reject it, accept or change it, and demonstrate whatever effectiveness there is in it to his colleagues. A creative administrator must design an organization and administer it. He must be an activator, a synthesizer, a dreamer, and a risk-taker. He must take the future and try it today. (p. 16)

The "Guidelines for Wisconsin's Directors, Coordinators and Supervisors of Special Education" (1969) have the following as one of their opening statements:

The function of the special education administrator or supervisor is to bring forth achievement through a diversity of human effort. Since special education itself is one of the most diverse fields of human endeavor, sound administration of the multi-faceted programs for the handicapped is both an art and a science. It is a science in that it requires the optimum utilization of both human and physical resources, the following of a systematic and methodical program, the testing of theory and structure against facts and the changing of theory and structure when and where the facts warrant. It is an art in its demand for individual insight, creativity and innovation and in the sense that highly important skills and abilities can be learned only in the crucible of experience and not from administration courses or textbooks. (p. iii)

The question is, do these skills and abilities have to be learned through experience on the job or can we provide a training program within the university structure that will build these abilities and skills prior to completion of the training program? How can we expect our special education administrator to provide leadership and to be an applier of science if we do not give him the necessary skills and techniques to efficiently and effectively perform what Gearheart referred to as the "general administrative duties and responsibilities"? Without these skills, he becomes so bogged down in the day-to-day tasks that he never has time to see the overall picture or plan for the future.

One of the ways to build into training programs these necessary skills and techniques, based upon applied theory, is through the

development of competency-based training programs for special education administrators.

Competency-Based Training Programs

Competency-based programs for the preparation of professional school personnel have become the latest bandwagon effort in education. This concept is based on the idea of specifying the minimal performances that must be displayed by a teacher or administrative trainee before he/she is approved to seek a specific professional position in education.

The origin of the concept in education can be attributed to a number of events and developments in the last ten to fifteen years.

Some of these include:

1. the increasing awareness that the present educational process is not meeting the needs of various racial, ethnic and socio-economic minority groups, but rather is geared toward the average middle-class, white student.
2. the development of programmed instructional materials which focus on every individual achieving the same knowledge and skills at differing rates of speed.
3. contractual arrangements by schools with private agencies who guarantee a specific, measurable gain in student learning.
4. demands by taxpayers that the rapidly increasing amounts of federal and state monies poured into education produce visible, measurable results.
5. the introduction of business and industrial management concepts, especially the systems approach, into education with emphasis on producing the best product for the least cost.
6. the increasing emphasis on individual teacher accountability for the progress of his/her students.
7. state and national assessments of student achievement which have shown wide discrepancies in levels of attainment of specific knowledge and skills.

8. the accumulation of evidence, through research and data collection from employers, colleges and universities, indicating the large number of students graduating from secondary programs with little or no proficiency in the basic skills.
9. technological advances and job shortages which require increasingly higher levels of educational achievement for successful competition in the job market.

A great deal of controversy has arisen over the development of competency-based programs. The most vocal supporters are those whose philosophical base lies in systems analysis and/or behavioral psychology or are those whose primary responsibility is the hiring and/or management of professional school personnel. Other groups who support competency-based programming are the professional school personnel themselves who feel that their training has not adequately prepared them to carry out their on-the-job responsibilities. Some of the arguments offered for the development of competency-based instruction are:

1. the employer has the right to expect certain common minimal competencies from any person who has completed a training program irrespective of where and by whom that training program was administered.
2. the pre-evaluation component of a competency-based program decreases repetition of knowledge and skills already mastered; thereby speeding up the completion of the program for many trainees.
3. competency-based programming provides a means of individualizing instruction so that the trainee can meet the requirements at his/her own rate of learning.
4. the trainee has the right to be evaluated on objective-based criteria which are the same for all trainees in that particular program and which are known to the trainee in advance.
5. development of competency-based programs forces the training institutions to identify, on the basis of research, what, in fact, are the knowledges and skills needed by various professionals for successful performance on the job.

The most vocal opponents of competency-based programs are those whose philosophical base lies in humanism and/or self-actualization or are those whose primary responsibility is the training of professional school personnel. Some of the arguments against the competency model are:

1. the emphasis on specifying performance objectives limits the education of the trainee to only those performances which can be measured. This may produce a technician who lacks the basic theoretical knowledge to create or take advantage of alternative modes of functioning.
2. education should be for the broadening of perspectives, enrichment of life and understanding of self as well as for the preparation for a particular career.
3. definite limits are placed on the academic freedom of faculty through external determination of curriculum, through minimizing time for individual faculty creativity and through limiting the ability to introduce new discoveries, knowledge and techniques until they are proven through research.
4. it is impossible to develop and measure performance objectives for outcomes that are complex and subtle in nature, particularly those that are related to affect and attitudes.

The major problem with a controversy of this type is the "all or nothing" view of the concept. As can be seen, there are good arguments on both sides. Hopefully, educational institutions will not turn into factories producing uniform products, fitting rigid specifications, which can perform only very limited functions. On the other hand, through the effort of trying to specify what, in fact, the trainee should be able to do at the end of his training program, educational institutions will have to take a closer look at the relationships between theory and practice, the content, the instructional strategies, the requirements and the evaluation procedures presently being used which

do not maximize the potential of individual trainees and meet the requirements of future positions. It is to this end, "the determination of competencies for special education administrators," that this study is directed.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study is to generate competency areas and competency statements which would be appropriate for use as rules for approval of special education directors and as guidelines for the development of pre-service training programs to qualify persons as special education directors. The initial problem was to assemble all of the literature related to curriculum content for pre-service training programs and all of the studies of administrative functions and tasks and to obtain an updated list of activities performed by Michigan special education directors in order to generate a comprehensive set of competency areas, with their more specific, descriptive competency statements.

The resulting competency areas and statements were the basis for eliciting specific information from practicing directors of special education in Michigan as to (1) the competencies which are very important or crucial to the functioning of the special education director and (2) the most appropriate means for initially developing these competencies.

Limitations

The purpose of this study is to develop the first and second steps in a series of four which would lead to the validation of a set of competencies for inclusion in a pre-service training program for special education directors. The four steps needed for competency validation are:

1. derivation of a set of competencies for directors of special education based upon recommended curriculum content for training programs and upon the administrative tasks these administrators are required to perform on the job.
2. specification of a set of "crucial" competencies for special education directors and specification of the best means for initial development of these competencies.
3. development of pre-service training programs designed to ensure the attainment of specified minimal proficiency in each of the crucial competencies identified as initially being developed in the pre-service program.
4. determination of the ability of this type of pre-service training program to produce more effective and efficient special education directors, who devote more time to broader and more creative leadership tasks, through field research comparing graduates of programs which include these crucial competencies with graduates of programs which do not include these competencies.

It is not within the scope of resources available to this author to attempt to accomplish more than the first two steps of the validation process. However, it is hoped that through the completion of these first two steps, sufficient interest will be aroused on the part of some training institutions to carry out the third and fourth steps of this process.

Definitions

Directors of Special Education. Those persons in administrative positions in Michigan who have either temporary or full state approval as a director of special education under R 340.1771 of the Michigan Special Education Code and receive state reimbursement as a full-time director of special education.

Training Institutions. Those colleges or universities who have a nationally accredited and state-approved program for the preparation of special education directors.

Intermediate School Districts. Those Michigan public school districts which are organized on a county or multi-county wide basis as described in Public Act 190 of 1957.

Local School Districts. Those Michigan public school districts which are not designated as intermediate school districts.

Competency Areas. Broad areas of administrative functioning to which competency statements are related.

Competency Statements. Broad statements of expected performances stated in behavioral terms which further define and refine "competency areas."

Competency-Based Training Programs. A training program designed to include a set of competencies which are considered necessary for effective on-the-job functioning of the persons completing the program.

Overview

Chapter II contains a review of the literature pertaining to recommended content for training programs in special education administration and a review of the literature pertaining to the role, tasks and functions of administrators of special education. In Chapter III, descriptions of the population surveyed, the method for deriving competency areas and statements and the means of analyzing and comparing the findings of the survey are discussed. Chapter IV specifies the findings of the survey and the analysis of the data collected. Chapter V presents the findings of the survey in the form of proposed rules for

approval of directors of special education and proposed guidelines for the development of training programs for the State of Michigan based on the survey findings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The basic review of the literature for this study focused primarily on two major topics:

1. standards and recommended content for special education administrative training programs;
2. role, tasks, functions and activities of administrators of special education.

This chapter presents a synopsis of the literature available concerning these two topics, which information has been used not only for the purpose of writing this chapter but also as a basis for the derivation of competency areas and competency statements, as will be explained in Chapter III, Design of the Study.

Training Programs

As early as 1955, an attempt was made to identify competencies for special education directors. Mackie and Engle utilized two approaches to the identification of these competencies. First they asked 153 directors in twenty-four states to rate the competencies contained in a list composed by the Office of Education staff. Through this process, the following competency areas were identified by the directors as extremely important:

1. ability to give leadership in directing and carrying on a special education program in keeping with community needs and resources;

2. ability to evaluate and select staff;
3. a knowledge or understanding of the services provided by psychologists, medical personnel, social workers and others interested in exceptional children;
4. ability to relate special education to the general school program through organizing procedures and securing the cooperation of other members of the education staff;
5. a knowledge or understanding of the functions of various types of special educational facilities such as: special classes, special schools, the services of itinerant teachers and their advantages and limitations;
6. a knowledge or understanding of the types and locations of various community organizations concerned with exceptional children and their services;
7. ability to work as a member of a professional team;
8. a knowledge or understanding of the physical, mental and emotional characteristics of the types of exceptional children for which he is responsible;
9. ability to work cooperatively with parent groups concerned with the general welfare of exceptional children;
10. a knowledge or understanding of the legal provisions and regulations governing the education of exceptional children, including those under which grants for transportation, special equipment, special classes are given;
11. a knowledge or understanding of the services available to exceptional children through such public agencies as departments of welfare and health;
12. a knowledge or understanding of the types of specialized educational materials, equipment, and supplies and their sources of procurement in the areas of exceptionality for which he is responsible;
13. a knowledge or understanding of current trends in literature on education of exceptional children in the areas of responsibility;
14. ability to serve as a consultant to general educators on education of exceptional children in areas for which he is responsible;

15. ability to recognize acceptable and unacceptable teaching and teacher-pupil relationships in the areas of exceptionality for which he is responsible, and to give constructive suggestions to his staff. (p. 14)

Second, Mackie and Engel utilized the services of a committee of twelve leaders in the field. This committee perceived the special education leader as engaging in tasks in eleven different competency areas including:

1. personal competencies;
2. administration and leadership;
3. evaluation and development of programs;
4. teacher recruitment and selection;
5. motivating professional development of staff;
6. supervision;
7. budget and finance;
8. research;
9. coordination with community agencies;
10. legislative procedures;
11. public relations (pp. 20-27).

In 1959, Gallagher reported on the work of a special committee established by the Division on Teacher Education at the 1957 CEC convention in Pittsburgh. This committee made the following recommendations:

Skill Area Requirements--Minimal Requirements for Doctoral Students in Special Education:

1. Special Education
 - a. knowledge of personality, social and academic characteristics of exceptional children;
 - b. two or three courses discussing the special problems of certain areas of exceptional children;
 - c. knowledge of administrative and curriculum adjustments of exceptional children.
2. Educational Psychology
 - a. knowledge of the normal child and his development;
 - b. ability to relate psychological theory to educational problems.
3. Curriculum Development
 - a. understanding of the general principles of curriculum development;

- b. understanding of curriculum problems in specific subject areas;
 - c. ability to design a curriculum for one or more types of exceptional children.
- 4. Statistics and Research Design
 - a. ability to understand common measures of central tendency variation;
 - b. ability to understand methods for comparing groups;
 - c. ability to read and interpret research in areas of special education.
- 5. Administration
 - a. knowledge of skills in supervision of elementary or secondary schools;
 - b. understanding of theory and practice of American Educational Administration;
 - c. legal basis of school administration;
 - d. school finance and business management.
- 6. Counseling
 - a. ability to counsel exceptional children and their parents. (p. 107)

Gallagher went on to point out that "the amount of required practical experience . . . generally would consist of a period of one year supervised practice in the area of their job specialty . . . by implication, the committee has suggested that the doctoral training program for Administration and Teacher Training are very similar and differ mainly in the character of the practicum experience obtained." (p. 109)

In a 1964 article, "Administration of Special Education: Aspects of a Professional Problem," Willenberg proposed the following areas for study:

- 1. nature and scope of programs and services;
- 2. structure, organization and relationship of instructional services for exceptional children;
- 3. instrumentalities for program planning, development and coordination;
- 4. provisions for recruitment, development and in-service training of personnel;
- 5. supervision of instruction including horizontal and vertical articulation of pupil personnel;

6. financing of special education, preparation of budgets and the control of expenditures;
7. planning of facilities and use of supplies and equipment;
8. provision of transportation, food and other auxiliary services;
9. evaluation and interpretation of the special program for purposes of pupil guidance and public information;
10. areas of administrative research activity and application of research findings. (pp. 194-195)

In 1966, after an extensive study of the problem of professional standards for all professional personnel in special education, the Council for Exceptional Children published a report of the findings of this study, the "Professional Standards for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children." The report had this to say regarding the training of special education administrators:

The responsibilities of the administrator of special education will vary with the size and type of program. In some cases, the administrator may have total responsibility for the administration and supervision of all of 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. In these instances, persons with only supervisory responsibilities should have the professional competencies required of those in the area(s) served. At the state level, the administrator of special education may have total responsibility for all of special education and, in addition, may have direct or indirect responsibilities for state-operated residential and special day school facilities.

The functions of administrators and supervisors, though complementary, are different. We are just entering a period when recognition is given to the need for specialized preparation of such leadership personnel. The trend is given impetus by increased school district reorganization, new state legislation encouraging the employment of administrative and supervisory personnel, etc. These have increased the need for a definition of separate functions and related competencies of administrative and supervisory positions and/or the accreditation of institutions preparing persons for each of these positions.

Although later it may be possible to differentiate between the specific training requirements of special education administrators and supervisors, this initial effort attempts to foster leadership preparation of value to the individual who has both administrative and supervisory assignments. (p. 48)

Broad practical experiences should be included in preparation in view of the differing responsibilities of administrators of special education as related to the size of the school system, the stage of development of the special education program, the changing role of the administrator of special education, whether employment is at the state or local level, etc. (p. 49)

The study also included the following list of what was termed "major areas of professional competence," which were listed as knowledge statements, and their attendant administrative and supervisory functions:

1. Understanding of Total Education Process
 - a. provide leadership and develop working relationships between regular and special education personnel;
 - b. philosophy
 - 1) develop a statement of philosophy which reflects the needs of exceptional children and is consistent with that of the total school system and acceptable to the community;
 - 2) promote understanding and acceptance of this philosophy in the school and community.
 - c. provide for the continuous assessment of the special education needs of the pupil population and supply this information to administrative officers for program planning and budgetary purposes;
 - d. policies and procedures
 - 1) develop policies and procedures which reflect the philosophy;
 - 2) continually evaluate and modify policies and procedures.
 - e. participate as a member of the total school system;
 - f. represent employer at various meetings.
2. Knowledge of School Organization and Administrative Practices
 - a. provide for effective organization and administration of special education programs within and among school districts, including cooperative arrangements and residential programs where indicated;
 - b. determine class size and case load;
 - c. develop schedules for special education personnel;
 - d. employ sound personnel and office management principles with professional or nonprofessional persons;
 - e. insure effective staff utilization;
 - f. develop procedures for selection and inventory of books, equipment, supplies and other instructional materials;
 - g. develop appropriate record and report forms;

- h. prepare reports to superintendent, board of education and others;
 - i. develop appropriate publications, brochures and other materials.
3. Knowledge of Various Administrative Provisions
- a. provide for continuing placement, replacement and dismissal;
 - b. provide for ancillary services;
 - c. provide for adequate guidance, placement and follow-up services;
 - d. assess transportation needs;
 - e. determine best transportation means;
 - f. arrange appropriate transportation schedules;
 - g. provide necessary personnel to insure safety of children.
4. Knowledge of Fiscal Procedures
- a. maintain inventories;
 - b. prepare budgets with supportive data;
 - c. develop and process forms and reports;
 - d. administer local budget;
 - e. administer state reimbursement program;
 - f. administer federally funded programs.
5. Knowledge of Curriculum Development and Methodology
- a. provide for appropriate methodology of teaching various exceptional children;
 - b. develop appropriate curriculum guides, courses of instruction and methods;
 - c. plan for continuous evaluation of and experimentation with curriculum and methodology;
 - d. develop publications, brochures and other materials;
 - e. utilize appropriate resource and consultant help.
6. Knowledge of Supervisory Practices and Theory and Techniques of Staff Development
- a. identify needs for and conduct in-service training;
 - b. develop channels of communication (for example, staff meetings, individual conferences, "brain storming sessions" and seminars);
 - c. make recommendations on groups and organization for instruction;
 - d. provide for the improvement of instruction through classroom visitation and consultative services to personnel;
 - e. develop appropriate publications, brochures and other materials;
 - f. develop and implement a state plan for federal programs for preparation of professional personnel.

