

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

JOHN WILLIAM ERICKSON
(Name of student)

for the

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Degree)

in EDUCATION presented on April 28, 1980
(Major Department)

Title: GUIDE GROUPS: AN EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL
INNOVATION IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL

Abstract approved: _____

Redacted for Privacy

Dr. E. Lawrence Dale

Purpose of the Study

This study was undertaken as a result of interest in the introduction of guide groups into the operation of secondary schools. Particularly when viewed from the historical perspective of the times in which it was initiated, the guide group concept offers an opportunity to examine the process of innovation and the forces which affect new programs.

The purpose for this investigation was to explore the significance of a secondary school's guide group program as a case study of innovation and educational practice. Furthermore, this study included an investigation into the political and economic forces which affected this particular innovation and the decisions made regarding it.

Design of the Study

Initiated largely on the assumption that this innovation would

accomplish humanistic goals, the guide group program examined in this study was introduced into a school district as part of the operation of a new high school in the community. For purposes of this case study, the school received the pseudonym "Westridge High School."

The techniques frequently associated with the activities of a journalist or of an historian were used for the primary data collection. Materials and documents, including records, memoranda, speech transcripts, letters, articles, editorials, and minutes from meetings were collected. An additional source of information was supplied by the use of personal interviews, conducted under the promise of anonymity.

Utilizing a collection of documents, materials, and personal interviews, this study evaluated the Westridge guide group program as an example of educational innovation. The resulting analysis and conclusions were intended to offer further contributions to the improvement of educational practices.

Findings of the Study

The study of the Westridge guide group program included investigation into the history of the program's operation, the forces which affected it, and the educational and political issues which concerned it.

The findings from this study included:

1. The guide group program changed from its original

purposes.

2. Known innovation practices received inadequate attention.
3. The guide group program evaluation was politically motivated.
4. The original program intents were ignored.
5. Educational decisions were controlled by economic and political considerations.

Conclusions and Implications of the Study

This study showed that the destiny of the Westridge guide group program depended less upon its educational contribution, than upon the success of the Westridge supporters in respect to the political intrigues operating within the school system and its community. It is particularly in this regard that this study was offered, both as testimony to what happened, and to what might be learned for future educational practice about the subtle workings of an educational system and the political pressures associated with it.

© 1980

JOHN WILLIAM ERICKSON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Guide Groups: An Evaluation of Educational
Innovation in a Secondary School

by

John William Erickson

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed April 28, 1980

Commencement June 1980

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

April 28, 1980

Typed by Doris Reiner for

John William Erickson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank many people for their time and effort assisting me in the preparation of this dissertation. I want to express appreciation to the professors who served on my doctoral committee: E. Lawrence Dale, Robert J. Frank, Henry Osibov, Edwin L. Anderson, Arnold W. Flath, William A. Kline, and William G. Robbins.

Although unidentified in this study, many educators and interested lay persons contributed substantially to the preparation of this thesis. Additionally, I want to thank my friends, colleagues, and associates who shared their insight and expertise regarding this research effort.

I am appreciative for the help supplied by Doris Reiner who typed the final manuscript. My thanks also goes to the staff members at the Coos County Educational Service District for assistance in producing the final copy.

I am particularly grateful to my wife, Susan, and to the members of my family for their patience and constant encouragement. Were it not for their support, this dissertation would not have been accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Definition of Terms	11
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
III	METHODOLOGY	18
IV	HISTORICAL NARRATION, DOCUMENTATION, AND ANALYSIS	24
V	CONCLUSIONS	108
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	120

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Check-List For Guide Teacher Visitation- Registration Conference	37
2	Number of F.T.E. Required to Staff Population of 1645 Students	53
3	Percentage of School Population in Subject Areas	54
4	High School Cost Analysis	55

PREFACE

All of the events described in this study were real and were carefully researched and documented. The promise of anonymity, which was part of the research design from the outset, provided access to information and material not probably available otherwise. The community, the school district, the particular school, and the persons involved in the events which transpired will remain anonymous. Consequently, many of the bibliographic references are presented to indicate the type of source used for specific information without violating the promised anonymity.

GUIDE GROUPS: AN EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL

I INTRODUCTION

In their discussion of the role of the American school in society, Pounds and Bryner observe, ". . . the school has always tended to lag behind society in periods of social change" (1, p. 562). Even so, schools, no less than other social institutions, do reflect the Zeitgeist, or spirit of the times, and are subject to the conflicting demands and expectations imposed by the culture. Changing political and economic forces mirror public priorities and broad objectives which have particular impact upon the secondary schools. The relationship suggests the possible accuracy of the contention, "As the secondary school is directed, so moves the nation" (2, p. 5).

The second half of the 1950's, a period characterized by ". . . political passivity, cultural conformity, endorsement of Eisenhower conservatism, and ambition to succeed economically" (3, p. 7), gradually gave way to post-Sputnik recognition of the need for change within the secondary schools of this country. The Cold War pressures suggested that massive, sweeping reforms were necessary for effective competition with the technology which appeared to indicate the educational priorities of the Soviet Union. Fueled by the ideas of Bruner (4) and other

educational reformers, efforts were focused upon national curricula, which resulted in what has been called the ". . . alphabet soup---BSCS, SMSG, PSSC---Chem Study, and others aimed at a more meaningful curriculum" (5, p. 21). Most of these projects were federally funded and attempted to improve both the curriculum content and the instructional methods found in the secondary schools.

Additional panaceas, although somewhat ephemeral, included ability grouping, flexible scheduling, differentiated staffing, career education, vouchers, and alternative schools. These innovations were pursued increasingly during the early 1960's, a period which

. . . seemingly witnessed a renewed consciousness of youth as a social force, an emphasis among them on idealism within the American tradition, the growth of concern about civil rights for minority groups, and the involvement in new cultural styles such as those exemplified by the 'beats' and rock music. (3, p. 7).