7. Knowledge of Psychoeducational and Other Diagnostic Procedures
 - a. develop procedures for identifying children for program;
 - b. determine eligibility;
 - c. evaluate pupil progress;
 - d. refer to appropriate agencies;
 - e. interpret medical, psychological and other reports;
 - f. develop appropriate publications, brochures and other materials;
 - g. maintain appropriate pupil records;
 - h. assist other personnel (teachers, principals, etc.) in techniques for the identification of children with special needs.
8. Knowledge of Personnel Practices
 - a. plan for recruitment, placement and transfer of teachers;
 - b. assist in evaluating personnel;
 - c. identify persons for promotion possibilities;
 - d. provide consultative service on personnel problems;
 - e. build staff morale;
 - f. maintain personnel records.
9. Knowledge and Utilization of Community Organizations and Resources
 - a. refer to appropriate agencies;
 - b. coordinate relationships between special education programs and other related agencies;
 - c. encourage and assist cooperative planning and development of centers for preparation of special education personnel.
10. Ability to Identify, Define and Influence the Power Structure Both Inside and Outside Education
 - a. knowledge and techniques in directing group thinking and action;
 - b. establish effective working relationships with the various individuals and groups with consideration for both stated and unstated principles and purposes.
11. Knowledge of Public Relations
 - a. carry out a continuous program of community education for professional and lay public;
 - b. develop appropriate publications, brochures and other materials;
 - c. promote interest and understanding of special education through speeches, publications, news releases, etc.;

- d. establish provisions for the interpretation of special programs to parents of exceptional children;
 - e. establish channels of communication between the school and the home.
12. Knowledge of School Law and Legislative Processes and Their Implementation
 - a. develop rules and regulations to implement special education legislation;
 - b. comply with and enforce state standards for program operation and certification;
 - c. stimulate the development of needed legislation and work toward accomplishment of this legislation;
 - d. operate programs as set forth by various school laws.
 13. Knowledge of School Plant Planning and Utilization
 - a. plan for initiating and providing appropriate physical environment in coordination with total school program;
 - b. plan for physical environment and needs of all children and staff.
 14. Knowledge of Research Techniques and Procedures
 - a. possess knowledge and ability to apply current research;
 - b. conduct and apply the findings of meaningful research and studies;
 - c. create a research climate;
 - d. identify sources and requirements for funding and implementation of research projects;
 - e. cooperate with universities and other research centers.
 15. Knowledge of Professional Responsibilities to the Field
 - a. stimulate interest in special education as a career;
 - b. work with preparation centers of various personnel in special education by providing practicum experiences (observation, demonstration, participation, student teaching, supervision-administration internship);
 - c. hold membership and participate in appropriate professional organizations;
 - d. stimulate local participation, in partnership with others, in the development of personnel with administrative and supervisory responsibilities;
 - e. evaluate college and university sequences in the preparation of special education personnel for certification purposes. (pp. 50-52)

These standards, though seemingly exhaustive, have yet to be researched in any way and, as noted earlier, the acquisition of knowledge

is not a competency in itself, but rather undergirds or provides the foundation for the skills to be performed.

Connor (1966) noted in his article, "Preparation Programs for Special Education Administrators" that "the chief administrator has, among other functions, those of manager, instructional leader, technician, financier, legislator, psychologist, politician and educationalist." He felt that "preparation programs must provide opportunities and insights into all of these practical areas of endeavor." (p. 374)

In 1967, the Michigan Department of Education promulgated rules for the approval of directors of special education. Among the requirements for approval were listed the following nine areas in which special education directors should demonstrate knowledge and competency through graduate credit earned in a college or university approved by the Michigan State Board of Education:

1. child growth and development theory and its application in the classroom;
2. personality development;
3. theories of learning;
4. systematic study of curriculum;
5. organization and financing of schools;
6. administrative and supervisory procedures;
7. evaluation methods and procedures;
8. research methods;
9. vocational rehabilitation programs.

Kothera (1967) in his study "to establish problem areas for simulation in a course of general practice for preparation of special education administrators" felt that the areas of training as specified by Mackie and Engel and the problem areas as specified by Wisland and Vaughan (to be reviewed in the next section of this chapter) were too broad (p. 37). He identified nineteen areas to be used to categorize the problems he identified for use in simulation:

1. coordinating community agencies;
2. inter-staff relations;
3. placement procedures;
4. consultant to generalists;
5. developing individualized programs;
6. transportation problems;
7. curriculum construction and coordination;
8. interdistrict relationships;
9. budget and finance;
10. policy formation;
11. public relations;
12. pupil identification and evaluation;
13. pupil discipline;
14. research;
15. classroom and program supply;
16. recruitment;
17. parent counseling;
18. general program development;
19. in-service training (p. 39).

In 1969, Catalina conducted a study "to come to a better understanding of the requirements of an administrator in special education; and, as a result of an analysis, to suggest an effective graduate sequence." (p. 8) While his major research focus was on the internship, the experiences rated as "very essential" for inclusion in the internship experience are of interest to this study:

1. becoming familiar with the legal responsibilities and rights of special education programs;
2. working with special education budgets, costs and reimbursements;
3. becoming familiar through observations and teacher conference with all areas of exceptionality;
4. becoming familiar with legislation pertaining to special education areas;
5. making "decisions" based on delegated areas of responsibility;
6. directing or assisting in the recruitment and selection of teaching personnel.

Henley (1969) has twice surveyed the colleges and universities approved for funding by the United States Office of Education in the area of special education administration. His speech, "A National

Perspective--Preparation Programs in Special Education Administration," given for the National Consortium of Universities Preparing Administrators of Special Education conference in Austin, Texas, summarizes both studies. Of interest to this study were the responses to three questions on his survey:

Question II: What are the specific courses which have been developed in Special Education Administration and Supervision?

1. Administration and Supervision of Special Education;
2. Problems in Special Education;
3. Doctoral Seminar in Special Education Administration;
4. Issues and Trends in Special Education;
5. Community Agency Programs for the Handicapped;
6. Design of Local, State Regulations and National Programs for the Exceptional;
7. Administration of Pupil Personnel Services;
8. Supervision of Special Education;
9. Special Education Finance;
10. Legal, Financial and Organizational Structure of Special Education Programs;
11. Seminar: The Intermediate School District;
12. Administration of Residential Programs;
13. Seminar: State and Federal Legislation;
14. Research in Special Education Administration;
15. Education Administration.

Question III: What are the courses in Educational Administration which are normally utilized in this program?

1. School Law;
2. School Administration (foundations);
3. School Finance;
4. Personnel Administration or Management;
5. Supervision of Instruction;
6. Plant Planning;
7. Public Relations for Administration;
8. Curriculum Development;
9. Philosophy of Education;
10. Problems in School Administration;
11. Organization and Administration of the Elementary and/or Secondary School;
12. State and Federal Education Programs;
13. Support Programs (grants);
14. Theory and Principles of Education;
15. School Business Management;
16. Proceedings of Classroom Observation and Analysis;

17. Change and Organization;
18. Dynamic Factors in School Administration;
19. Social Policy in Public School Administration;
20. Principles, Practices and Policies of Modern Management;
21. Labor Relations;
22. Administration Theory;
23. Administration Information Systems.

Question IV: What are the areas other than special education administration and educational administration which are normally considered to be essential to the program?

1. Research and Statistics;
2. Additional Special Education coursework (general);
3. Mental Retardation (not included in #2 above);
4. Foundations of Education;
5. Educational Psychology;
6. Sociology;
7. Vocational Rehabilitation;
8. Diagnostic Techniques;
9. Business;
10. Psychology (pp. 38-40).

The above named titles and areas represent a compilation of all of the programs surveyed and should not be construed as meaning that all of these titles and areas were included in any one training program surveyed. None of these titles and areas were represented in all training programs and very few of them represented even three-fourths of the training programs, indicating a fairly wide discrepancy in requirements.

In a presentation, "A Model for Competency-Based Administrative Training," given at the National Council for Exceptional Children convention, April 27, 1973, held in Dallas, Texas, Wright proposed a model based on the concept that all prospective administrators must have competencies in twelve core areas, irrespective of the type of administrative position sought. The twelve core competencies proposed were:

1. developing objectives;
2. planning and scheduling;
3. developing programs;
4. personnel selection and management;

5. establishing communications;
6. physical plant management;
7. public relations;
8. fiscal management;
9. program evaluation;
10. professional development;
11. personal development;
12. systems analysis.

He then proposed that the core competencies be supplemented by the following competency areas related to the special education administrator:

1. categorical approaches;
2. non-categorical approaches;
3. self-contained programs;
4. resource programs;
5. mainstream approaches;
6. work-study programs;
7. clinical programs.

As the competencies are developed by the prospective special education administrator, Wright suggested that further perspectives be sought in competency areas pertaining to general education programs:

1. public;
2. private;
3. elementary;
4. intermediate;
5. secondary;
6. industrial (distributive education).

Wright stated that it should also be possible for the special education administrator to obtain competencies for administering programs as they are found in:

1. rural settings;
2. suburban settings;
3. urban settings;
4. intercity settings.

"Finally, since such competencies as in the areas of law, finance, and legislative processes are often different from region to

region, the prospective Special Education Administrator should obtain competencies relevant to any region(s) in which he/she might be working." (pp. 1, 2, 4)

Role, Tasks, Functions and Activities

Graham (1956) defined the functions of the director of special education in the following manner:

1. Administrative Functions
 - a. developing policies;
 - b. establishing special education programs;
 - c. placement of children;
 - d. schedules for special teachers;
 - e. completion of state forms;
 - f. pupil accounting and records;
 - g. teacher accounting;
 - h. transportation;
 - i. establishing channels of communication;
 - j. evaluation of personnel (for hiring, tenure and promotion);
 - k. equipment and instructional supplies;
 - l. planning and appraisal of the total program.
2. Supervisory Functions
 - a. fostering professional growth;
 - b. evaluating personnel (for teaching effectiveness, relations with other teachers and parents);
 - c. serving as a resource person;
 - d. building staff morale.
3. Coordinating Functions
 - a. school personnel;
 - b. community agencies;
 - c. state personnel.

Conner (1961) in his book, Administration of Special Education Programs, was more descriptive in his definition of the functions of a special education administrator:

1. Personnel
 - a. selection;
 - b. provision of information as to
 - 1) orientation to the teaching techniques;

- 2) information about particular children, local schedules and organization of community facilities;
 - c. curriculum development;
 - d. encouragement of professional growth;
 - e. evaluation of salary schedules, retirement benefits and tenure rights.
- 2. Finance and Business Management
 - a. preparation and control of the annual budget;
 - b. providing income sources for the special education program;
 - c. transportation planning and operation.
- 3. Provisions for Plant and Equipment
 - a. knowledge of the physical plant and equipment utilized by special classes;
 - b. recommend schedule for school buildings which includes a cycle of inspection, painting and repairs;
 - c. propose master plan of needed building construction;
 - d. evaluation of present facilities and help plan more effective utilization of school service areas.
- 4. Instructional Services to Exceptional Children
 - a. development of policies concerning attendance and absences of teachers, and their scheduling of children, reporting to parents, assignments of homework, promotion and grading of pupils, etc.;
 - b. development of general and specific aims of the school and determination of teaching methods for various age levels of each exceptionality;
 - c. development of relationships with the community, parent groups, and service agencies as adjuncts of the instructional program;
 - d. setting of time schedules, utilization of auxiliary services and various building areas and ordering of instructional materials;
 - e. upgrading of the instructional level of a school through helping classroom teachers gain insight into children's learning processes and behavior;
 - f. developing cooperation between local or county districts for supervision of teachers;
 - g. development of lines of communication among the administration, the staff and the public;
 - h. responsibility for coordination and implementation of services in the special education program;
 - i. development of a well-organized and comprehensive system for recording and reporting pupil data;
 - j. development of curriculum;
 - k. encouraging professional growth of staff.

5. Administrative Relationship with Groups
 - a. ability to deal with administrative groups such as boards of control, the state department of education, federal level groups, other school administrators, as well as the superintendent;
 - b. ability to deal with school groups such as teachers, office staff, food preparation personnel, custodial personnel, bus drivers, parent organizations;
 - c. ability to deal with community and special interest groups as well as the community newspaper and other media of publicity.
6. Special Activities
 - a. identification, diagnosis and referral;
 - b. program planning;
 - c. legislation;
 - d. research.

Wisland and Vaughan (1964) "undertook the task of identifying problems and problem areas which directors and supervisors are currently experiencing in thirteen western states to provide empirical evidence for developing better training programs for individuals planning to enter this field." (p. 17) They identified eight major problem areas:

1. Self-directed study and research;
2. Student personnel;
3. Communication;
4. Supervision;
5. Professional personnel;
6. Policies and procedures;
7. Education of the public;
8. Finance (p. 89).

In addition to the major problem areas, the Wisland and Vaughan study also identified the ten most significant problems of special education administrators and supervisors:

1. obtaining adequately prepared personnel;
2. adequately providing for the multiply handicapped child;
3. helping parents understand their exceptional child;
4. adequately providing for all types of exceptional children;
5. having adequate time to carry out active research;
6. counseling parents;
7. developing curriculum for the different types of exceptional children;

8. starting new programs for exceptional children not previously included in your program;
9. developing new programs and services to expand the program for exceptional children;
10. obtaining adequate physical facilities for the instructional phase of the special education program such as classrooms, therapy rooms, counseling rooms and examining rooms (p. 89).

Gearheart (1967) divided the duties and responsibilities of the local special education administrator into the following general categories:

1. General administrative duties;
2. Supervisory duties;
3. Research and continued professional study;
4. Public relations;
5. Legislative responsibilities;
6. Staff development: in-service training.

Throughout his book, Gearheart discussed the duties and responsibilities of the director. The following passages were of particular interest for this study:

A director is obviously the key person in the special education team. He must know enough about the various exceptionalities to develop a good program, and must recognize a quality program when he sees it. He must be able to find good personnel for his staff--or at least help the personnel director find them. He must have considerable administrative ability and be well enough informed about the general school program to be able to work efficiently with those in charge of other departments of the school system. In most school systems, he will need to know a great deal about parent counseling, but at the same time will need to be well-informed regarding local school budget, state budgeting procedures and problems, and the state reimbursement plan. (p. 37)

To carry out his administrative duties properly, the director must first understand the total functioning of the school system in which he works. This means understanding official line-staff relationships and the additional "power structures" which may be superimposed on the carefully charted, well-written relationships to be found in the policies and regulations handbook.

He must further be intimately acquainted with the various individuals and agencies in the community which contribute or relate to services for handicapped youth. In addition, he must

understand how state leadership in special education influences the local program. (p. 74)

In addition to certain specific understandings and knowledge, the director must be able to handle detail, relate well with other educators, be fair, patient, understanding--and when necessary, know how to be quite positive and "hard-nosed."

To have an effective program, the local director of special education must supervise those individuals who report directly to him. In addition, he must assist in supervision of such personnel as special education teachers (who report directly to their building principal); speech therapists (who may report to a chief therapist in larger systems) and others. With the responsibility of recommending the employment of individuals to fill specific vacancies, there is also the responsibility to supervise, evaluate and sometimes to recommend dismissal. (p. 75)

Although relatively little time is spent by most special education administrators in pursuit of further professional competency via the professional study and/or research route, this is indeed an important duty and responsibility. If the administrator actually spends five per cent of his time in professional study and research, this is probably "par for the course."

The director of special education must not only be continually aware of the public relations implications of everyday happenings in special education, but must also attempt to keep all special education personnel aware of their public relations responsibilities.

Within the limitations of local district regulations regarding contacts with news media, a concentrated effort should be made to keep the public informed. (p. 76)

Legislative knowledge and planned efforts to correct any deficiencies in existing laws are an important part of the total responsibility of the special education administrator. He need not be a politician (in the sense of promoting partisan politics), but he should understand the political scene, and play the legislative game carefully, with deliberation.

There are many aspects to the staff development responsibility of the special education administrator. This may involve provision of professional resource material; provision of opportunities for attendance of state level, regional and national professional meetings; establishment of local in-service meetings which really challenge the classroom teacher; arrangement for teacher participation in curriculum writing; selling the superintendent and the board of education on the need for specialized, full-time consultative help and other similar tasks.

The administrator can be a living example of one who keeps abreast of new developments, and by his example cause others to do the same. He can work with university officials to promote the offering of meaningful night, Saturday, or extension courses for special education teachers. He can demonstrate to the staff his

open-mindedness and his desire to innovate, thus encouraging the use of new ideas, materials and other motivators. He can make every attempt to make in-service meetings come alive, even if he does not have the money to bring in nationally recognized leaders and authorities. He can work to bring building principals and other school districts' administrative personnel into the on-going training program, which may really "pay off." He can encourage teachers to participate in professional organizations, do action research and become involved in other similar individual growth activities, by his strong support through the year, and by specific favorable comments about these activities at teacher evaluation time. (pp. 77-79)

In the "Guidelines for Wisconsin's Directors, Coordinators and Supervisors of Special Education" (1969), the role and functions of special education administrators were defined according to whether they were locally or regionally based. The functions of local administrators were defined as the following:

1. Administrative Functions
 - a. policy development;
 - b. establishing a special education program;
 - c. referral, examination, placement and dismissal (pupils);
 - d. maintaining staff morale;
 - e. establishing communication between staff members and disciplines;
 - f. evaluation of teaching personnel;
 - g. evaluation of specific programs;
 - h. assisting the discipline to become an integral part of the total school program;
 - i. role in records and accounting;
 - j. relationships to other administrative heads.
2. Supervisory-Consultative Functions
 - a. pre-service orientation and training;
 - b. fostering of professional growth;
 - c. resource consultant;
 - d. maintaining staff morale;
 - e. fostering research, pilot and demonstration projects;
 - f. development and dissemination of materials (materials meaning more than instructional . . . press releases, pamphlets);
 - g. relationships to other resource consultants (outside system).

3. Coordinative Functions

- a. working with community agencies;
- b. working with personnel outside our discipline;
- c. working with state groups;
- d. working with federal groups (pp. 2-5).

The Wisconsin guidelines defined the functions of the regional directors, coordinators and supervisors as:

1. Administrative Functions

- a. role in policy development;
- b. role in keeping appropriate records and accounting;
- c. . . . making proper referrals, examinations, placements and dismissals;
- d. role in pupil personnel services including transportation, class rosters . . . , family counseling . . . ;
- e. role in budgeting;
- f. . . . as administrator and the agent of the board of education;
- g. role as coordinator with other agencies dealing with handicapped children;
- h. role as recruiter of special education staff;
- i. role as public relations consultant in the community;
- j. role as liaison person with universities for research purposes and teacher training;
- k. role in providing in-service training programs and sessions;
- l. role in participating in conferences and conclaves;
- m. role as coordinator of services to handicapped children (includes outside agencies.)

2. Supervisory Functions

- a. classroom supervisor and instructional leader;
- b. developer of curriculum;
- c. providing pre-service and in-service training and professional growth;
- d. evaluating teaching personnel;
- e. promoting innovations in teaching, creative thinking and improved programs;
- f. role in helping teachers help each other and themselves (p. 7).

In 1969, Harris conducted a 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." (p. 14) "The purpose of this study was to investigate the present role and determine the specific administrative activities of directors of special education in Michigan." (p. 15) This is one of the most comprehensive studies of the activities of directors of special education administrators that has been conducted to date. The following ten major areas and their related activities were identified:

1. Major Area: Curriculum and Instruction
 - a. developing curriculum for total school or specialized area;
 - b. improving and changing curriculum;
 - c. selecting textbooks and instructional material;
 - d. providing for instructional supervision and consultation;
 - e. providing leadership at staff meetings;
 - f. consulting with classroom teachers;
 - g. evaluating the instructional program;
 - h. evaluating individual teaching;
 - i. developing an in-service education program for teachers;
 - j. promoting the use of community resources in the instructional program;
 - k. initiating new programs;
 - l. keeping aware of state school laws.
2. Major Area: Personnel Administration
 - a. preparing criteria for personnel selection;
 - b. conducting personnel interviews;
 - c. selecting personnel for employment;
 - d. orienting personnel;
 - e. developing schedules and work loads for professional personnel;
 - f. developing schedules and work loads for non-professional personnel;
 - g. evaluating teaching personnel;
 - h. evaluating non-teaching personnel;
 - i. suspending or dismissing employees;
 - j. assigning personnel to a specific facility;
 - k. recommending tenure appointments.
3. Major Area: Finance
 - a. preparing a budget;
 - b. administering a budget;
 - c. preparing financial statements for the board;
 - d. preparing financial data for citizens advisory groups;

- e. formulating and evaluating salary schedules;
 - f. preparing and completing state reports;
 - g. computing per pupil costs and other statistical data;
 - h. requesting and administering federal funds.
4. Major Area: Business Management and Practices
- a. organizing and coordinating purchase practices;
 - b. studying equipment and supply needs;
 - c. analyzing school district expenditures;
 - d. arranging to serve non-resident pupils.
5. Major Area: School Plant
- a. planning for buildings and equipment with the architect;
 - b. planning for buildings and equipment with the staff;
 - c. determining remodeling needs of school facilities;
 - d. determining physical location of classes.
6. Major Area: Auxiliary Services
- a. evaluating transportation needs;
 - b. developing transportation plans;
 - c. supervising or coordinating school diagnostician program;
 - d. supervising or coordinating school social worker program;
 - e. supervising or coordinating speech correction program.
7. Major Area: Pupil-Personnel Guidance
- a. developing procedures for reporting to parents;
 - b. counseling of students and parents.
8. Major Area: Community Relations
- a. organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities;
 - b. interpreting and presenting school policies to the community;
 - c. developing and administering a community relations program;
 - d. preparing news releases;
 - e. conducting and utilizing research concerning educational problems of the school and community;
 - f. using community resources in the school program;
 - g. participating in parent-school organizations;
 - h. making speeches at state and national conferences;
 - i. conducting individual parent conferences;
 - j. arranging student teaching and internship experiences with universities;
 - k. meeting with legislators regarding school issues;
 - l. developing cooperative agreements between school districts for programs.

9. Major Area: Staff Relations
 - a. arranging for and/or conducting staff meetings;
 - b. encouraging staff participation in professional organizations;
 - c. encouraging staff participation in community activities;
 - d. recommending sick leave provisions and other fringe benefits for staff;
 - e. defining the duties and responsibilities of the staff;
 - f. developing and utilizing a staff newsletter;
 - g. interpreting specialized educational programs to other educators.

10. Major Area: School Board Relations
 - a. recommending items for the school board agenda;
 - b. preparing written and oral reports for the board of education;
 - c. recommending policy to the board of education;
 - d. administering board policy;
 - e. aiding the board to distinguish between policy and executive function;
 - f. developing and providing opportunities for the board to meet and work with the staff;
 - g. developing and providing opportunities for the board to appear before the public.

Another extensive study was conducted in 1969. Newman studied the functional tasks of special education administrators in 100 public school districts with pupil populations between 13,000 and 30,000. "An instrument was developed utilizing Orwick's 'POSDCORB' theory (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting) to study seven types of administration activities." (1970, p. 521)

Summary

As can be seen from this review of the literature, initial attempts have been made to describe through research the activities or tasks of administrators of special education (Harris, 1969; Newman, 1969, 1970); however, little has been done to describe through research the competencies needed in the pre-service training program of these

administrators except as related to the internship experience (Catalina, 1969) and to simulation problems (Kothera, 1967). Most of the literature related to both training programs and administrative tasks has been based on the opinion of one or two persons or a committee and not based on information from practicing special education administrators themselves.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF STUDY

This chapter contains a description of the procedures used in the development of this study, the population surveyed and the methods used for analyzing and reporting the data obtained.

Procedure

Derivation of Competency Areas

At a Michigan Department of Education summer institute, held June, 1973, eleven major areas of administrative functioning were identified by the special education directors and supervisors in attendance.

The areas identified were:

1. Staffing
2. Programs
3. Budgets
4. Reports
5. Public Relations
6. Supervision
7. Evaluation
8. Transportation
9. In-service
10. Morale
11. Negotiations

The information obtained from this institute was used as the basis for the identification, by this author, of seventeen major competency areas. The additions and revisions to the original list were made on the basis of the author's own experience and a review of the

literature. The following revised list was used as the basis for a preliminary study, conducted by this author, of activities of special education directors in Michigan (see "Preliminary Study," pp. 46-47).

1. Program Development and Evaluation;
2. Personnel Staffing, Supervision and Evaluation (director with individual staff members);
3. Interpersonal Relationships, Communications, Persuasion and Morale (staff, administration, school board . . . director with individuals and groups);
4. In-service Organization and Management (includes both formal in-service and informal information dissemination);
5. Budgeting, Finance and Reporting (reporting means filling out forms for state department, etc.);
6. Public Relations (lectures to civic groups, radio and T.V. announcements of programs for handicapped, etc.);
7. Parent Relationships (parent advisory groups, involvement of parents in determining eligibility and programming, fielding complaints, etc. . . . list only where the director had direct contact with the parents; not those which were handled by staff);
8. Transportation Planning and Management;
9. School Plant Planning and Management;
10. Service to Students (direct contact by the director; direct service provided by the director, EPPC meetings attended by the director, etc.);
11. Salary Negotiations;
12. Management and Coordination of Resources (supplied, equipment, non-school supportive agencies, etc.);
13. Research and Grant Writing;
14. Office Management (space and office supplies allocation, management of secretarial time, planning for central office building needs and/or utilization, etc.);
15. Lobbying and other School Related Political Activities;
16. Due Process Hearings;
17. Professional Activities (publications, organizations, lectures, service on state department committees, etc.).

On the basis of the preliminary study, competency area #15 was revised from "Lobbying and Other School-Related Political Activities" to "School-Related Political Activities, Legal Activities and Due Process Hearings." This combined competency areas #15 and #16. "Salary Negotiations," #11, was eliminated and any competency statements related to that area became a part of #2, "Personnel Staffing, Supervision and

Evaluation." The competency areas were then renumbered accordingly. The title for #10 was changed from "Service to Students" to "Consultation." This was considered to be a more appropriate title given the activities listed by directors in this area. With the indicated changes, a total of fifteen competency areas were derived (see Appendix A - Questionnaire).

Derivation of Competency Statements

Three sources were used by this author in order to derive competency statements for each of the competency areas:

1. A review of the literature as to course offerings in pre-service programs and as to recommend curriculum and competencies for trainees in special education administration;
2. A review of the literature as to role, functions and tasks of special education administrators as seen by various authors and as identified through research.
3. A preliminary study of the activities of Michigan directors of special education conducted by this author.

The literature reviews are contained in Chapter II, Review of the Literature. The procedure for the preliminary study was as follows:

Preliminary Study: Eight of the total population of Michigan directors of special education to be surveyed for this study were selected for a preliminary study. The purpose of the preliminary study was to gather updated information on the tasks of directors of special education in Michigan. Four intermediate and four local directors were chosen to represent various sizes of districts, rural and urban settings and geographical locations. A log was designed utilizing the seventeen major areas of functioning (competency areas) as described above. The directors were asked to keep a daily record of their activities for two full weeks, listing each of their activities under one of the competency areas. At the end of the two-week period, they were asked to note any other major activities, which they performed as a part of their job, that had not been included in the two-week log

(again by categories). Six of the eight logs were returned, one local director and one intermediate director not responding as promised. All of the categories were utilized by the respondents, with the number of responses listed under each category ranging from three for "Due Process Hearing" to eighty-seven for "Personnel Staffing, Supervision and Evaluation." (Four of the six respondents reported having no due process hearings to date.)

On the basis of information obtained from these three sources, seventy-nine competency statements were written which related to the fifteen competency areas. The number of statements written for each area ranged from two for "Consultation" to twelve for "Budgeting, Financing and Reporting." (For a complete list of the competency areas and statements, see the questionnaire in Appendix A.)

Because these competency statements were to be written at the state rules and guidelines level, no attempt was made to set conditions or criteria for evaluation. These components of behavioral statements are more appropriate to the specification of performance objectives, which task is seen by this author as the responsibility of the individual training institutions in the development of training programs to meet objectives derived from these competencies.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of two sections: 1) a section which allowed the directors to choose the best means for the initial development of each competency as described in the competency statements and to rate the importance of each competency as it related to their on-the-job performance; and 2) a section requesting specific information regarding each director and his/her special education program (see Appendix A).

In order to determine the most appropriate means for the initial development of the competencies specified, the directors were asked to select one of the following for each competency statement:

1. Pre-service Training Program
2. On the Job

The selection of crucial or very important competencies was made by the directors on the basis of a one-to-five rating scale ranging from "not important" to "crucial." Each competency was rated individually using this scale.

Five questions were developed for the purpose of obtaining additional information regarding the population of directors designated for this study. Two of the questions relate to the size of the special education staff and three of the questions relate to the experience and approval of the special education director.

The directors were asked to record all of their answers to both sections of the questionnaire on machine-scored answer sheets to facilitate data processing. The answer sheets were color coded to differentiate between local and intermediate directors. Both the answer sheets and the questionnaires were numerically coded for follow-up on non-returns.

In order to encourage the return of the questionnaires, the following procedures were carried out: First, an announcement was made at the first fall meeting of the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education which briefly informed the directors of the purpose of the study and the fact that they would be receiving a questionnaire. Second, the letter accompanying the questionnaire (see Appendix A) further defined the purposes of the study and the need for returning

the questionnaire promptly. Third, two weeks following the mailing of the questionnaire, a follow-up postcard was mailed to all directors who had not returned the questionnaire. Fourth, one week following the mailing of the postcard, phone calls were made to some of the directors who had not returned the questionnaire.

Population

The population used for this study was all of the directors of special education in the State of Michigan who were eligible to receive categorical special education state reimbursement as full-time directors of special education. To receive state reimbursement, these directors must either: 1) hold temporary or full approval as a director of special education, which approval has been recommended by a college or university offering a nationally accredited and state approved training program for special education administrators, or 2) have been grandfathered into position in 1967 as stated in the Michigan rules for approval of directors of special education which were promulgated that year.

The 1973-74 computer print-out of information, giving the names of the directors of special education who met the requirements listed above, was obtained from the Michigan Department of Education, Special Education Services, and updated through phone calls to each of the intermediate directors of special education, asking them for additions and deletions to the 1973-74 data for the 1974-75 school year. From the information supplied, fifty intermediate directors and

ninety-four local directors were identified, giving a total of 144 directors eligible for participation in this study.

Of the 105 directors who responded to the questionnaire, 73 percent were fully approved directors of special education, 11 percent were temporarily approved and 16 percent were grandfathered in position. In terms of years completed as a director of special education, 13 percent had 0-1 year of experience, 37 percent had 2-5 years of experience, 30 percent had 6-10 years of experience and 20 percent had 11 or more years of experience. Regarding the areas of greatest number of years of experience prior to becoming a director of special education, 37 percent of the directors reported that their primary experience was as a special education teacher and/or teacher consultant, 25 percent as a school psychologist, 4 percent as a school social worker, 13 percent as a speech therapist and 21 percent as a regular education teacher and/or administrator.