However, much of this optimism was lost in the great social conflicts which closed the decade in violence, campus disorder, increased drug usage, political assassinations, and a disastrous, unpopular war in Southeast Asia.

This cultural turmoil was not lost on the schools as riots, disruptions, protests, violence, and court intervention increased the recognition that schools, somehow, must attempt to change in an effort to cope with the social forces raging within the country. Strategies varied according to the specific situation, but secondary

school administrators were cautioned, "Those who seek simple solutions founded on historical authoritarian approaches fail to grasp the complex origins and purposes of activism today" (6, p. 11).

This suggested rejection of stereotypical authoritarian problem-solving introduced several possible alternative ways in which the message from this activist period might be viewed as a legitimate demand for pervasive changes throughout the school system. Numerous critics, notably Silberman (7), Kohl (8), Kozol (9), and Illich (10), finding new acceptance in popular literature, supported the demands for change and added a note of credibility to the catalog of horrors depicting contemporary American education. Increasingly, the notion that school experiences ought to be tailored to the individual student's needs and ought to recognize affective concerns gained acceptance both by professional educators and by the general public.

Accordingly, many communities supported the design and development of schools which adopted the curriculum innovations of the 1960's, but also tried to accommodate the new demands for increased personal attention, program planning, evaluation, and counseling. Less oppressive operating procedures coupled with support for the students' affective needs suggested opportunities for high schools to be more responsive not only in terms of the instruction that was provided but also in the

manner in which students were treated as individuals.

Among the innovations considered as possibilities for providing substantial personal attention and guidance was the teacher-advisor concept which stressed the development of personal relationships among staff members, students and families. This concept utilized small clusters of students, typically called "guide groups" or "advisee groups," working closely with individual staff members. This program probably received its most widespread support and publicity through the Model Schools Project, developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in an effort to initiate more humane schools, which the association defined as being locations where ". . . every human being is cared for, known and valued by at least one other person" (11, p. 11).

Many variations of the "guide group" concept were developed and implemented nationally. The group configurations, the nature of expected tasks, the meeting schedules, the contact with the students' families revealed great diversity among schools using the model but the stated program goals were frequently very similar. The goals used for the teacher-advisor systems in several states received this explanation:

Typical goals for such programs are to assist the student in adjustment to school and to life. It is often implied in the development of such programs that the teacher-advisor should get to know students and their families well, and should in some way assist student-advisees in developing healthy attitudes, values, and goals, gaining the most out of their curricular experiences, in solving personal problems, and

in fostering effective interpersonal relationships. (12, p. 17).

Another list of typical goals included:

Make the school a more humane place.

Bring together staff and students.

Bring staff closer together.

Develop a feeling of belonging among students and staff.

Help students develop stronger self-concept.

Provides a one to one relationship, with accompanying responsibility and accountability between a student and a professional staff.

Help close the gap between subject matter and reality.

Help students learn more. (12, p. 28).

Included in the materials prepared as part of the teacher-advisor system which was an ESEA Title III Project in Ferguson-Florissant School District in Florissant, Missouri, was this explanation of the program's impact:

Through this relationship, an Advisement program can effectively combat the impersonalization of today's highly specialized secondary schools. In addition, it can effect change in a school by continually keeping the school as an institution in touch with the feelings, attitudes, concerns and needs of each student. This advisor-advisee relationship is a way for a school to show human concern. (12, p. 3).

A teacher-advisor system in Pawtucket, Rhode Island was credited for the following:

Our student-faculty advisory program has done much to prevent difficulties, increase faculty's awareness of themselves as helping agents, and improve counselor-teacher relations, and detect and refer students who need additional counseling. (14, p. 368).

Pilkington and Jarmin, in an article discussing teacher-advisor groups, offered this list of advantages:

- The students become familiar with and can relate to at least one faculty member in the school.
- The students gain a sense of 'belonging' in the school because of their association with their teacher-advisor group.
- The students are assisted with curriculum planning, registration, and program changes.
- The students receive help in developing more effective study habits and study skills.
- The school becomes more humanized.
- The counselor is relieved of administrative duties, responsibility for disseminating school information and registration responsibilities. Thus the counselors are free to perform their professional guidance and counseling duties. (15, p. 81).

As various school districts attempted to devise and to implement local teacher-advisor programs, the results ranged from "Home Rooms" to group process sessions attempting to help students with personal needs. The effectiveness of these programs has not been determined although the concept has received national publicity and widespread acceptance. There is a dearth of program evaluations based upon stated expectations and anticipated outcomes. The extent to which these programs succeeded or failed has not been measured by any in-depth study located by this investigator.

Consequently, there remains a need for evaluation of guide groups based upon the expectations established for them.

Additionally, the introduction of guide groups into the operation of secondary schools involved very complex innovation processes which affected, among other areas, the staffing and funding of schools, the organization of daily schedules and teacher assignments, the role expectations of all faculty members, and the relationships among staff, students, parents, and community persons. Particularly when viewed from the historical perspective of the times in which it was initiated, the guide group concept offered an opportunity to examine the processes of innovation and the forces which affect new programs. Although much has been written about innovation generally, very little has been written about the adoption of guide groups. There exists a need to consider the entangled forces and processes which characterized and influenced this educational innovation.

This dissertation provides a case study of a guide group program. Initiated largely on the assumption that this innovation would accomplish humanistic goals, the guide group program examined in this study was introduced into a school district as part of the operation of a new high school within the community.

For the purposes of this study, the school received the pseudonym "Westridge High School." Heuristic theory was utilized to interpret the political and educational significance of the school's guide

group program.

This type of research necessarily includes inquiry into the evolution of the program in an effort to trace its development and operation. The theoretical assumptions prompting the design of this innovation are of interest in terms of contributions to educational practice and school management. The program goals and evolving ideas reflect decisions regarding this particular innovation and, whether implicit or explicit, suggest the developers' intentions for the program and some anticipation of its evaluation. A case study such as this interpretive history offers the opportunity to examine the guide group program as a potential agent for school reform and to learn more about how innovations emerge and the forces which influence them. Innovations, then, provided a very important heuristic lead for conducting the research in this study.