Information regarding the size of the reimbursable special education staff under the direction of the special education director was also elicited. The staff size, not including supervisors and assistant directors, was reported by 6 percent of the directors as 1-10, 35 percent of the directors as 11-25, 34 percent of the directors as 26-50, 14 percent of the directors as 51-90 and 11 percent of the directors as 91 or more. The number of supervisors and assistant directors was reported by 32 percent of the directors as 0, 51 percent of the directors as 1-3, 8 percent of the directors as 4-7, 2 percent of the directors as 8-11 and 7 percent of the directors as 12 or more (see Appendix B for complete compilation of data).

Methods of Data Reporting and Analysis

The data obtained through this study were descriptive in nature and were reported primarily in terms of combined total responses of local directors and intermediate directors of special education.

In order for the local directors and the intermediate directors to carry equal weight in the totals for each competency statement, the following methods were utilized:

1. Percentages of directors choosing (a) "Pre-service Training" vs. (b) "On the Job" for each competency statement.

Local Directors	(a) %	(b) %
Intermediate Directors	+(a) %	(b) %
Total Directors	(a) % \div 2	(b) % \div 2

2. Rating score for each competency statement.

Local Directors	average rating score
Intermediate Directors	+average rating score
Total Directors	rating score \div 2

The information obtained from numbers 1 and 2 above was then used to rank order the competency statements according to average ratings and was grouped according to whether the majority of the directors saw the competencies as being initially developed through a pre-service training program or initially developed on the job.

Those competency statements which received an average rating of 3.5 or above and were seen by 41 percent or more of the directors as being initially developed in a pre-service training program were recommended for use as guidelines for development of college/university training programs for special education directors in Michigan. (See Chapter V, Recommendations, pp. 78-85.)

Those competency areas which did not include at least one competency statement which received an average rating of 3.5 or above and which should be contained in a pre-service training program were deleted from the list of competency areas. The remaining competency areas were recommended for use in the rules for approval of directors of special education in Michigan. (See Chapter V, Recommendations, pp. 78- 85.)

Summary

The author first derived seventeen competency areas for directors of special education which were later revised and consolidated into fifteen competency areas based on data from a preliminary study of activities of directors of special education. On the basis of the review of the literature and the preliminary study, competency statements for each of the competency areas were derived. These seventy-nine competency statements formed the basis for a questionnaire which was sent to all approved directors of special education in Michigan. The directors were asked to indicate whether each competency should initially be developed through a pre-service training program or on the job and were asked to indicate the importance of each competency. These data were then analyzed to determine those competencies which received a high rating (3.5 or above) which were also seen by 41 percent or more of directors as initially being developed in a pre-service training program. The information obtained from that analysis was used to recommend rules for approval of directors of special education and guidelines for development of university training programs in Michigan.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This chapter contains a description of the return rate of the questionnaires, a presentation of the findings as a whole and a discussion of the findings.

Questionnaire Returns

Of the 144 questionnaires mailed to approved special education directors, 112 (78 percent) were returned. Seven of the 112 questionnaires were unusable; five because of incomplete data and two because of late return. Six of the seven unusable questionnaires were from local directors and one from an intermediate director.

Therefore, 105 (73 percent) questionnaires were used in the analysis of results of this study. Of the 50 questionnaires sent to intermediate directors, 43 (86 percent) were used in the analysis and of the 94 questionnaires sent to local directors, 62 (66 percent) were used. The 43 questionnaires from intermediate directors represented 41 percent of the 105 total questionnaires used in the analysis and the 62 questionnaires from local directors represented 59 percent of the 105 questionnaires used.

Description of Data

Initial Competency Development

The directors were asked to evaluate each competency statement in terms of where the initial training of the competency should take place: 1) through a college-university pre-service training program which would include course work, simulation and internship/practicum experiences or 2) on the job (after the completion of the pre-service training program including the internship) which would include in-service training, conferences and literature review as well as actual working experiences.

As seen in Table 1, only eight (10 percent) of the 79 competency statements received 60 percent or more responses of pre-service training. Of these eight competency statements, only three (3 percent of the total) received 70 percent or more responses of pre-service training. A total of 45 (56 percent) of the 79 competency statements received 60 percent or more responses of on-the-job training. Of these 45 competency statements, 25 (31 percent of the total) received 70 percent or more responses of on-the-job training.

The remaining 26 (32 percent) competency statements received close to a 50-50 split between the two possible responses. Of the 26, 14 (17 percent of the total) received responses favoring pre-service training and 12 (15 percent of the total) received responses favoring on-the-job training.

Table 1. Distribution of competency statements according to the preference for initial training.

Competencies	Pre-service			On The Job		
	51-59%	60-100%	Totals	51-59%	60-100%	Totals
Number	14	8	22	12	45	57
Percent	17%	10%	28%	15%	56%	72%

As can be seen in Table 2, there was some variation between intermediate and local directors in response to the initial training question for each competency statement. The 12 competencies with a spread of 16-23 percent, as listed in Appendix C, indicated the most variation. On ten of these 12 competency statements, the local directors indicated a greater preference for pre-service training in the initial development than the intermediate directors. On two of these 12 competency statements, the local directors indicated a greater preference for on-the-job training in the initial development than the intermediate directors. (See Appendix B for complete compilation of data.)

Table 2. Variation between intermediate and local directors according to preference for pre-service training.

Percent Spread	Number of Statements
20-23	1
16-19	11
12-15	4
8-11	21
4- 7	19
0- 3	23
	<u>70</u>

Competency Ratings

The directors were asked to rate the importance of each of the competency statements in the questionnaire on a 1 to 5 rating scale (1 = not important to 5 = crucial). Table 3 indicates the values for each rating category and the number and percent of competency statements receiving each rating.

Table 3. Distribution of competency statements according to their average ratings.

Ratings		Competencies	
Category	Interval	Number	Percent
Crucial	4.5-5.0	1	1%
Very Important	3.5-4.4	62	78%
Some Importance	2.5-3.4	16	20%
Little Importance	1.5-2.4	--	---
No Importance	1.0-1.4	--	---

As seen in Table 3, out of 79 competency statements, only one received a rating of crucial (4.5-5.0). To obtain this rating, at least 50 percent or more of the directors would have to give a 5 rating to the competency. The largest number, 62, of the competency statements were given a rating of very important (3.5-4.4). Only 16 competency statements received a rating of some importance (2.5-3.4) and no competency statements received ratings of little importance (1.5-2.4) and no importance (1.0-1.4).

As can be seen in Table 4, there was little variation between intermediate and local directors in terms of the average ratings given to each competency statement. The 12 competencies with a spread of .4-.7, as listed in Appendix D, indicated the most variation. Five of these 12 competency statements received higher average ratings from intermediate directors than from local directors. Seven of these 12 competency statements received higher average ratings from local directors than from intermediate directors. (See Appendix B for complete compilation of data.)

Table 4. Variation between intermediate and local directors according to ratings of individual competency statements.

Rating Spread	Number of Statements
.6-.7	2
.4-.5	10
.2-.3	37
.0-.1	30
	<u>79</u>

Interrelationships

In order to make a determination as to which of the competency areas and statements would be included in proposed rules and guidelines for special education directors, it was necessary to look at the interrelationship of the initial training preference and the importance rating level for each competency statement.

The first step in this process was to rank order the competency statements by their ratings with the initial training preference indicated for each (see Table 5).

Table 5. Rank order of competency statements by rating with indication of percent of respondents choosing pre-service v. on the job for initial development of competencies.

Competency Statement Number	Rating	Pre-service		On the Job	
		51-59%	60-100%	51-59%	60-100%
5.04	4.5	X			
3.03	4.4				X
14.05	4.4	X			
1.06	4.3			X	
5.03	4.3			X	
7.04	4.3			X	
1.03	4.2	X			
3.04	4.2				X
7.03	4.2				X
1.02	4.1				X
3.01	4.1				X
5.01	4.1	X			
5.05	4.1				X
5.06	4.1				X
5.08	4.1				X
11.05	4.1				X
13.02	4.1				X
1.01	4.0	X			
2.03	4.0		X		
5.07	4.0				X
7.02	4.0				X
14.04	4.0	X			
15.02	4.0				X
1.04	3.9	X			
2.01	3.9	X			
2.02	3.9	X			
2.06	3.9			X	
3.02	3.9				X
4.02	3.9				X
8.01	3.9				X
9.04	3.9				X
10.01	3.9	X			
10.02	3.9	X			
14.06	3.9	X			
2.04	3.8		X		
3.05	3.8				X
3.07	3.8				X
5.02	3.8	X			
7.01	3.8				X
14.03	3.8		X		

Table 5. (cont.)

Competency Statement Number	Rating	Pre-service		On the Job	
		51-59%	60-100%	51-59%	60-100%
1.07	3.7			X	
3.06	3.7			X	
4.05	3.7			X	
5.09	3.7			X	
6.03	3.7				X
6.04	3.7				X
9.01	3.7		X		
13.01	3.7			X	
14.02	3.7			X	
4.04	3.6				X
5.11	3.6				X
8.02	3.6				X
14.01	3.6				X
14.07	3.6	X			
15.01	3.6				X
15.03	3.6				X
2.05	3.5				X
2.07	3.5				X
5.10	3.5				X
9.03	3.5			X	
11.04	3.5				X
12.01	3.5		X		
12.04	3.5		X		
1.05	3.4				X
2.08	3.4				X
4.01	3.4				X
6.01	3.4				X
6.02	3.4				X
12.02	3.4		X		
13.03	3.4				X
11.01	3.3			X	
11.03	3.3				X
12.03	3.3		X		
9.02	3.2				X
11.02	3.2				X
--	3.1				
5.12	3.0				X
13.04	3.0				X
4.03	2.9				X
8.03	2.9				X

The second step involved the setting up of a decision table using the previously tabled ranges (Table 3) for the different categories of ratings. The number of competency statements by the initial training preference was then tabulated for each category of rating (see Table 6).

In establishing priorities for inclusion of competency statements in proposed guidelines, the rating was considered first and then the percentage of directors who considered the competency statements in that rating type to have an initial pre-servicing training component. Because of the original intent to identify competencies which were crucial or very important to the functioning of a special education director, competency statements which received a rating of some importance (2.5-3.4) were rejected for inclusion in the proposed guidelines. Competency statements with between 51 percent and 59 percent of the directors specifying on the job initial training with a very important (3.5-4.4) rating were accepted for inclusion in the proposed guidelines because of the apparent indecision on the part of the total number of directors as to whether or not a pre-service training component was a part of the initial development of these competencies.

Therefore, based on the decision table, the criteria for selection of competency statements for inclusion in proposed guidelines were a 3.5 or higher average rating with 41 percent or more directors indicating a pre-service training preference.

The third step involved listing all of the competency statements which met the above criteria in order by their assigned competency numbers. Then the competency area to which each of these competency statements related was specified. The 11 competency areas thus identified became the competencies to be recommended for inclusion in the proposed rules for

Table 6. Method used to prioritize competency statements for inclusion in proposed state guidelines.

Ratings		Number of Competencies as Related to Respondent's Ratings		Number of Competencies as Related to Initial Development of Competencies							
				Pre-service				On the Job			
				51-59%		60-100%		51-59%		60-100%	
Category	Interval	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Crucial	4.5-5.0	1	1%	1	100%						
Very Important	3.5-4.4	62	78%	13	21%	6	10%	11	18%	32	52%
Some Importance	2.5-3.4	16	20%			2	13%	1	6%	13	81%
Little Importance	1.5-2.4	--	--								
No Importance	1.0-1.4	--	--								

approval of special education directors and the 31 competency statements thus identified became the competencies to be recommended for inclusion in the proposed guidelines for the development of pre-service training programs (see Chapter V, Recommendations, pp. 78-85 for the proposed rules and guidelines). The emphasis that pre-service training programs should place on each of these competencies was recommended on the basis of their average ratings.

Results

Program Development and Evaluation. Out of the seven competency statements included under this competency area, five of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These five competency statements included competencies having to do with proposing the need and rationale for personnel to meet the requirements of mandatory special education, setting up a system for referrals, assessments and educational planning and placement committee meetings, develop a comprehensive career education/vocational education program, developing a system for continuous evaluation of programs, and developing a case finding program for handicapped children and adults not presently in school.

The two competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies dealing with devising an intermediate-wide plan for the location of all special education programs and services, which received a rating of very important but was seen as being initially trained on the job, and developing a summer school program which received the lower rating of some importance.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the components of program development and program evaluation, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Personnel Staffing, Supervision and Evaluation. Out of the eight competency statements included under this competency area, five of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These five competency statements included competencies regarding developing a role description and list of desirable characteristics for each classification of personnel, developing an on-going system for evaluation of personnel, initiating the development and evaluation of a comprehensive curriculum, evaluating performance objectives written by professional personnel, and developing a case for dismissal of an undesirable professional staff member.

The three competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies dealing with developing work, travel and reporting policies for staff and acting as an advisor during staff salary negotiations, which both received a rating of very important, but were seen as being initially trained on the job, and a competency dealing with developing a system for recruitment of personnel which received the lower rating of some importance.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the components of personnel staffing, personnel supervision and personnel evaluation, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Interpersonal Relationships, Communications, Persuasion and Morale. Out of the seven competency statements included under this competency area, only one of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. This competency statement had to do with competency in providing leadership of a meeting discussing crucial issues.

The six competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies regarding development of an on-going system for

the assessment of general climate, morale and working relationships, developing an on-going system of communication, developing a working relationship with the superintendent, developing an on-going system for keeping the school board informed, developing a system whereby regular education staff can easily utilize special education programs and services, and developing a procedure for individual assistance to staff for personal problems. All of these competency statements were rated as very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job.

Since the competency statement meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the components of interpersonal relationships, communications, persuasion and morale, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

In-service Organization and Management. Out of the five competency statements included under this competency area, only one of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. This competency statement had to do with competency in evaluating the ability of a comprehensive in-service program to meet its objectives.

The four competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies dealing with directing and utilizing the talents and expertise of professional staff members to provide in-service education and assessing the in-service needs of regular and special education personnel and parents, which received ratings of very important, but were seen as being initially developed on the job, and competencies dealing with directing and utilizing the Special

Education Instructional Media Center for in-service and utilizing Michigan college and university coursework and faculty for in-service education, which received lower ratings of some importance.

Since the competency statement meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines had to do primarily with the evaluation of in-service, the wording for this competency area was changed to "Evaluation of In-service Organization and Management" prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Budgeting, Financing and Reporting. Out of the 12 competency statements included under this competency area, five of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These five competency statements included competencies regarding developing a budget and completing reports for the utilization of state-allocated federal money, initiating and evaluating the effectiveness of a comprehensive data processing system for current records on all handicapped students, devising a system for disbursement of Act 18 millage to local districts, assessing the financial needs of and developing a comprehensive budget for a district-wide program, and devising a system for reporting and recording expenditures by staff.

The seven competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies dealing with projecting for two years the personnel and general financial needs and resources, estimating the ability of the Act 18 millage to meet financial needs and developing a rationale for its increase, organizing a system for retrieval of information for accurate completion of reporting forms for state records and reimbursement, effectively utilizing the variety of sources

for funding programs, developing a plan for financing the construction and furnishing of a special education building, and preparing contracts and expense reporting forms for programs operated in another district, which received ratings of very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job, and a competency dealing with recommending appropriate insurance, which received the lower rating of some importance.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the components of budgeting, financing and reporting, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Public Relations. Out of the four competency statements included under this competency area, none of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. The competency statements included competencies regarding preparing and delivering speeches and developing an on-going system for public relations with the community which received ratings of very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job, and competencies regarding initiating and evaluating public media news releases on special education and developing and evaluating brochures and other written material for community distribution, which received the lower rating of some importance.

Since there were no competency statements which met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines, this competency area was not included in proposed rules.

Parent Relationships. Out of the four competency statements included under this competency area, only one of them met the criteria

for inclusion in proposed guidelines. This competency statement had to do with competency in developing a system for insuring that the rights of handicapped students and their parents are fully met.

The three competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies dealing with developing an on-going program of consultation for parents, organizing and utilizing a parent advisory committee, and developing a system for maximum support of parents participating in educational planning and placement committee meetings, due process hearings and other school meetings, which received ratings of very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job.

Since the competency statement meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the component of parent relationships, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Transportation Planning and Management. Out of the three competency statements included under this competency area, none of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. The competency statements included competencies regarding developing a comprehensive plan for transporting handicapped students and devising a system to handle interruptions of the normal transportation schedule, which received ratings of very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job, and a competency regarding developing policies for use of transportation vehicles other than to and from school, which received the lower rating of some importance.

Since there were no competency statements which met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines, this competency area was not included in proposed rules.

School Plant Planning and Management. Out of the four competency statements included under this competency area, two of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These competency statements included competencies having to do with providing consultation as to special building needs for housing programs and itinerant services in new school buildings or when renovating old buildings, and recommending and providing sources for obtaining appropriate special furniture and equipment for and recommending the types of facilities needed to house programs and services in regular school buildings.

The two competency statements which did not meet the criteria included a competency dealing with developing policies and procedures for the rapid finding and removal of moderately to severely handicapped students from school buildings in case of fire or other disasters, which received a rating of very important but was seen as being initially trained on the job, and a competency dealing with effective and efficient management and maintenance of special education buildings, which received the lower rating of some importance.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the component of school plant planning but did not contain the component of school plant management, the wording for this competency area was changed to "School Plant Planning" prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Consultation. Out of the two competency statements included under this competency area, both of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These two competency statements included

competencies having to do with providing consultation regarding general diagnostic assessment, placement and instructional techniques and materials and providing individual case consultation.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the component of consultation, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Management and Coordination of Resources. Out of the five competency statements included under this competency area, none of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These competency statements included competencies regarding assessing the potential of the community for work-study placement and developing a system for the effective utilization and evaluation of such placements, and effectively utilizing the services of mental health and other agencies serving the handicapped and coordinating these services with the special education program, which received ratings of very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job; and competencies regarding developing a system for the maximum utilization of a Special Education Instructional Media Center's equipment and materials, developing a system for purchase, inventory and maintenance of furniture, equipment and materials, and developing policies regarding the selection and use of volunteers, which received lower ratings of some importance.

Since there were no competency statements which met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines, this competency area was not included in proposed rules.

Research and Grant Writing. Out of the four competency statements included under this competency area, two of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These competency statements included competencies having to do with writing grant proposals for federal money, and evaluating research results as generated by other investigators and modifying programs and services based on these results.

The two competency statements which did not meet the criteria included competencies dealing with designing, analyzing and reporting the results of a survey and designing, analyzing and reporting the results of research, which received lower ratings of some importance.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the components of research and of grant writing, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Office Management. Out of the four competency statements included under this competency area, only one of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. This competency statement had to do with competency in preparing a yearly plan of terminal objectives for the director, him/herself.

The three competency statements which did not meet the criteria included a competency dealing with organizing and directing the office staff under the director's supervision, which received a rating of very important but was seen as being initially trained on the job, and competencies dealing with developing a space utilization plan for

offices, equipment and storage of materials and developing a plan for purchase, inventory and maintenance of office furniture, equipment and supplies, which received lower ratings of some importance.

Since the competency statement meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the component of office management, no change was made in the wording of this competency area prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

School Related Political Activities, Legal Activities and Due Process Hearings. Out of the seven competency statements included under this competency area, six of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. These competency statements included competencies regarding providing relevant testimony within the director's areas of expertise for civil court proceedings, advising staff as to legal implications of proposed activities, advising hearing officers as to rules and procedures or acting as the hearing officer, correctly interpreting the legal implications of Public Act 198 of 1971 and the Michigan Special Education Code, establishing policies and procedures for the administration of medication, and initiating legal proceedings in child neglect or abuse cases.

The one competency statement which did not meet the criteria had to do with competency in developing an effective liaison with state and federal congressmen, which received a rating of very important but was seen as being initially trained on the job.

Since the competency statements meeting the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines contained the components of school-related legal activities and school-related due process hearings but

did not contain the component of school-related political activities, the wording for this competency area was changed to "School-Related Legal Activities and Due Process Hearings" prior to inclusion in proposed rules.

Professional Activities. Out of the three competency statements included under this competency area, none of them met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines. The competency statements included competencies dealing with developing a plan for personal attendance at conferences and reviews of the literature, developing a plan for obtaining current information on state-wide laws, rules, policies and procedures, and contributing state-wide leadership in special education and related areas, which received ratings of very important but were seen as being initially trained on the job.

Since there were no competency statements which met the criteria for inclusion in proposed guidelines, this competency area was not included in proposed rules.

Discussion

The results of 72 percent of the competencies receiving an on-the-job preference as to initial training is difficult to interpret. There could have been a lack of knowledge on the part of the respondents in terms of the range of possible methods which might be incorporated into a pre-service training program. On the other hand, the respondents may have been clearly indicating a perceived lack of value of training programs in the initial development of competencies necessary to carry out their role as a special education director.

None of the average ratings of the competency statements fell into the ranges of little importance (1.5-2.4) and no importance (1.0-1.4). This appears to support the original premise of this study: that appropriate competencies can be derived from a combination of an extensive review of the literature in terms of training and activities and a study of the current activities of special education directors.

The variation between intermediate and local directors in their preferences for the initial training of the competencies and in the average ratings of the competencies may be due to the extent of experience with and the degree of responsibility for the activities described in these competencies. This could only be determined through a more definitive study of the differences in the activities and responsibilities of intermediate and local directors.

Each of the four competency areas, public relations, transportation planning and management, management and coordination of resources and professional activities, which were not included in proposed rules, had two or more competency statements which received ratings of very important. However, the percentage of directors indicating on-the-job initial training was better than 65 percent for the very important rated competencies in public relations and in management and coordination of resources and better than 80 percent for the very important rated competencies in transportation planning and management and in professional activities. From this type of response, one might postulate that: 1) these competencies have been primarily

learned on the job, and 2) the directors feel reasonably comfortable with the way they are currently performing these activities.

Summary

There were 112 (78 percent) of the 144 questionnaires returned with 105 (73 percent) of these used in the final analysis of the results. Of the 105, 43 (41 percent) represented intermediate directors and 62 (59 percent) represented local directors.

The analysis of the data indicated that 22 (28 percent) of the competency statements received a majority of responses favoring pre-service initial training and 57 (72 percent) received a majority of responses favoring on-the-job initial training. Some variation was noted between intermediate and local directors in the preference for the initial training of the competencies. Of the 79 total competency statements, only 1 (1 percent) received an average rating of crucial (4.5-5.0), 62 (78 percent) received an average rating of very important (3.5-4.4), 16 (20 percent) received an average rating of some importance (2.5-3.4) and no competency statements received average ratings of little importance (1.5-2.4) and no importance (1.0-1.4). Little variation was noted between intermediate and local directors in the average ratings of the competencies.

A determination of the competency statements to be recommended for inclusion in proposed guidelines was made on the basis of the interrelationship between the initial training preference and the average rating of importance. Of the 79 competency statements, 31 were identified for inclusion in the proposed guidelines for

development of pre-service training programs for special education directors. There were 15 original competency areas, 11 of which were related to the 31 competency statements. These 11 competency areas were, therefore, recommended for inclusion in the proposed rules for approval of special education directors. Recommended emphasis on the competencies within pre-service training programs was based on their average ratings.

The apparent preference for on-the-job training was seen as possibly related to two factors: 1) a lack of understanding of the capabilities of the pre-service programs, and/or 2) a perceived lack of value of pre-service training programs in the initial development of competencies necessary to carry out the role of a special education director. The fact that no competency statements received ratings of little importance and no importance was seen as supporting the method used in this study for the development of competencies. The variation between intermediate and local directors in the preferences for initial training and in the average ratings of importance was seen as a possible factor of experience with and responsibility for the activities designated in the competency statements. The four competency areas which were not included in proposed rules each included some competency statements which received ratings of very important. The perceived lack of need for a pre-service training component within the development of these highly rated competencies was seen as an indication of satisfaction with the way these activities are currently being performed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to generate competency areas and competency statements which would be appropriate for use as rules for approval of Michigan special education directors and guidelines for the development of pre-service training programs to qualify persons as special education directors in Michigan. The need for the study was indicated by the emphasis placed on competency-based training programs for professional educators by the State of Michigan and by the lack of research designed to elicit from practicing administrators of special education their views as to the appropriate means for the initial development of specific competencies and as to the crucial competencies for inclusion in pre-service training programs. The study proposed to develop the first two steps in a series of four leading to the validation of competencies for inclusion in a pre-service training program for special education directors.

The review of the literature focused primarily on two major topics: 1) standards and recommended content for special education administration training programs and 2) role, tasks, functions and activities of administrators of special education. This review indicated that initial attempts have been made to describe through research

the activities or tasks of administrators of special education, but that little has been done to describe through research the competencies needed in pre-service training programs for these administrators.

The 15 competency areas and 79 competency statements, which were finally included in a questionnaire sent to the 144 approved directors of special education in Michigan, were derived from the literature review and from a preliminary study, conducted by this author, of the activities of six intermediate and local directors of special education in Michigan. The questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate for each competency statement: 1) whether the competency should initially be developed through a pre-service training program or on the job and 2) the importance of the competency to their functioning as a director of special education. Intermediate and local directors were given equal weighting in the analysis and reporting of the data.

Out of the 144 questionnaires sent, 105 (73 percent) were used in analyzing the data. A majority of directors recommended on the job initial development for 57 (72 percent) of the competencies and pre-service initial development for 22 (28 percent) of the competencies. No competency statements received an average rating of no importance (1.0-1.4) and little importance (1.5-2.4), 16 (20 percent) received an average rating of some importance (2.5-3.4), 62 (78 percent) received an average rating of very important (3.5-4.4) and 1 (1 percent) received an average rating of crucial (4.5-5.0). There was some variation between intermediate and local directors in preferences for initial development of competency statements and in average ratings of competency statements.

Selection of competency areas and statements for inclusion in proposed rules and guidelines for special education directors was made on the basis of two criteria: 1) average ratings of very important to crucial (3.5-5.0) and 2) percentages of preference for pre-service training of 41 percent - 100 percent. Of the 79 competency statements, 31 were identified for inclusion in the proposed guidelines for development of pre-service training programs, and of the 15 competency areas, 11 were identified for inclusion in the proposed rules for approval of special education directors in Michigan

Recommendations

Proposed Rules for Approval

The following is recommended for inclusion in the Michigan rules for approval of special education directors:

College or university credit shall be distributed appropriately to assure knowledge and competency in the following areas:

1. Program Development and Evaluation.
2. Personnel Staffing, Supervision and Evaluation.
3. Interpersonal Relationships, Communications, Persuasion and Morale.
4. Evaluation of In-service Organization and Management.
5. Budgeting, Financing and Reporting.
6. Parent Relationships.
7. School Plant Planning.
8. Consultation.
9. Research and Grant Writing.
10. Office Management.
11. School-Related Legal Activities and Due Process Hearings.

Proposed Guidelines for Pre-service Training Programs

The following is recommended for state adoption as guidelines for the development of pre-service training programs for directors of special education:

Guidelines

Emphasis on Competency
Within Training Program
Based on Ratings

1.0 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

- | | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 1.01 | Given the school age population of a district and utilizing projections for pre-primary (0-5) and post secondary (17-25) population, the director can list and give a rationale for the number and types of personnel required by Michigan's P.A. 198 of 1971 (Mandatory Special Education) to carry out a comprehensive program for all disabilities as defined in the Michigan Special Education Code. | 4.0 |
| 1.02 | Given an intermediate school district and its constituent districts, the director can devise a system for referrals, assessments and educational planning and placement meetings which takes into account entrance into, changes of levels and services within and exit from special education programs and services and which minimizes waiting time for each procedure to occur. | 4.2 |
| 1.03 | Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a comprehensive career education/vocational education program for handicapped students from primary through post secondary which meets the Michigan rules and guidelines for such programs and can identify the resources required to carry out the program at each level, utilizing both regular and special education programs and services. | 3.9 |
| 1.04 | Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an on-going system for continuous evaluation of that program as to the extent it meets the Intermediate District Plan and the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines based on the Michigan Accountability System. | 4.3 |

Guidelines

Emphasis on Competency
Within Training Program
Based on Ratings

-
- | | | |
|--|---|-----|
| 1.05 | Given an intermediate district and its constituent districts, the director can develop a case finding program for handicapped children and adults of pre-primary and post-secondary ages who are not presently in school but who may be eligible for special education programs and services as mandated by P.A. 198 of 1971 and the Michigan Special Education Code. | 3.7 |
| 2.0 PERSONNEL STAFFING, SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION | | |
| 2.01 | Given the various classifications of special education professional and non-professional personnel as defined by Michigan for reimbursement, the director can develop a role description and a list of desirable characteristics for each classification of personnel and can effectively utilize these in the hiring procedure for such personnel. | 3.9 |
| 2.02 | Given the various classifications of special education professional and non-professional personnel, the director can develop an ongoing system for objective evaluation of such personnel which includes written reports and personal observation and which includes the necessary components to meet the requirements of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act when necessary. | 3.9 |
| 2.03 | Given the handicaps as defined in the Michigan Special Education Code, the director can initiate the development of a comprehensive curriculum which includes career education/vocational education for each of the handicaps at all levels from pre-primary through post-secondary, utilizing both regular and special education programs, and can evaluate it in terms of meeting the | 4.0 |

Guidelines

requirements of Michigan law, the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines and the Michigan State-Wide Performance Objectives.

- | | | |
|--|--|-----|
| 2.04 | Given the Michigan Special Education Code requirement of performance objectives for each special education student, the director can evaluate the performance objectives written by professional personnel as to their structure, content and applicability to the students for whom they are written. | 3.8 |
| 2.05 | Given an undesirable professional staff member, the director can develop a case for dismissal which meets the requirements of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act and carry the dismissal procedures through to conclusion. | 3.9 |
| 3.0 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, COMMUNICATIONS, PERSUASION AND MORALE | | |
| 3.01 | Given the leadership of a meeting discussing issues crucial to the special education program, the director can keep the discussion focused on the topic, can provide all participants with the opportunity to contribute, and can elicit suggestions and/or decisions on appropriate action to be taken. | 3.7 |
| 4.0 EVALUATION OF IN-SERVICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT | | |
| 4.01 | Given a comprehensive special education in-service program, the director can effectively evaluate the ability of that program to meet its objectives. | 3.7 |
| 5.0 BUDGETING, FINANCING AND REPORTING | | |
| 5.01 | Given federal money allocated through the State, the director can develop a budget and complete the reports for | 4.1 |

Guidelines

Emphasis on Competency
Within Training Program
Based on Ratings

the utilization of the allocation in such a manner as meets the requirements of the Michigan Department of Education.

- | | | |
|------|---|------|
| 5.02 | Given the Michigan Special Education Code requirement of current records on all handicapped students in the intermediate district, the director can initiate and evaluate the effectiveness of a comprehensive data processing system, either computer or hand recorded, which system facilitates record keeping and provides for rapid retrieval of any portion or all of the data. | 3.8 |
| 5.03 | Given the intermediate district Act 18 millage, the director can devise a system for disbursement of funds to local district special education programs and services which provides for easy documentation of local program expenditures and which provides for equitable reimbursement of costs not reimbursed by the State. | 4.3 |
| 5.04 | Given a district-wide special education program, the director can assess the financial needs and can develop a comprehensive budget to meet those needs for the following school year, utilizing projections on state and federal reimbursement, on salary and benefit increases and on other cost increases, which budget has no more than a small overall error in the final computation of assets and liabilities. | 4.5* |
| 5.05 | Given a special education budget, the director can develop a system for reporting and recording, either by hand or computer, expenditures by special education personnel which can be easily totaled and retrieved on a monthly basis. | 3.7 |

*Crucial Competency

Guidelines	Emphasis on Competency Within Training Program Based on Ratings
6.0 PARENT RELATIONSHIPS	
6.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a system for insuring that the rights of the handicapped students and their parents are fully met as specified in the Michigan Special Education Code.	4.3
7.0 SCHOOL PLANT PLANNING	
7.01 Given a proposal for a new school building or renovation of an old building, the director can provide consultation to the superintendent, the school board and the architect as to special building needs for housing special education programs and itinerant services, including information on barrier-free architecture, appropriate room and elevator braille markings for the blind and other facility modification needs specific to various handicapping conditions.	3.7
7.02 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can recommend and provide sources for obtaining appropriate special furniture and equipment needed by the various types of special education programs and services and can recommend the types of facilities needed to house the various special education programs and services in regular school buildings.	3.5
8.0 CONSULTATION	
8.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can provide consultation to the special education personnel, the principals and the regular education teachers regarding general diagnostic assessment, placement and	3.9

Guidelines

Emphasis on Competency
Within Training Program
Based on Ratings

instructional techniques and materials for all disability areas as designated by the Special Education Code and Guidelines.

- | | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 8.02 | Given a district-wide special education program, the director can provide individual case consultation regarding diagnostic assessment, instructional techniques and materials, and placement in any disability area either through individual meetings with special and regular education personnel or as a member of an educational planning and placement committee. | 3.9 |
|------|---|-----|

9.0 RESEARCH AND GRANT WRITING

- | | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 9.01 | Given the availability of federal money through direct application, the director can write a grant proposal which meets the requirements of the agency disbursing the funds. | 3.5 |
| 9.02 | Given research results in special education and related fields as generated by other investigators, the director can evaluate these results and can modify special education programs and services based on these results where deemed applicable and desirable. | 3.5 |

10.0 OFFICE MANAGEMENT

- | | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 10.01 | Given a district-wide program, the director can prepare a yearly plan of terminal objectives for him/herself which can be broken down into enabling objectives with times lines for accomplishing each enabling objective, which plan acts as a guide in setting priorities for scheduling his/her activities, including correspondence and reports, on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. | 3.7 |
|-------|--|-----|

Guidelines

Emphasis on Competency
Within Training Program
Based on Ratings11.0 SCHOOL-RELATED LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND DUE
PROCESS HEARINGS

- | | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 11.01 | Given a civil suit or other court proceedings relating to special education programs and services, the director can provide relevant testimony within his areas of expertise concerning the contested issues in the case. | 3.7 |
| 11.02 | Given proposed activities by special education personnel, the director can advise them as to possible legal implications of such activities. | 3.8 |
| 11.03 | Given a due process hearing, the director can advise the hearing officer and other concerned persons as to the rules, regulations and procedures for correctly carrying out such a hearing as required by the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines or can, if so designated, act as the hearing officer him/herself. | 4.0 |
| 11.04 | Given Public Act 198 of 1971 and the Michigan Special Education Code, the director can correctly interpret the legal implications of these documents as they affect the district and its programs and services for handicapped students and can advise the district accordingly. | 4.4 |
| 11.05 | Given the need to administer medication to some handicapped students during the school day, the director can establish policies and procedures for its administration which conform to existing Michigan laws. | 3.9 |
| 11.06 | Given child neglect or abuse, need for change of custody, etc., the director can correctly initiate the appropriate legal proceedings to ensure the best interests of the students involved. | 3.6 |

In-service Training

It is recommended that when the Michigan Department of Education and/or the Michigan colleges and universities plan to conduct in-service training programs for special education directors, they review those competency statements, included in this study, which received a rating of very important to crucial. This should be of assistance in setting priorities for the content of proposed in-service programs.

General Discussion

The rules and guidelines generated by this study appear, to this author, to be the most comprehensive and job-related set of competencies thus far generated by any study. The use of a review of the literature in combination with a current study of daily activities gave the author a broad range of material on which to draw for the writing of competencies. The use of currently-employed directors of special education to respond to the competencies ensured that the competencies recommended for inclusion in a training program would have meaning and use for those persons who were about to enter this professional field. In spite of the fact that the respondents were urged to suggest additions and changes to the competency areas and statements on the questionnaire, none were made. This further supports the comprehensiveness of these items as they were written.

The validation of these rules and guidelines can, in the final analysis, only come through the initiation of training programs designed to develop the competencies and through comparing the

evaluations of directors who have completed these training programs with evaluations of directors who have completed other types of training programs. However, care must be taken in this validation process in that performance objectives written for each of these competencies must specifically spell out the skills to be developed, the methods for evaluating these skills, the conditions under which they will be evaluated, and the proficiency levels which must be obtained. Furthermore, the evaluation procedure to be used to follow-up graduates of training programs must be constructed in such a way that a true picture of the functioning of the graduates can be obtained and compared. Without careful study in the development of the final two steps of the validation process, little will have been gained from the generation of these competencies.

The building of competency-based training programs must be seen as an ever-changing process. As the theory base changes and as the role of the professional educator changes, new competencies must emerge and old competencies must be updated if, in fact, the training program is to meet the needs of its students. To write competencies so broad as to encompass all possible changes is to leave us in the same position as we have been for years--with nothing specific enough on which to hang our hat. Only by getting down to specifics can we motivate changes in training programs and evaluate results. But by being specific, we must also be aware of changes taking place and be flexible enough to incorporate those changes when necessary.

The high percentage of competencies seen by directors of special education as being initially trained on the job should act

as a word of warning to training institutions to make a careful study of present training practices. Knowledge and theories presented, which are not grounded in the opportunity for practice, may have little carryover to on-the-job functioning and may thereby be seen as having little value. One year internships with specific job responsibilities related to coursework and seminars, which are being conducted concurrently with the internship, might be one vehicle for providing this practical application of theory and knowledge. Certainly some major revamping of training practices will have to take place if true competency-based training is to take place.

Implications for Future Research

The following might be areas of interest for future research in special education administration:

1. The perceived adequacy of pre-service training programs to prepare special education administrators as viewed by practicing administrators.
2. The variations in the role, tasks and functions between intermediate and local directors of special education in Michigan.
3. Competencies for supervisors of special education which could be incorporated into rules for approval and guidelines for pre-service training programs.
4. The development of specific performance objectives for each of the competencies in the proposed guidelines to be used in the development of training programs for directors of special education in Michigan.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, P. R. and Geer, W. C. Design for organizing and administering special education. In J. W. Birch (Ed.), Designs for organizing and administering special education; proceedings of a cooperative work-conference. (Atwood Lodge, Dellroy, Ohio, May 9-10, 1968). MF: ED031006.
- Blessing, K. R. and Milazzo, T. C. The training of directors and supervisors of special education programs. Exceptional Children, 1964, 31, 129-141.
- Catalina, T. M. Preparation of special education administrators based on knowledges, competencies, skills and experiences considered essential. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969. No. 71-29,950.
- Connor, L. E. Administration of special education programs. TC series in special education. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1961, 54-82.
- Connor, L. E. Preparation programs for special education administrators. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 161-166. As reprinted in C. H. Meisgeier and J. D. King, The process of special education administration. Penn.: International Textbook Company, 1970, 369-380.
- Gallagher, J. J. Advanced graduate training in special education. Exceptional Children, 1959, 26, 104-109.
- Gearheart, B. R. Administration of special education; a guide for general administrators and special educators. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1967.
- Graham, R. A guide--directing the education for exceptional children in a local school district. Functions of the director of special education. State of Illinois, Superintendent of Public Instruction. As reprinted in C. H. Meisgeier and J. D. King, The process of special education administration. Penn.: International Textbook Company, 1970, 410-438.
- Guidelines for Wisconsin's directors, coordinators and supervisors of special education. 1969. MF: ED036930.

- Harris, G. A. An investigation of the preparation patterns and administrative activities of special education directors in Michigan. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969. No. 69-20,869.
- Haskew, L. D. Common and specialized learning. Proceedings of the National Conference--Common and Specialized Learnings, Competencies, and Experiences for Special Education Administrators, 1969, 13-22.
- Henderson, R. A. Preparation of administrators and supervisors of special education. Paper presented at the 46th Annual C.E.C. Convention, Denver, April, 1968. As reprinted in C. H. Meisgeier and J. D. King, The process of special education administration. Penn.: International Textbook Company, 1970, 381-389.
- Henley, C. E. Designing a college program in special education administration. Paper presented at the 45th Annual C.E.C. Convention, St. Louis, March, 1967.
- Henley, C. E. A national perspective--preparation programs in special education administration. Proceedings of the National Conference--Common and Specialized Learnings, Competencies, and Experiences for Special Education Administrators, 1969, 37-45.
- Kohl, J. W. and Marro, T. D. A normative study of the administrative position in special education. Final Report. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Projects and Program Research Branch, March, 1971. Project No. 482266. MF: ED058679.
- Kothera, R. J. A criterion and set of reality based problems for simulation in special education administration. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1967. No.
- Mackie, R. P. and Engel, A. M. Directors and supervisors of special education in local school systems. Bulletin No. 13. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955.
- Michigan Department of Education, Special Education Services. Michigan special education code. Lansing, Michigan, October, 1973.

Newman, K. S. Administrative tasks in special education. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 521-524.

Professional standards for personnel in the education of exceptional children. Professional standards project report. Washington, D.C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1966. Stock No. 551-20944. MF: ED017085.

Willenberg, E. P. Administration of special education: aspects of a professional problem. Exceptional Children, 1964, 30, 194-195.

Willower, D. J. Special Education: organization and administration. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 591-594.

Wisland, M. V. and Vaughan, T. D. Administrative problems in special education. Exceptional Children, 1964, 31, 87-89.

Wright, W. S. A model for competency-based administrative training. Paper presented at the 51st Annual C.E.C. Convention, Dallas, April, 1973.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

East Lansing, Michigan 48824

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire concerning the competencies needed by a director of special education which is a part of my dissertation study. The purpose of this study is to gather information from you, the person who is doing the job, so that more appropriate competency areas may be designated in the rules for state approval of special education directors and so that guidelines can be developed for university training programs.

I strongly feel that you should be the one to help develop these proposed changes to the rules and these proposed guidelines because you have had the practical experience and really know what the needs are. I realize that this will take from 1 to 1 1/2 hours out of your busy schedule, but your contribution to future administrative trainees will be invaluable.

Rule 340.1771 of the Special Education Code has been approved by the State Board of Education for hearings on changes. These hearings are tentatively scheduled for December. If I can process your questionnaire in time, I can prepare testimony to be presented at the hearings. In order to do this, I need to have your questionnaire returned no later than 10 days from the date you received it.

Please mark your answers on the enclosed answer sheet which has been provided with the questionnaire so that I can machine process your answers. All information received is strictly confidential and you and your district will not be identified by name in any forthcoming reports on this data. If you have any questions concerning this questionnaire, please feel free to call me at either of the phone numbers listed on the last page of the questionnaire.

I greatly appreciate your contribution to this study and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

M. Diane Hodson

MDH/am

Enclosure

Michigan State University
Department of Elementary and Special Education
301 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

COMPETENCIES FOR THE SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS.

Below you will find a list of major competency areas with their corresponding competency statements. For each competency statement, you will find two questions to answer:

1. The first question asks you to indicate where you believe the **initial** development of each competency should take place -- (a) through a college/university preservice training program which would include course work, simulation and internship/practicum experiences or (b) on the job (after the completion of the preservice training program including the internship) which would include inservice training, conferences and literature review as well as actual working experiences.
2. The second question asks you to rate the importance of each competency to the functioning of the local/intermediate director of special education on a 1 to 5 rating scale (5 = crucial to 1 = not important).

Please use the enclosed answer sheet to mark your responses to each competency statement. Carefully follow the numbering that is in **bold type** in the answer columns following each competency statement.

<p>PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] 2 [3] [4] [5] with a no. 2 pencil. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.</p>	<p>INITIAL TRAINING 1. Preservice Training Program 2. On the Job</p>	<p>IMPORTANCE 5. Crucial 4. Very Important 3. Some Importance 2. Little Importance 1. Not Important</p>
<p>1.0 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION</p>		
<p>1.01 Given the school age population of a district and utilizing projections for pre-primary (0-5) and post-secondary (17-25) population, the director can list and give a rationale for the number and types of personnel required by Michigan's P.A. 198 of 1971 (Mandatory Special Education) to carry out a comprehensive program for all disabilities as defined in the Michigan Special Education Code.</p>	<p>1. 1 2</p>	<p>2. 5 4 3 2 1</p>
<p>1.02 Given an intermediate district and its constituent districts, the director can devise an intermediate - wide plan for the location of all special education programs and services which distributes these programs and services according to density of population, high need areas, location of facilities and minimum transportation required, taking into account all levels from pre-primary through post secondary.</p>	<p>3. 1 2</p>	<p>4. 5 4 3 2 1</p>
<p>1.03 Given an intermediate school district and its constituent districts, the director can devise a system for referrals, assessments and educational planning and placement meetings which takes into account entrance into, changes of levels and services within and exit from special education programs and services and which minimizes waiting time for each procedure to occur.</p>	<p>5. 1 2</p>	<p>6. 5 4 3 2 1</p>
<p>1.04 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a comprehensive career education/vocational education program for handicapped students from primary through post secondary which meets the Michigan rules and guidelines for such programs and can identify the resources required to carry out the program at each level, utilizing both regular and special education programs and services.</p>	<p>7. 1 2</p>	<p>8. 5 4 3 2 1</p>

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a **no. 2 pencil**. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

- 1.05 Given a school district, the director can develop a special education summer school program which meets the greatest needs of the handicapped students in that district.
- 1.06 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an on-going system for continuous evaluation of that program as to the extent it meets the Intermediate District Plan and the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines based on the Michigan Accountability System.
- 1.07 Given an intermediate district and its constituent districts, the director can develop a case finding program for handicapped children and adults of pre-primary and post-secondary ages who are not presently in school but who may be eligible for special education programs and services as mandated by P.A. 198 of 1971 and the Michigan Special Education Code.

9.

1 2

10.

5 4 3 2 1

11.

1 2

12.

5 4 3 2 1

13.

1 2

14.

5 4 3 2 1

2.0 PERSONNEL STAFFING, SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

- 2.01 Given the various classifications of special education professional and non-professional personnel as defined by Michigan for reimbursement, the director can develop a role description and a list of desirable characteristics for each classification of personnel and can effectively utilize these in the hiring procedure for such personnel.
- 2.02 Given the various classifications of special education professional and non-professional personnel, the director can develop an ongoing system for objective evaluation of such personnel which includes written reports and personal observation and which includes the necessary components to meet the requirements of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act when necessary.
- 2.03 Given the handicaps as defined in the Michigan Special Education Code, the director can initiate the development of a comprehensive curriculum which includes career education/vocational education for each of the handicaps at all levels from pre-primary through post-secondary, utilizing both regular and special education programs, and can evaluate it in terms of meeting the requirements of Michigan law, the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines and the Michigan State-Wide Performance Objectives,
- 2.04 Given the Michigan Special Education Code requirement of performance objectives for each special education student, the director can evaluate the performance objectives written by professional personnel as to their structure, content and applicability to the students for whom they are written.
- 2.05 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop policies concerning work and time schedules, work loads, attendance and absences, in-district and out-of-district travel, reporting and other procedures as related to the special education personnel.
- 2.06 Given an undesirable professional staff member, the director can develop a case for dismissal which meets the requirements of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act and carry the dismissal procedures through to conclusion.
- 2.07 Given salary negotiations in a district, the director can act as an advisor to the superintendent and board as the negotiations affect the special education personnel and can provide information to the special education personnel that is deemed permissible and necessary.

15.

1 2

16.

5 4 3 2 1

17.

1 2

18.

5 4 3 2 1

19.

1 2

20.

5 4 3 2 1

21.

1 2

22.

5 4 3 2 1

23.

1 2

24.

5 4 3 2 1

25.

1 2

26.

5 4 3 2 1

27.

1 2

28.

5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a no. 2 pencil. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

2.08 Given a shortage of special education personnel, the director can develop a system for state-wide and nation-wide recruitment of personnel which produces the needed qualified personnel to fill allocated positions no later than the beginning of the school year or no later than one month following vacancy of a position during the school year.