Another heuristic lead focused upon the controversy which plagued the guide group program at Westridge High School. The exploration of this aspect of the program led to the collection of some interesting data which proved to be very useful for further consideration of the events which transpired in respect to this case study.

This research stems, additionally, from the desire to follow the heuristic lead regarding the forms in which professional and bureaucratic controls of schools are manifested. Power, influence, opinion, and values all affect the daily operation of school

systems and this research effort is intended to contribute to contemporary scholarship addressing this important area.

To guide this research, the following major questions were asked:

1. How did the guide group program develop? What were the expectations? What were the assumptions or theoretical ideas upon which the program was based? What were the intents for staff, student, and family interactions? What sort of activities were intended, encouraged, or discarded? How? Why?
2. How was the guide group program implemented? What modifications occurred? How? Why? How did the program operate after implementation? Were known practices regarding successful innovation followed?
3. What goals were established? Who determined them? What provisions for evaluation had been included? How was success or failure to be determined?
4. What were the political implications of the program? Who was to benefit? How was professional and bureaucratic control manifested? Why? How are programs "sold?" What educational research had been considered? What was the impact of value judgments or systems on this program?

5. What was meant by humanizing a school? What characterizes a humanistic school? What did the Westridge developers mean by humanizing? Did the program fulfill its purpose? Can schools be humanistic or are there too many forces at work which undermine the idea and demand non-humanistic outcomes?

The study was limited in two respects. The need for preserving anonymity, which was important to the research design, imposed some limitation on the method of reporting the study. A second limitation was represented by the possibility that some information remained which was unknown, unavailable, or undiscovered by the investigator.

The study was organized into five chapters. Following the introduction, the second chapter presents a review of the literature which relates to this study. The third chapter provides the explanation of the research methodology. The historical narration, documentation, and analysis are presented in the fourth chapter. The final chapter offers the conclusions from this study.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this research, the following definitions were used:

Guide Groups: This term refers to small groups of students who work closely with staff members responsible for a variety of tasks.

Heuristic: This term refers to the use of major themes or concepts which guide research by ordering existing knowledge, hypotheses, and hunches into an explanation of what occurred.

Humanistic: This term refers to the attempt to meet each individual's needs and to structure an educational program so that all students feel known and cared for in some personal way.

Goal-Free Evaluation: This term refers to evaluation when explicit program goals or standards are not available or used.

Implied Standards: This term refers to the basis for program evaluations when individuals' perceptions replace program goals or standards.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Any review of related literature pertaining to this study necessarily represents diverse sources of material, largely due to the use of heuristic research. The literature assisted in conceptualizing the problem to be investigated and in determining the pertinence of the study. The literature is listed according to general categories: school reform; the cultural role of schools and schooling; schools as organizations; political and economic forces affecting schools; educational innovation; and teacher-advisor programs. These areas were important for study of the guide group concept as an educational innovation in a secondary school.

Historically, the emergence of the guide group concept is closely related to the demands for more humane schools. Literature concerning the need for humane schools interested not only educators but lay readers, as well. A number of authors, notably Holt (16), (17), Kozol (9), Glasser (18), Kohl (8), Neill (19), Silberman (7), Jackson (20), and Postman and Weingartner (21) have become widely known and their ideas have stimulated considerable discussion about the condition of American schools and schooling practices. Futurists, including Leonard (22) and Samples (23) have provided new visions of the schools and educational systems the future might demand in respect to the rapidly changing technology and in regard to the concern

for the total well-being of the individual. Jencks (24), Illich (10), and Reimer (25), have offered other perspectives which strongly suggest that either American schools must change significantly to meet society's demands or that these cultural expectations will undergo rapid transformation themselves.

Further clarification of the cultural role played by society's schools and the schooling practices was provided by Spindler (26), Wolcott (27), and Sarason (28). Goffman's (29) discussions of other cultural institutions have suggested some additional perspectives by which American schools can be seen not only as important cultural institutions but also as complex organizations directed by management systems.

The nature of organizations and the ways in which they process information was further explained by the works of Etzioni (30), (31), Argyris (32), Webb (33), and Goode (34). March (35) discussed schools as formal organizations and provided helpful commentary about their management. Systems analysis and executive decision-making were addressed by Murdick and Ross (36), Hicks (37), and Johnson (38).

The political and economic forces which influenced the guide group innovation were seriously considered in this study. Wirt and Kirst (39) provided insight into the tangled configurations of the political influences operating within American schools. Tyack's (40) work was important to this study in respect to the development of the historical narrative and the examination

of political and economic influences on educational decisions. Further considerations of school finance were assisted by the work of Johns and Morphet (41), Reischauer and Hartman (42), and Benson (43). The case study published by Goldhammer and Pellegrin (44) stressed political and economic influences within an anonymous school system.

Although there exists a compendium of literature discussing innovation, this study focused upon a few specific authors. Brickell's (45) work in respect to innovation in New York was very helpful in the formulation of the ideas for this study by providing a systematic approach to large-scale change in a state educational system. Carlson (46), (47), (48) and Woods (49) also contributed examples and information which were important to this study particularly in respect to attitudes toward change and the role of administrators affected by change. Miles (50) and Eurich (51) offered a variety of viewpoints which helped to place in perspective the events which transpired in this study. Charters (52) and Wolcott (27) provided helpful insight into the further understanding of the change processes and the individual and institutional obstacles which emerged. Although they did not discuss guide groups, these authors represent those whose work most directly contributed to the consideration of the impact of the guide group concept as an educational innovation.

In their discussion of the guide group concept, Hubel and Beaty indicated, "The Teacher/Advisor System is a structured

attempt by school staffs to build warm and open personal relationships in a school" (53, p. 28). Additionally, Hubel, et al., stated:

There are four activities that the advisor engages in in the Teacher/Advisor Program: program planning, parent conferences, human development activities, and survival assistance. (54, p. 1).