29.

1 2

30.

5 4 3 2 1

3.0 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, COMMUNICATIONS, PERSUASION AND MORALE

3.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an on-going system for the assessment of the general climate, morale and working relationships of the special education personnel with each other and with the general education personnel and can take effective action to develop the positive aspects and alleviate any negative factors.

31.

1 2

32.

5 4 3 2 1

3.02 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can devise an on-going system of communication with professional and non-professional special and regular education personnel which includes such components as meetings, memorandums posted announcements, newsletters, etc. which facilitate the implementation and coordination of special education programs and services and which effectively keep these personnel informed of all matters which directly or indirectly concern their functioning.

33.

1 2

34.

5 4 3 2 1

3.03 Given a superintendent of a district, the director can develop a working relationship with that person which facilitates and supports the special education district-wide program and can prepare written and oral reports and memorandums that effectively keep that person informed of every aspect of the special education program.

35.

1 2

36.

5 4 3 2 1

3.04 Given a school board of a district, the director can develop an on-going system for keeping the board informed of all aspects of the special education district-wide program and what it is trying to accomplish, and can prepare written and oral reports with appropriate documentation and rationale that the board can readily understand and upon which it can pass informed judgements.

37.

1 2

38.

5 4 3 2 1

3.05 Given regular education staff, the director can develop a system by which these persons can easily utilize special education programs and services to meet the needs of their handicapped students and students whom they suspect of having handicaps, and can prepare written communications which serve as readily-available and easily-understood resources for information as to how they may utilize the system.

39.

1 2

40.

5 4 3 2 1

3.06 Given the leadership of a meeting discussing issues crucial to the special education program, the director can keep the discussion focused on the topic, can provide all participants with the opportunity to contribute, and can elicit suggestions and/or decisions on appropriate action to be taken.

41.

1 2

42.

5 4 3 2 1

3.07 Given personal problems of special education personnel which may affect functioning on the job, the director can develop a procedure whereby personnel can receive individual assistance whenever necessary to maintain these personnel as effective workers.

43.

1 2

44.

5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a **no. 2 pencil**. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

4.0 INSERVICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

- 4.01 Given a Special Education Instructional Media Center in conjunction with a Regional Education Media Service, the director can direct and utilize these services to provide on-going inservice education to special and regular education staff, administrators and parents.
- 4.02 Given the special education professional personnel in a district, the director can direct and utilize their particular talents and expertise to provide on-going inservice education to each other and to the parents and the regular education staff.
- 4.03 Given the colleges and universities in Michigan which offer special education training programs, the director can develop a system for dissemination of information to the special education staff as to course work currently being offered on campus and through extension services and can effectively utilize and select appropriate college and university faculty members to provide inservice education within the district itself.
- 4.04 Given a school district, the director can assess the needs of the special education and regular education teachers and administrators and the parents for special education inservice training and can organize a comprehensive inservice program to meet these needs utilizing a variety of resources.
- 4.05 Given a comprehensive special education inservice program, the director can effectively evaluate the ability of that program to meet its objectives.

45.

1 2

46.

5 4 3 2 1

47.

1 2

48.

5 4 3 2 1

49.

1 2

50.

5 4 3 2 1

51.

1 2

52.

5 4 3 2 1

53.

1 2

54.

5 4 3 2 1

5.0 BUDGETING, FINANCING AND REPORTING

- 5.01 Given federal money allocated through the State, the director can develop a budget and complete the reports for the utilization of the allocation in such a manner as meets the requirements of the Michigan Department of Education.
- 5.02 Given the Michigan Special Education Code requirement of current records on all handicapped students in the intermediate district, the director can initiate and evaluate the effectiveness of a comprehensive data processing system, either computer or hand recorded, which system facilitates record keeping and provides for rapid retrieval of any portion or all of the data.
- 5.03 Given the intermediate district Act 18 millage, the director can devise a system for disbursement of funds to local district special education programs and services which provides for easy documentation of local program expenditures and which provides for equitable reimbursement of costs not reimbursed by the State.
- 5.04 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can assess the financial needs and can develop a comprehensive budget to meet those needs for the following school year, utilizing projections on state and federal reimbursement, on salary and benefit increases and on other cost increases, which budget has no more than a small overall error in the final computation of assets and liabilities.

55.

1 2

56.

5 4 3 2 1

57.

1 2

58.

5 4 3 2 1

59.

1 2

60.

5 4 3 2 1

61.

1 2

62.

5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a no. 2 pencil. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

5.05	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can project the personnel and general financial needs and resources for the second school year beyond the current one in which he is operating.	63. 1 2	64. 5 4 3 2 1
5.06	Given the intermediate district Act 18 millage, the director can estimate the ability of that millage to meet the financial needs of the special education programs in the intermediate district and its constituent districts and can develop a rationale for its increase which can be understood and supported by other educational personnel, the intermediate and constituent school district boards and the general population.	65. 1 2	66. 5 4 3 2 1
5.07	Given the reporting forms for State records and reimbursement, the director can organize a system for the retrieval of necessary information and can accurately complete those forms to the satisfaction of the Michigan Department of Education.	67. 1 2	68. 5 4 3 2 1
5.08	Given a wide variety of sources for funding special education programs, the director can effectively and maximally utilize all of these sources in the funding of the district's special education program.	69. 1 2	70. 5 4 3 2 1
5.09	Given a special education budget, the director can develop a system for reporting and recording, either by hand or computer, expenditures by special education personnel which can be easily totaled and retrieved on a monthly basis.	71. 1 2	72. 5 4 3 2 1
5.10	Given the need for a building for special education students, the director can develop a plan for financing the construction and furnishing of such a building, including recommendations for bonding proposals.	73. 1 2	74. 5 4 3 2 1
5.11	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can prepare contracts and expense reporting forms for the special education programs for that district's handicapped students which are delivered in another district.	75. 1 2	76. 5 4 3 2 1
5.12	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can recommend appropriate insurance to cover all necessary phases of that program and transportation to and from that program.	77. 1 2	78. 5 4 3 2 1
6.0 PUBLIC RELATIONS			
6.01	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can initiate and evaluate the effectiveness of radio, television and newspaper releases which keep the community informed and supportive of the purposes of mandatory special education in general and of special events related to educational programming for handicapped students.	79. 1 2	80. 5 4 3 2 1
6.02	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can initiate the development and evaluate the effectiveness of brochures and other written material concerning the identification of handicapped students and the educational programs available to them for distribution to the medical profession and community agencies who have contact with children and adults of pre-primary and post secondary ages.	81. 1 2	82. 5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a **no. 2 pencil**. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

**INITIAL
TRAINING**

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

6.03 Given the various community civic organizations and other interested groups, the director can effectively prepare and deliver speeches which provide information about and develop support for special education and its purposes, the means of and needs for funding and other related topics of interest.

83.

1 2

84.

5 4 3 2 1

6.04 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an on-going system for public relations with the community which produces informed and active support of the special education program, purposes and needs.

85.

1 2

86.

5 4 3 2 1

7.0 PARENT RELATIONSHIPS

7.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an on-going program of consultation for parents of handicapped students through individual and group meetings both in the school and in the home.

87.

1 2

88.

5 4 3 2 1

7.02 Given an intermediate district special education program, the director can organize and effectively utilize a parent advisory committee to assist in the development of the intermediate district plan and in the development of other aspects of special education programs and services.

89.

1 2

90.

5 4 3 2 1

7.03 Given educational planning and placement committee meetings, due process hearings and other school meetings in which parents of handicapped students participate, the director can develop a system for the maximum support of the parents to assist them in effectively utilizing and participating in such meetings with a minimum of personal discomfort.

91.

1 2

92.

5 4 3 2 1

7.04 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a system for insuring that the rights of the handicapped students and their parents are fully met as specified in the Michigan Special Education Code.

93.

1 2

94.

5 4 3 2 1

8.0 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

8.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a comprehensive plan for transporting handicapped students which makes maximum use of existing transportation vehicles and routes, involves a minimum of transportation and waiting time for the students and delivers and picks up the students at times that ensure them a full day of school.

95.

1 2

96.

5 4 3 2 1

8.02 Given the need to transport handicapped students, the director can devise a system to handle non-attendance of students, transportation breakdowns, severe weather problems and other situations which may arise on short notice, including medical and other emergencies.

97.

1 2

98.

5 4 3 2 1

8.03 Given special education transportation vehicles, the director can develop policies for their use other than transporting students to and from school.

99.

1 2

100.

5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a **no. 2 pencil**. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

9.0 SCHOOL PLANT PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

9.01 Given a proposal for a new school building or renovation of an old building, the director can provide consultation to the superintendent, the school board and the architect as to special building needs for housing special education programs and itinerant services, including information on barrier-free architecture, appropriate room and elevator braille markings for the blind and other facility modification needs specific to various handicapping conditions.

101.

1 2

102.

5 4 3 2 1

9.02 Given a special education building, the director can develop a plan for effective and efficient management and maintenance of that building, can develop policies as to its school-related and non-school related use and can organize a lunch program and other food services for that building.

103.

1 2

104.

5 4 3 2 1

9.03 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can recommend and provide sources for obtaining appropriate special furniture and equipment needed by the various types of special education programs and services and can recommend the types of facilities needed to house the various special education programs and services in regular school buildings.

105.

1 2

106.

5 4 3 2 1

9.04 Given moderately to severely handicapped students, the director can develop policies and procedures for the rapid finding and removal of those students from school buildings in case of fire or other disasters and can provide practice for the students and personnel involved.

107.

1 2

108.

5 4 3 2 1

10.0 CONSULTATION

10.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can provide consultation to the special education personnel, the principals and the regular education teachers regarding general diagnostic assessment, placement and instructional techniques and materials for all disability areas as designated by the Special Education Code and Guidelines.

109.

1 2

110.

5 4 3 2 1

10.02 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can provide individual case consultation regarding diagnostic assessment, instructional techniques and materials, and placement in any disability area either through individual meetings with special and regular education personnel or as a member of an educational planning and placement committee.

111.

1 2

112.

5 4 3 2 1

11.0. MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF RESOURCES

11.01 Given a Special Education Instructional Media Center in conjunction with a Regional Education Media Service, the director can develop a system for the maximum utilization of the center's equipment and materials by handicapped students in regular and special education classrooms.

113.

1 2

114.

5 4 3 2 1

11.02 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a system for purchase, inventory and maintenance of all special education furniture, equipment and materials and for rapid replacement of damaged and expended items.

115.

1 2

116.

5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a **no. 2 pencil**. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

- 11.03 Given the need and availability of volunteer assistance to special education programs, the director can develop policies regarding the selection and use of volunteers in special education programs.
- 11.04 Given a school district and community, the director can assess the potential for community work-study placements of secondary level handicapped students and can develop a system for the effective utilization and evaluation of such placements.
- 11.05 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can effectively utilize the services of mental health, public health, social services, vocational rehabilitation and other agencies serving the handicapped and can coordinate these services with the special education program in that district to provide continuous, complete and non-overlapping programs and services for handicapped students.

117.

1 2

118.

5 4 3 2 1

119.

1 2

120.

5 4 3 2 1

121.

1 2

122.

5 4 3 2 1

12.0 RESEARCH AND GRANT WRITING

- 12.01 Given the availability of federal money through direct application, the director can write a grant proposal which meets the requirements of the agency disbursing the funds.
- 12.02 Given the need for specific information on factors which affect special education programs and services, the director can correctly design, analyze and report the results of a survey to obtain this information.
- 12.03 Given the need to compare the results of specific programs, techniques, materials, etc. as they affect handicapped students, the director can correctly design, analyze and report research on these results.
- 12.04 Given research results in special education and related fields as generated by other investigators, the director can evaluate these results and can modify special education programs and services based on these results where deemed applicable and desirable.

123.

1 2

124.

5 4 3 2 1

125.

1 2

126.

5 4 3 2 1

127.

1 2

128.

5 4 3 2 1

129.

1 2

130.

5 4 3 2 1

13.0 OFFICE MANAGEMENT

- 13.01 Given a district-wide program, the director can prepare a yearly plan of terminal objectives for him/herself which can be broken down into enabling objectives with times lines for accomplishing each enabling objective, which plan acts as a guide in setting priorities for scheduling his/her activities, including correspondence and reports, on a daily, weekly and monthly basis.
- 13.02 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can organize and direct the office staff under his/her supervision in such a manner as to produce maximum efficiency and accuracy in dealing with the work assigned to them.
- 13.02 Given an office staff and other personnel under his/her direction which are housed in the central office, the director can develop a space utilization plan for offices, equipment and storage of materials which makes maximum and efficient use of the available space.
- 13.04 Given special education office furniture, equipment and supplies, the director can develop a plan for the purchase, inventory and maintenance of these items and for rapid replacement of damaged and expended items.

131.

1 2

132.

5 4 3 2 1

133.

1 2

134.

5 4 3 2 1

135.

1 2

136.

5 4 3 2 1

137.

1 2

138.

5 4 3 2 1

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS by firmly and carefully filling in the brackets around your answer [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] with a no. 2 pencil. Completely erase any errors. It is alright to mark on the questionnaire but make sure your answer is also marked on the answer sheet.

INITIAL TRAINING

1. Preservice Training Program
2. On the Job

IMPORTANCE

5. Crucial
4. Very Important
3. Some Importance
2. Little Importance
1. Not Important

14.0 SCHOOL RELATED POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND DUE PROCESS HEARINGS

14.01 Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an effective liaison with state and federal congressmen representing his/her district to obtain current information on legislation affecting special education and to provide to these congressmen information about and personal contacts with the special education program so that they can make informed decisions when drafting and voting on legislation affecting special education.

139.

140.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

14.02 Given a civil suit or other court proceedings relating to special education programs and services, the director can provide relevant testimony within his areas of expertise concerning the contested issues in the case.

141.

142.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

14.03 Given proposed activities by special education personnel, the director can advise them as to possible legal implications of such activities.

143.

144.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

14.04 Given a due process hearing, the director can advise the hearing officer and other concerned persons as to the rules, regulations and procedures for correctly carrying out such a hearing as required by the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines or can, if so designated, act as the hearing officer him/herself.

145.

146.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

14.05 Given Public Act 198 of 1971 and the Michigan Special Education Code, the director can correctly interpret the legal implications of these documents as they affect the district and its programs and services for handicapped students and can advise the district accordingly.

147.

148.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

14.06 Given the need to administer medication to some handicapped students during the school day, the director can establish policies and procedures for its administration which conform to existing Michigan laws.

149.

150.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

14.07 Given child neglect or abuse, need for change of custody, etc., the director can correctly initiate the appropriate legal proceedings to ensure the best interests of the students involved.

151.

152.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

15.0 PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

15.01 Given conferences and literature in all of the disability areas of special education, the director can develop a plan for personal attendance at conferences and reviews of the literature which expand his/her knowledge and competencies in areas of least expertise and which keep him/her current in areas of expertise.

153.

154.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

15.02 Given a need for current information on state-wide laws, rules, policies and procedures relating to special education programs and services, the director can develop a plan for obtaining this information through review of written documents, attendance at director's meetings and direct contact with the various state agencies serving the handicapped.

155.

156.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

15.03 Given the need for state-wide leadership in special education and related areas, the director can contribute, on an on-going basis, his expertise and direction to at least one state-wide organization or agency effort concerned with the handicapped.

157.

158.

1 2

5 4 3 2 1

159. What is the size of your reimbursable special education staff not including supervisors and assistant directors (not including aides).

1. 1 - 10
2. 11 - 25
3. 26 - 50
4. 51 - 90
5. 91 and up

159

160. What is the size of your supervisory staff including assistant directors?

1. 0
2. 1 - 3
3. 4 - 7
4. 8 - 11
5. 12 and up

160

161. How many years have you completed as a full-time director of special education?

1. 0 - 1
2. 2 - 5
3. 6 - 10
4. 11 and up

161

162. In which area did you have your greatest number of years of experience prior to becoming a special education director?