Further definition of the staff roles was provided by Pantesco, who observed, "Students benefit from the contact and interest, and teachers enjoy the realization that they can complement and amplify their role as teacher" (14, p. 368). Larson and Mable commented:

The TA played a vital role in helping students to establish an identity in a new student body, to adjust to a radically different school plan, and to develop individualized academic programs. (55, p. 38).

To assist staff members in the execution of the tasks associated with the guide group concept, Tamminen, et al., proposed

. . . a model for preparing teachers in such a way that they not only carry out the humane functions envisioned in the teacher-advisor plan, but that they are actually more likely to do so. (12, pp. 17-18).

Pine (56) also suggested the expansion of the counseling role to include the teaching staff. Ohlsen (57) provided additional description of the potential for the guide group concept as a vehicle for group counseling activity, under staff direction and assistance.

Various activities have been devised to help staff members in

the advisor roles. Hubel (58) published a K-12 orientation plan which included over 200 activities designed to make learning more meaningful and humane. Cowles and Hawkins (13), (59), (60), (61), (62), prepared an extensive array of materials as part of a teacher-advisor system in Missouri.

The guide group concept in many forms, utilizing a variety of modifications, has been implemented in numerous educational settings. Despite these alterations, the program goals and descriptions continue to be closely linked to the NASSP Model Schools Project initially described by Georgiades and Trump (11). Clay (62) acknowledged the previous work by Larson and Mable (55), but illustrated a guide group concept which permitted students to select their own teacher/advisors, provided for regular group meetings, and maintained groups of students representing all grade levels. Pilkington and Jarmin (15) argued that guide group programs must distinguish between the roles of "teacher-advisors" whose duties are largely administrative and "teacher-counselors" whose tasks included educational planning and attention toward the student's personal affective growth. Goldberg (64) provided another perspective by combining the guide group concept with the "House Plan," resulting in yet another program adaption. Mariner High School in Mukilteo, Washington incorporated major portions of the Georgiades and Trump NASSP Model Schools Project in the development and operation of an individualized, criterion-referenced academic program (65), (66).

Although differing in several respects, these various forms of the guide group concept were important discoveries both in respect to their operations and in regard to the difficulties encountered when the programs were implemented. These programs and their problems helped place in perspective the controversy encountered by the guide group concept discussed in this study.

The collection of related literature assisted in the conceptualizing of the study and in the design of the investigation. The literature contributed to the further understanding of the guide group concept examined in this study and, in so doing, provided additional perspectives regarding how schools actually operate and the forces which affect them.

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

The events which affected the decisions about the guide group program involved many complicated issues. A demand for evaluation of the guide group program emerged after the program had operated for several years. Responding to political pressures within the school system and the community, the local school board requested an evaluation of the Westridge guide group program. Aware of the amounts of money invested in the program's operation and also appreciative of the political stresses brought by the community, the local school board, and the school officials involved in the program, the district's personnel mounted an evaluation effort in 1977. Using Scriven's "Goal-free" model (67), the evaluation was conducted and reported. Quickly accepted, the report was offered as evidence that the program was working and the operation continued with the same levels of funding and staffing. Within months, however, the local board entered into collective bargaining with teachers, and the guide group program at Westridge became a heated issue in the community.

Quite naturally, the question which remained and which prompted the desire to conduct this study was: "What happened and what does it mean?" A corollary might be: "How can the subtle workings of the educational system and the political issues associated with it be better understood and, in so

doing, contribute so that others might benefit as well?"

An approach to discovering the answers was provided by Wirt and Kirst, who explained, "Heuristic theory is not so much a predictive scheme as a method for analytically separating and categorizing items in experience" (39, p. 13). This conceptual framework was not predictive but attempted, instead, to order existing knowledge, hypotheses, and hunches into an explanation of what occurred. This theory offered a way in which diverse areas of study and research could be synthesized to focus upon a specific educational practice. The particular educational practice examined in this study was the Westridge High School guide group program. Heuristic theory was utilized to explore the forces which had impact upon the innovative program and the decisions made regarding it.

This investigation attempted to enrich the knowledge of how schools actually operate or, as Tyack observed, "Who got what, where, when, and how" (40, p. 3). Of particular interest to this research was the consideration of the professional and bureaucratic controls operating within a school system and the manner in which these forces interact. Of necessity, the procedural style was exploratory, interpreting the social, political, economic, and educational issues involved in this educational innovation. Although there was a kaleidoscopic aspect to this investigation, this element was due to the recognition that many issues, in varying amounts of influence, affected the operation of

the guide group program and the school system of which it is a part.

The primary data collection for this study drew upon the techniques frequently associated with the activities of a journalist or of an historian. The mixture of materials which resulted was assembled and carefully examined and provided the basis for much of the discussion offered in this study.

An additional source of information was supplied by the use of personal interviews. These interviews, conducted under the promise of anonymity, provided the opportunity to gain information directly from those individuals entangled in the chain of events which were central to this study. Most of the interviews were conducted in the spring of 1978 with some additional interviewing performed during the 1978-1979 school year.

The guide group program examined in this study was largely the result of the plans devised by four program developers. These innovators, all members of the original administrative team at Westridge, consisted of the principal, two assistant principals, and an activities director. These four individuals were contacted and interviewed regarding the intents and purposes for the program as well as the impact the guide group concept had on the school's operation.

Of these four developers, one remains at the school, serving as its current principal. He and the other present administrative staff members were interviewed regarding the continued operation

of the program and the eventual controversy which engulfed it.

Part of the controversy involved the program's evaluation and the political issues which prompted it. The evaluation procedures offered data about the effectiveness of guide groups, but also provided considerable information about the politics involved in schooling and school practices. The school district personnel responsible for conducting that evaluation were interviewed. These persons were asked to comment on the evaluation task and the political implications it suggested.

The program evaluation included interviews with students, teachers, parents, administrators, and the school board members. The data collected from these personal contacts figured prominently in the design and conclusions revealed in the final evaluation report. One local school board member responded very critically to that report and his views were further developed as a result of a personal interview conducted in 1978, just after the final evaluation report had been submitted for acceptance by the board.

Although much of the data investigated affected staff and administration, the program's impact upon students, parents and the larger community was also considered. Those community persons most knowledgeable about the events surrounding the program and the controversy it generated were interviewed and furnished important information for this study.

The personal interview data were tremendously helpful in the attempt to establish an historical framework for the events which

transpired. The interview data also provided a richer, fuller picture of the issues because of the varied perspectives, impressions, and motives held by the key participants. The analysis of this interview data further revealed information which would not otherwise have been discovered. In these three respects, the personal interviews proved to be particularly valuable.

Additionally, materials and documents, constituting an artifact collection, were assembled and studied. The investigator's personal contacts within the school and its district substantially increased the accessibility to records, memoranda, notes, speeches, and remarks not probably available to a person unfamiliar with the system. Newspaper articles, editorials, school board minutes, and speech transcripts were added to this collection of important materials.

The combined data were examined initially from an historical perspective, in an attempt to place on a timeline the events which had developed. Following that assessment, further attention was given to the many ideas introduced by the data, particularly in respect to educational decisions. The possibility that educational decisions might be more likely promoted by economic and political considerations than by what is known about teaching and learning received particular emphasis.

Utilizing a collection of documents, materials, and personal interviews, organized by heuristic leads, this study evaluated the Westridge guide group program as an example of educational

innovation. The resulting analysis and conclusions were intended to offer further contributions to the improvement of educational practices.

CHAPTER IV HISTORICAL NARRATION, DOCUMENTATION, AND ANALYSIS

The analysis of the educational significance of the introduction and operation of the Westridge High School guide group program must take into account several major events and their consequences. These incidents occurred throughout the life of the program and exerted influence on the decisions made regarding the effectiveness and continued operation of the innovation.

On April 23, 1971, the assistant superintendent of schools in the community where Westridge High School is located, recommended to the local school board the formation of a committee composed of students, teachers, administrators, representatives from the local school advisory committees, and a member of the state department of education. This group was given the following task:

The purpose of this committee is to make recommendations to the administration and school board on the following matters: The characteristics of a modern senior high school that includes consideration for the needs of the youth to be served, the community surrounding the school, the educational program best planned to meet these conditions, the grouping patterns for students and the staffing plans best designed to meet these concerns. (69).

This planning committee met seventeen times between May, 1971 and November, 1971. The committee members drafted goals which became the philosophical basis or "touchstone" for the school's operation. The goals for the new school were:

1. The development of students who are responsible for their actions should be given a high priority.
2. Students' learning activities should be designed to result in the development of self-learners.
3. Course offerings should permit a variety of choices for a student each year.
4. Students should be able to select courses by interest and ability based on realistic plans developed with the assistance of a guide-teacher and/or counselor.
5. A schedule should be developed which would permit flexible use of student and staff time.
6. The size of the instructional group should be flexible.
7. Student achievement should be interpreted in a variety of ways.
8. The total community should be utilized as a part of the educational program.
9. The interdependence of school and community should be recognized, accepted and built upon. (70).

A summary statement, attached to this list, suggested, "The success of the student is therefore dependent upon the student, the home, the school, and the community" (70).

The school's first principal served as a liaison person with the planning committee. He agreed with the committee members that a guide-teacher program offered several advantages in meeting the goals the committee had determined. In a January 5, 1972 letter to the planning committee, the principal commented, "The expansion of the guidance function from counselors to teachers will be initiated through a 'guide-teacher' concept" (71). This commitment reflected the thinking of the

original administrative team which had met regularly to develop the overall operation of the new school. At one of those sessions, an administrator had remarked:

If we are going to mean it when we say that parents and kids are going to be the ones to plan the educational program, then we need some way to meet one-to-one. Teachers in the homes or parents in the school appear to be the only ways. (72).

As a result of this meeting and the direction of the planning committee, the guide group concept at Westridge High School was included in the plans as an integral factor in the school's operation and the home visit component was emphasized as part of the expected duty of every certificated staff member.

The Westridge guide group program required that each teacher, counselor, and administrator be responsible for a group of 15-20 students. These students were grouped randomly by grade and typically remained with the initial staff member throughout the students' high school careers. The staff person was expected to assist these students, to counsel them, to meet their parents or guardians, and, if possible, to visit in the students' homes.

The school's first principal indicated that the overarching purpose for the program was an attempt to do the following:

We wanted to turn a 1200-1500 student school into a one-room schoolhouse in the prairie of South Dakota again because one teacher knows the kids well, cares about them, advises them, can be leaned upon, and provides a passageway to more expert help. The guide teacher program gives students some better breaks than usually given in a typical large high school. Most kids have had a 'guide teacher,' someone who cares.

The lucky ones found teachers whom they liked and who liked them. This program formalized that chance for about 100% of the kids. (72).

Another member of the original group of developers observed, "We said, 'What we're doing now isn't making it---let's do something new, different.'" (68). He, too, felt that the guide group program would be a way

. . . to make a large, metropolitan school more personal, to provide more personal contact with parents and kids about educational decisions as young people go through the educational process. (68).

In addition to these goals, there were some secondary benefits, which the original principal identified as kinds of "spinoffs" generated by the guide group program. These expectations were never revealed to the teachers but had substantial impact on them, at least as far as the program developers were concerned.

The first of these additional benefits was based on the administrative hope that teachers would become motivated to learn the entire curriculum as a necessary step in the efforts to help students and families make responsible decisions about educational programs and options. The teachers' increased awareness of curriculum offerings, prerequisites, rules and regulations, created a climate which encouraged heated dialogue, debate, and aggressive questioning of all aspects relating to student concerns and difficulties with the curriculum and with various academic

departments. This interaction among the staff members led to the observation, "Teacher behavior changed because of the peer influence" (72). Although unstated publicly, the mastery of the school's curriculum and the resulting peer influence were major administrative anticipations based on the introduction of the guide group program.