1. Special education teacher and/or teacher consultant
2. School psychologist/school diagnostician
3. School social worker/visiting teacher
4. Teacher of the speech and language impaired/school speech correctionist/school speech therapist
5. Regular education teacher and/or administrator

1. Spec. Ed. Teacher/Consultant
2. School Psychologist
3. School Social Worker
4. Speech
5. Reg. Ed. Teacher/Administrator

162

163. In terms of being reimbursed as a director of special education, are you:

1. Fully approved with your training program and internship completed
2. Temporarily approved with your training program partially completed
3. Grandfathered in position as per the rules and regulations of 1967
4. Not approved as a director of special education for special education reimbursement

1. Full
2. Temporary
3. Grandfathered
4. Not Approved

163

NOTE:

If you have the time and interest, please add additional pages to this questionnaire and (a) indicate any changes you would make in the existing competency areas and competency statements, (b) indicate any additions and/or deletions that you would make to this list of competency areas and statements, and (c) add other comments that you would like to make regarding the training of directors — innovative ideas, suggestions for change, etc. PLEASE DO NOT MARK ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITSELF for this purpose but do feel free to xerox it and mark your changes on the xeroxed pages.

IT WOULD BE OF TREMENDOUS HELP TO ME IF YOU COULD RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WITHIN 10 DAYS OF RECEIPT.

Thank you,

M. Diane Hodson
301 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
Office No. (517) 355-4501
Home No. (517) 393-1578

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL
ITEMS ON QUESTIONNAIRE

	Intermediate Percents		Local Percents		Total Percents		Ratings		
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Inter- mediate</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Total</u>
1.0									
1.01	49	51	56	44	53	47	3.8	4.1	4.0
1.02	23	77	34	66	29	71	4.2	4.0	4.1
1.03	56	44	47	53	51	49	4.3	4.1	4.2
1.04	44	56	61	39	53	47	3.8	4.0	3.9
1.05	16	84	21	79	19	81	3.3	3.5	3.4
1.06	49	51	50	50	49	51	4.3	4.3	4.3
1.07	<u>51</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.7</u>
MT	41	59	44	56	42	58	3.9	4.0	4.0
2.0									
2.01	53	47	55	45	54	46	3.8	3.9	3.9
2.02	47	53	55	45	51	49	4.0	3.8	3.9
2.03	58	42	76	24	67	33	3.9	4.0	4.0
2.04	67	33	74	26	71	29	3.7	3.8	3.8
2.05	21	79	19	81	20	80	3.6	3.4	3.5
2.06	40	60	56	44	48	52	3.9	3.9	3.9
2.07	23	77	15	85	19	81	3.7	3.3	3.5
2.08	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.4</u>
MT	43	57	47	53	45	55	3.8	3.7	3.8

1 = Pre-service Initial Development of Competencies
2 = On-the-Job Initial Development of Competencies

	Intermediate Percents		Local Percents		Total Percents		Ratings		
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Inter-</u> <u>mediate</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Total</u>
3.0									
3.01	16	84	37	63	27	73	4.1	4.1	4.1
3.02	21	79	29	71	25	75	3.9	3.8	3.9
3.03	19	81	24	76	21	79	4.4	4.3	4.4
3.04	19	81	23	77	21	79	4.4	4.0	4.2
3.05	30	70	32	68	31	69	3.6	4.0	3.8
3.06	49	51	50	50	49	51	3.6	3.8	3.7
3.07	<u>26</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.8</u>
MT	26	74	31	69	28	72	4.0	4.0	4.0
4.0									
4.01	35	65	37	63	36	64	3.3	3.5	3.4
4.02	28	72	19	81	24	76	3.8	3.9	3.9
4.03	33	67	34	66	33	67	2.8	2.9	2.9
4.04	28	72	42	58	35	65	3.5	3.7	3.6
4.05	<u>47</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.7</u>
MT	34	66	36	64	35	65	3.4	3.5	3.5
5.0									
5.01	49	51	66	34	57	43	4.1	4.0	4.1
5.02	49	51	65	35	57	43	4.0	3.6	3.8
5.03	42	58	52	48	47	53	4.4	4.2	4.3
5.04	44	56	63	37	54	46	4.4	4.5	4.5
5.05	28	72	26	74	27	73	4.0	4.1	4.1
5.06	23	77	37	63	30	70	4.1	4.0	4.1
5.07	35	65	45	55	40	60	3.9	4.0	4.0
5.08	28	72	42	58	35	65	4.1	4.0	4.1
5.09	49	51	39	61	44	56	3.7	3.7	3.7
5.10	37	63	44	56	40	60	3.8	3.1	3.5
5.11	37	63	31	69	34	66	3.6	3.5	3.6
5.12	<u>28</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>
MT	37	63	45	55	41	59	3.9	3.8	3.9

	Intermediate Percents		Local Percents		Total Percents		Ratings		
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Inter</u> <u>mediate</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Total</u>
6.0									
6.01	33	67	44	56	38	62	3.5	3.2	3.4
6.02	37	63	34	66	36	64	3.5	3.3	3.4
6.03	37	63	29	71	33	67	3.8	3.6	3.7
6.04	<u>33</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>
MT	35	65	35	65	35	65	3.7	3.4	3.6
7.0									
7.01	30	70	35	65	33	67	3.7	3.8	3.8
7.02	19	81	29	71	24	76	4.1	3.9	4.0
7.03	37	63	32	68	35	65	4.1	4.3	4.2
7.04	<u>44</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.3</u>
MT	33	67	35	65	34	66	4.0	4.1	4.1
8.0									
8.01	16	84	19	81	18	82	3.9	3.8	3.9
8.02	14	86	16	84	15	85	3.9	3.3	3.6
8.03	<u>23</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.9</u>
MT	18	82	16	84	17	83	3.6	3.3	3.5
9.0									
9.01	60	40	60	40	60	40	3.6	3.7	3.7
9.02	42	58	34	66	38	62	3.2	3.1	3.2
9.03	47	53	45	55	46	54	3.4	3.6	3.5
9.04	<u>14</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>
MT	41	59	42	58	41	59	3.5	3.6	3.6
10.0									
10.01	60	40	52	48	56	44	3.7	4.1	3.9
10.02	<u>58</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.9</u>
MT	59	41	51	49	55	45	3.7	4.1	3.9

	Intermediate		Local		Total		Ratings		
	Percents		Percents		Percents		Inter- mediate	Local	Total
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>			
11.0									
11.01	44	56	48	52	46	54	3.3	3.3	3.3
11.02	47	53	29	71	38	62	3.2	3.2	3.2
11.03	40	60	23	77	31	69	3.2	3.4	3.3
11.04	26	74	34	66	30	70	3.3	3.7	3.5
11.05	<u>28</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>
MT	37	63	34	66	35	65	3.4	3.5	3.5
12.0									
12.01	70	30	76	24	73	27	3.4	3.6	3.5
12.02	67	33	69	31	68	32	3.3	3.5	3.4
12.03	81	19	79	21	80	20	3.2	3.4	3.3
12.04	<u>65</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.5</u>
MT	71	29	72	28	72	28	3.3	3.5	3.4
13.0									
13.01	40	60	58	42	49	51	3.6	3.8	3.7
13.02	19	81	24	76	21	79	4.0	4.2	4.1
13.03	23	77	24	76	24	76	3.3	3.5	3.4
13.04	<u>26</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.0</u>
MT	27	73	32	68	29	71	3.5	3.6	3.6
14.0									
14.01	16	84	19	81	18	82	3.6	3.5	3.6
12.02	47	53	39	61	43	57	3.6	3.8	3.7
12.03	60	40	60	40	60	40	3.6	4.0	3.8
14.04	56	44	60	40	58	42	3.9	4.1	4.0
14.05	53	47	61	39	57	43	4.3	4.5	4.4
14.06	63	37	45	55	54	46	3.7	4.0	3.9
14.07	<u>51</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>
MT	49	51	48	52	49	51	3.7	4.0	3.9

	Intermediate Percents		Local Percents		Total Percents		Ratings		
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Inter-</u> <u>mediate</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Total</u>
15.0									
15.01	16	84	23	77	19	81	3.5	3.6	3.6
15.02	9	91	26	74	18	82	4.1	3.9	4.0
15.03	<u>9</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.6</u>
MT	11	89	22	78	17	83	3.8	3.7	3.8

STAFF

159.	<u>1-10</u>	<u>11-25</u>	<u>26-50</u>	<u>51-90</u>	<u>91+</u>
Intermediate	2 5%	12 28%	16 37%	7 16%	6 14%
Local	4 7%	25 40%	20 32%	8 13%	5 8%
Total	6 6%	37 35%	36 34%	15 14%	11 11%

SUPERVISORS/ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

160.	<u>0</u>	<u>1-3</u>	<u>4-7</u>	<u>8-11</u>	<u>12+</u>
Intermediate	8 19%	23 53%	6 14%	2 5%	4 9%
Local	26 42%	31 50%	2 3%	0 -	3 5%
Total	34 32%	54 51%	8 8%	2 2%	7 7%

YEARS AS DIRECTOR

161.	<u>0-1</u>	<u>2-5</u>	<u>6-10</u>	<u>11+</u>
Intermediate	3 7%	17 39%	11 26%	12 28%
Local	11 18%	22 35%	20 32%	9 15%
Total	14 13%	39 37%	31 30%	21 20%

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

162.	<u>Teach.</u>	<u>Psych.</u>	<u>S.W.</u>	<u>Sp.</u>	<u>Reg. Ed.</u>
Intermediate	19 44%	10 23%	1 2%	9 21%	4 9%
Local	20 32%	16 26%	3 5%	5 8%	18 29%
Total	39 37%	26 25%	4 4%	14 13%	22 21%

APPROVAL

163.	<u>Full</u>	<u>Temp.</u>	<u>G.F.</u>	<u>NA</u>
Intermediate	34 79%	4 9%	5 12%	0 -
Local	43 69%	7 11%	12 19%	0 -
Total	77 73%	11 11%	17 16%	0 -

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

COMPETENCY STATEMENTS INDICATING MOST VARIATION IN PREFERENCES FOR INITIAL DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL DIRECTORS

		<u>Initial Training</u>	<u>Percent Intermediate</u>	<u>Percent Local</u>
1.04	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a comprehensive career education/vocational education program for handicapped students from primary through post-secondary which meets the Michigan rules and guidelines for such programs and can identify the resources required to carry out the programs at each level, utilizing both regular and special education programs and services.	Pre-service	44	61
		On the Job	56	39
2.06	Given an undesirable professional staff member, the director can develop a case for dismissal which meets the requirements of the Michigan Teacher Tenure Act and carry the dismissal procedures through to conclusion.	Pre-service	40	56
		On the Job	60	44
3.01	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop an on-going system for the assessment of the general climate, morale and working relationships of the special education personnel with each other and with the general education personnel and can take effective action to develop the positive aspects and alleviate any negative factors.	Pre-service	16	37
		On the Job	84	63
5.01	Given federal money allocated through the State, the director can develop a budget and complete the reports for the utilization of the allocation in such a manner as meets the requirements of the Michigan Department of Education.	Pre-service	49	66
		On the Job	51	34

		<u>Initial Training</u>	<u>Percent Intermediate</u>	<u>Percent Local</u>
5.02	Given the Michigan Special Education Code requirement of current records on all handicapped students in the intermediate district, the director can initiate and evaluate the effectiveness of a comprehensive data processing system, either computer or hand recorded, which system facilitates record keeping and provides for rapid retrieval of any portion or all of the data.	Pre-service	49	65
		On the Job	51	35
5.04	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can assess the financial needs and can develop a comprehensive budget to meet those needs for the following school year, utilizing projections on state and federal reimbursement, on salary and benefit increases and on other cost increases, which budget has no more than a small overall error in the final computation of assets and liabilities.	Pre-service	44	63
		On the Job	56	37
11.02	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a system for purchase, inventory and maintenance of all special education furniture, equipment and materials and for rapid replacement of damaged and expended items.	Pre-service	47	29
		On the Job	53	71
11.03	Given the need and availability of volunteer assistance to special education programs, the director can develop policies regarding the selection and use of volunteers in special education programs.	Pre-service	40	23
		On the Job	60	77
13.01	Given a district-wide program, the director can prepare a yearly plan of terminal objectives for him/herself which can be broken down into enabling objective, with time lines for accomplishing each enabling objective, which plan acts as a guide in setting priorities for scheduling his/her activities, including correspondence and reports, on a daily, weekly and monthly basis.	Pre-service	40	58
		On the Job	60	42

		<u>Initial Training</u>	<u>Percent Intermediate</u>	<u>Percent Local</u>
15.02	Given a need for current information on state-wide laws, rules, policies and procedures relating to special education programs and services, the director can develop a plan for obtaining this information through review of written documents, attendance at director's meetings and direct contact with the various state agencies serving the handicapped.	Pre-service	9	26
		On the Job	91	74
<hr/>				
2.03	Given the handicaps as defined in the Michigan Special Education Code, the director can initiate the development of a comprehensive curriculum which includes career education/vocational education for each of the handicaps at all levels from pre-primary through post-secondary, utilizing both regular and special education programs, and can evaluate it in terms of meeting the requirements of Michigan law, the Michigan Special Education Code and Guidelines and the Michigan State-Wide Performance Objectives.	Pre-service	58	76
		On the Job	42	24
14.06	Given the need to administer medication to some handicapped students during the school day, the director can establish policies and procedures for its administration which conform to existing Michigan laws.	Pre-service	63	45
		On the Job	37	55

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

COMPETENCY STATEMENTS INDICATING MOST VARIATION IN AVERAGE RATINGS BETWEEN INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL DIRECTORS

		<u>Average Rating</u>	
		<u>Intermediate</u>	<u>Local</u>
2.07	Given salary negotiations in a district, the director can act as an advisor to the superintendent and board as the negotiations affect the special education personnel and can provide information to the special education personnel that is deemed permissible and necessary.	3.7	3.3
3.04	Given a school board of a district, the director can develop an on-going system for keeping the board informed of all aspects of the special education district-wide program and what it is trying to accomplish and can prepare written and oral reports with appropriate documentation and rationale that the board can readily understand and upon which it can pass informed judgments.	4.4	4.0
5.02	Given the Michigan Special Education Code requirement of current records on all handicapped students in the intermediate district, the director can initiate and evaluate the effectiveness of a comprehensive data processing system, either computer or hand recorded, which system facilitates record keeping and provides for rapid retrieval of any portion or all of the data.	4.0	3.6
5.10	Given the need for a building for special education students, the director can develop a plan for financing the construction and furnishing of such a building, including recommendations for bonding proposals.	3.8	3.1
8.02	Given the need to transport handicapped students, the director can devise a system to handle non-attendance of students, transportation breakdowns, severe weather problems and other situations which may arise on short notice, including medical and other emergencies.	3.9	3.3

		<u>Average Rating</u>	
		<u>Intermediate</u>	<u>Local</u>
3.05	Given regular education staff, the director can develop a system by which these persons can easily utilize special education programs and services to meet the needs of their handicapped students and students whom they suspect of having handicaps, and can prepare written communications which serve as readily-available and easily-understood resources for information as to how they may utilize the system.	3.6	4.0
7.04	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can develop a system for insuring that the rights of the handicapped students and their parents are fully met as specified in the Michigan Special Education Code.	4.1	4.5
10.01	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can provide consultation to the special education personnel, the principals and the regular education teachers regarding general diagnostic assessment, placement and instructional techniques and materials for all disability areas as designated by the Special Education Code and Guidelines.	3.7	4.1
10.02	Given a district-wide special education program, the director can provide individual case consultation regarding diagnostic assessment, instructional techniques and materials, and placement in any disability area either through individual meetings with special and regular education personnel or as a member of an educational planning and placement committee.	3.6	4.1
11.04	Given a school district and community, the director can assess the potential for community work-study placements of secondary level handicapped students and can develop a system for the effective utilization and evaluation of such placements.	3.3	3.7
14.03	Given proposed activities by special education personnel, the director can advise them as to possible legal implications of such activities.	3.6	4.0
14.07	Given child neglect or abuse, need for change of custody, etc., the director can correctly initiate the appropriate legal proceedings to ensure the best interests of the students involved.	3.4	3.8