A second benefit desired by the developers was the hope for the emergence of an improved relationship between teachers and building administrators. Teachers, because of the guide group program, were to work closely with administrators in attempts to solve problems and, in that process, were to become increasingly sensitive to situations where easy success was not always certain. Here, too, the first principal noticed changed teacher behavior. He commented, "Teachers became aware of limitations in certain situations" (72).

These unstated administrative expectations did not obscure the point that the guide group program had been introduced primarily as a vehicle for achieving the goals established by the planning committee. The program developers also wanted to create a school environment which would be consistent with the humanistic values expressed by the NASSP model and by their own educational philosophies and used the guide group program to pursue that end.

The Westridge faculty members were hired during the spring and summer of 1972. Most of the teachers were hired from within the system utilizing a staff transfer process. A second group

of staff members was hired new to the school and to the district. A third portion of the general faculty represented teachers who were, essentially, "draftees" whose positions had been eliminated when new school attendance boundaries had been developed to accommodate Westridge. "Approximately one-third of the teachers faced the choice of joining the Westridge faculty or of leaving the district" (68).

During the summer before Westridge opened in 1972, a cadre of staff members was chosen to meet with the Westridge administrators to plan the school's programs and to select additional faculty. As one administrator recalled:

We had the 16 member Team Leader group locked in. They were involved in hiring the next one-third of the staff. Those people were told 'Buy into the guide teacher program or you don't get past the front door.' (68).

One general meeting of the Westridge faculty, hired at that time, was held in the spring of 1972 and a series of department meetings followed to plan the instructional programs.

These programs were assisted by the ample, flexible space capabilities provided by the design of the building. Teacher work areas were constructed in several locations and staffed resource areas were similarly dispersed throughout the building. A commons was provided for student use, and space was provided for social as well as academic interests. The new building, the new equipment, and the new potential uses were very attractive to the

staff but when fall arrived, the building was not completed and the opening of school was delayed.

As a consequence, several days were spent in meetings at a nearby junior high school. A cadre of department leaders and key staff members had been meeting at the junior high school with the Westridge administrators for several days, but the majority of the teachers reported without any additional preparation for the difficulties to be encountered in getting the school opened or for the demands made by the guide group functions. Brief meetings were held to inform the total staff about the expected timelines for opening the school and to prepare the staff to begin making home visits to students assigned to guide groups. Even after those cursory meetings, the role of the teacher in the guide group program was not generally well-known by the staff, but the home visits began. The premier edition of the school newspaper contained the lists of guide groups and the students assigned to them but also contained this program description:

. . . students and parents will have an opportunity to discuss curriculum offerings, school philosophy, admission after absence procedure, arena scheduling, graduation requirements and develop a tentative student schedule with the guide teacher. (73, p. 2).

Additionally, the guide teacher was expected to ". . . explore the student's goals and interests in the areas of education, vocation, and recreation" (74, p. 1).

A record-keeping function was expected from the program's

inception. Teachers were required to:

1. Keep a folder on the student which will contain up-to-date records on attendance, progress reports, parent and student conferences, educational forecasts and a check list of requirements and credits and performance indicator competencies when appropriate.
2. Conduct a home visit with each student and parents prior to the beginning of classes each fall.
3. Assist the student and parents in interpreting the graduation requirements and competencies, and to monitor student's progress. (74, p. 1).

Following the initial home visits in the fall of 1972, staff enthusiasm for the guide group program grew. One of the Westridge counselors remarked:

You just won't find anyone here who has anything negative to say about the teacher guide program. Sure, it's been a lot of work, but if the administrators can find the time, busy as they are, we certainly can. (75, p. 2).

Another staff member observed, "Seeing these kids in their home environment has helped us understand them better, and it should help us refrain from prejudging or stereotyping our students" (75, p. 2). One other charter staff member commented:

. . . we've been telling parents and students for years that the schools belong to them. Now we're showing them, and I know they appreciate our efforts. (75, p. 2).

Perhaps anticipating the eventual program evaluation, one Westridge staff member claimed, "It's changed teachers tremendously. Sooner or later it's got to have the same effect on the students" (75, p. 2).

Nonetheless, in that first year, the long-range results from the guide group program were only speculative. The program had drawn heavily upon an example used in another high school in the state but no firm data base had been established for that program. The impact of the Westridge adaptation was based largely upon staff enthusiasm and the conviction that positive results would eventually appear, although the extent of this expectation was not determined. No formal evaluation plans were developed or, apparently, anticipated.

To facilitate the performance of the varied guide group responsibilities, specific time was built into the Westridge daily schedule which, for teachers in 1972-1979, consisted of five periods of instruction, one period of preparation time, and one period of guide group duties. The guide periods were distributed throughout the school day, similar to preparation periods, varying with each teacher's assignment for a particular academic quarter. Students were permitted to schedule seven periods of classes but typically carried five or six with the additional time remaining legitimately unstructured, to be used in resource areas, in the media center, in the commons, or in independent study. These facilities were available throughout the day and provided students and staff many opportunities for the flexible use of time and space, an approach which was compatible with the prevailing educational philosophy described by the planning committee and implemented by the Westridge developers.

Because a large portion of the Westridge curriculum consisted of nine-week and semester classes and because the students' and teachers' schedules varied nearly every quarter, there was no effort to structure the students' open time to coincide with the guide periods of the individual teachers. Unlike some other schools using the guide group concept, Westridge did not operate with all of the students and teachers meeting at the same time during the day.

The absence of regular group meetings which characterize guide group programs in other schools reflected the views of the Westridge developers. One of these administrators explained:

We don't have group activities because few teachers are capable of leading them. Group activities have the potential to become a negative thing, degenerating into a home room where 90% of the teachers didn't use the time for instruction and lots of kids skipped. (76).

A similar condemnation of the stereotypical "Home Room" is provided by another Westridge developer, who remarked:

Home Room is a case where students are told not to disturb the teacher, to do what they damn please. There is no attention given to the students and very little supervision. Teachers don't assist students with topics, problems, course changes, etc. (72).

Another member of the Westridge administrative staff and an influential person in the development of the school's original goals, expressed this view:

Other programs used the group thing as an outgrowth

of the Home Room or Reg. Room, using extensive staff inservice to prepare for group counseling. This would require lots of structure and help for most of the staff. We provide 1/7 of a teacher's day to meet individually with students---no other program really does that. How can anything meaningful be done in 10 minutes in a group? If groups were of 9-10 students, then maybe, but with 15-20 students, it's not possible. One-to-one is better, more advantageous. (77).

The only time that Westridge guide teachers regularly met with their students as an entire group was at about three-week intervals when the students assisted in the completion of attendance verification notices which were mailed to parents and guardians. With this exception, which was essentially a clerical function, the teachers and the students in their guide groups planned to meet for individual conferences rather than for group activities.

Acknowledging this situation, one Westridge administrator commented:

A clerical function has evolved. It can be performed in a variety of ways, but our guide teachers work closely and the guide teacher groups become a way to go about it. We seldom have group work, although guide teachers do a lot of clerical work which concerns their guide students. Credit checks, C.P.I.'s, etc. can be a catalyst for other types of relationships or concerns based on individual contacts. For instance, a teacher might ask 'What do you want to do after here? Let's get some plans.' (77).

These individual contacts or conferences required, under the Westridge model, that students occasionally miss portions of classes to meet with guide teachers. Because all guide teachers

needed to meet with their students at various times throughout the school year, there was a high tolerance for permitting students to keep appointments with guide teachers, even though classes might be missed, a practice not typically well-received in other school settings.

A related issue involved the implied acceptance of using spare time, lunch periods, or preparation time to conduct guide teacher work. The guide period was available each day but often the teachers' and the students' schedules made contact during that particular part of the day virtually impossible. In a sense, when guide teacher work was done during other portions of the day, the guide period became compensatory time and teachers occasionally used the guide periods to complete class preparation efforts, for coffee breaks, for casual conversation, etc., when a preparation period, for example, had been used for guide group work. This trading of time was a distinguishing factor in the Westridge program.

In addition to time, Westridge guide teachers were given extra compensation. Because they were expected to make home visits each fall, the guide teachers reported early to begin each school year. The first year of operation, the Westridge guide group program required staff members to report two days earlier than other teachers in the district. After that initial experience, three days of extra duty were required to complete the guide group tasks and teachers were paid per diem for that effort. After the

first year's lessons, a token mileage factor was paid as reimbursement to teachers for their travel required to complete the home visits. The program cost for the Westridge model with approximately 1300 students and 80 F.T.E. was roughly \$20,000.

During the three extra days, guide teachers contacted students' families and arranged for home visits. Until the 1978-79 school year, when computerized scheduling was introduced, one of the critical agenda items for the home visits had been the planning of the academic program and first quarter's schedule. Until the switch to computerized scheduling, Westridge offered an arena scheduling process each nine-week quarter, and students were permitted to select courses and teachers based on plans made with the guide teacher.

Most families received home visits from the Westridge staff, although parents were given the option of meeting at the school or in some other setting. For a typical school year, Westridge guide teachers reported:

1. 28.8 hours average time per guide-teacher in the registration process
2. 99.19 average mileage per staff member
3. 96% of the total registration was completed by the guide-teachers.
4. 81% of the . . . students were registered during a home visit. (78).

Although registration and program planning received substantial attention during the home visits, there were numerous other topics

suggested for guide teachers and families. These areas of possible discussion were included in a "Check List for Guide Teacher Visitation-Registration Conference" which served also as a record of the home visits. This "Check List" (Fig. 1) was intended to suggest items typically of concern to students and to their families but was also meant to assist the guide teachers when trying to explain the guide group program and the operating procedures in effect at Westridge High School.

Despite the philosophical arguments made by the Westridge developers in support of the guide group program, the "Check List" (Fig. 1) gave little evidence of humanistic purposes or program intents. In contrast, the form listed several topics which outlined clerical and procedural issues requiring record-keeping by the guide teacher and communication to the families. It is interesting to note that the "Check List" (Fig. 1), while providing something to talk about with families, reveals that human concerns were not recorded in any formal way. This approach illustrated little of the humanistic philosophy credited with generating support for the inclusion of the guide group concept at Westridge.

Although the home visit, and the tasks expected during it, were emphasized since the opening of the school, there were some attempted modifications in the operation of the guide group program. In 1974, students who were to enter Westridge from the junior high school were given the opportunity to choose guide teachers, rather than being assigned randomly. The decision to

(Fig. 1)

CHECK-LIST FOR GUIDE TEACHER VISITATION-REGISTRATION CONFERENCE

1. Student _____ Date/Time of Conference _____
2. Guide Teacher _____ Length of Conference _____
3. Items/Topics to be covered:
 - ___ 3.1 Development of seven period schedule, with course alternates, as necessary.
 - 3.1.1 Minimum six credit classes for Sophomores.
 - 3.1.2 Minimum five credit classes for Juniors/Seniors.
 - 3.1.3 Four credit classes or less with conference approval of student, parent, G.T. (Counselor involved as necessary).
 - 3.1.4 Explanation of Resource time use (in building) and/or Campus Release time (away from building).
 - ___ 3.2 Development of an agreement regarding family's involvement in student program changes.
 - ___ 3.3 Graduation requirements and credits guide student has earned.
 - ___ 3.4 Student's status re: Competency Performance Indicators.
 - * ___ 3.5 Emergency Data Card (If new telephone/address, please place asterisk (*) in upper right corner of card.)
 - * ___ 3.6 Excuse writing and check-out card.
 - ___ 3.7 Attendance mail-out procedure (to be mailed out twice each quarter).
 - ___ 3.8 Opening Day(s) schedule(s).
 - ___ 3.9 Students Rights/Responsibilities Guide (If available, otherwise to be distributed at a later time).
 - ___ 3.10 Automobile Registration card, if appropriate.
4. Suggested Items/Topics to be covered:
 - ___ 4.1 Role of Guide Teacher (for Sophomore and new families).
 - ___ 4.2 Areas of interest to the student.
 - ___ 4.3 Post high school planning.
 - ___ 4.4 Handbook items such as grading, closed campus, student conduct, fees/insurance.
 - ___ 4.5 Volunteer parent aide/resource bulletin.
5. ___ Home Visit ___ Student Only ___ With Parent
6. ___ School Conference or ___ Other ___ Student Only ___ With Parent
7. ___ Total time involved regarding this conference. (Please include preparation, travel, home visitation and follow-up time necessary to complete this conference).
8. ___ Miles traveled to complete conference.

*Cards from each family are to be completed and signed by Guardian. Please return cards to Guidance Secretary.

permit student selection of guide teachers was quickly abandoned after that trial experience. Two problems emerged which led to the decision. The junior high school students had no opportunity to meet the prospective guide teachers and, consequently, used rumor, innuendo, and reputations as the selection criteria. The second problem involved a few Westridge teachers who tried to recruit potential guide students. Both of these practices occurred in other guide group programs operating nationally, but in the Westridge model the impact was perceived as negative. The intent had been for each guide group to contain a random selection of students rather than a hand-picked collection. As a result, this attempted modification in the organization of the guide groups was rejected by administrative decision and guide teachers and their student groups were randomly matched since that time.

A second modification was attempted as a result from concern that more comprehensive orientation for new students should be provided. Although an "Open House" was held each spring for incoming students and their families, the decision was made to attempt a nine-week orientation, using the guide teachers as the staff leaders for groups of new students. After the first few weeks of activities, students and guide teachers argued that the daily meetings were degenerating into "Home Rooms" or "Reg. Rooms" and that this transformation was inappropriate.

Several reasons possibly contributed to this reaction. The advising responsibilities left little time for group work.

Counselors developed agendas which stressed group process skills and anticipated that teachers would willingly serve in that role. The teachers, however, had not received training for that task and rejected many of the planned activities. Additionally, many teachers quite openly expressed their dissatisfaction with the agendas to the students, who certainly had no investment in the scheduled tasks and were generally pleased to be reprieved for another day.

In a questionnaire administered in 1973-1974, one staff member critiqued the orientation aspect of the guide group program by observing:

I hated it and my kids hated it, but it should be kept for two more years so that everyone else on the staff will be able to share the joys of the program. (79, p. 2).

Because of the negative reaction to the orientation activities and to the "Home Room" style which guide teachers perceived as developing, the orientation dimension of the program was abandoned and the group facilitator role was never again attempted. Ironically, the abandonment of group activities probably contributed more to the development of "Home Room" types of clerical emphasis.

Despite the rejection of these attempted modifications, the organization of the guide group program remained unchanged. Counselors did not continue the rejected activities. The students were divided into groups responsible to teachers and the teachers

were divided into groups responsible to counselors, who were accountable for the operation of the guide group program and reported to an administrator. The counselors, who were guide teachers as well, retained the following list of responsibilities:

1. Meet with the guide teacher routinely each month and with the total group periodically.
2. Develop guide room agendas.
3. Arrange for college visitations.
4. Arrange for military visitations.
5. Act as a resource for students and staff when they have questions about College Entrance and Placement Examinations.
6. Assist students in post high school planning.
7. Be able to administer and interpret standardized tests and disseminate information of dates of such tests.
8. Assist guide teachers with sustaining helpful relationships with parents.
9. Assist classroom teachers who are having student attendance problems.
10. Act on student referrals from guide teachers.
11. Make any referrals to resources outside the building. These may include:
 - a. School district specialists.
 - b. Social and health agencies.
12. Counsel individual students.
13. Counsel groups in areas of interpersonal relationships, self-awareness, career decision-making, values, etc.
14. Coordinate freshman and new student orientation. (74, p. 3).

Guide teachers were expected to ". . . make referrals to counselor regarding learning or behavior problems when needed" (74, p. 2).

The counselors and guide teachers shared the responsibility for maintaining accurate records of student progress. This record-keeping function included monitoring student efforts to pass the competency requirements instituted as part of the state graduation guidelines. The guide teachers were responsible for recording and reporting the status of all students in the guide groups. When formal notification was required that a student would not receive a diploma, the guide teacher and the counselor made the necessary determination and notified the student and family. The emergence of this clerical role was explained by a Westridge administrator, who argued:

We wanted individuality---different guide teachers for kids in the same family. We wanted the kids to have someone to relate to individually. We wanted parents to have free access to school and the guide teacher to be the ambassador to the family. The clerical work came after the fact. (76).

This administrator further commented:

The guide teachers are the most knowledgeable about kids that community members recognize. Kids see guide teachers as primary sources, not as book-keepers. (76).

Nonetheless, many of the duties often expected of counselors were transferred to classroom teachers.

The administrative expectation that all staff members were to function as guide teachers reflected the importance placed on the

program from the outset. All Westridge staff members were hired with the performance of the guide group functions as a condition of employment and guide teacher responsibilities were part of annual evaluations. The guide group concept was perceived as part of the original planning committee's list of goals and was implemented by the program developers as a major component in the school's daily operation. The first Westridge principal recalled, "The guide teacher program is the best single idea we had" (72).

In 1972, the guide group program was included as one of the innovations at Westridge High School. Among the other ideas which were novelties in the community's schools were: using a planning committee composed of students and parents as well as educators; permitting students to select their own courses and teachers; eliminating study halls; abandoning the "excused" and "unexcused" absence designations and permitting students to sign their own readmit slips; forsaking the "hall pass" concept; developing a quarterly arena scheduling procedure; assisting students in the development of lengthened or modified academic programs; utilizing independent study contracts; introducing challenge testing for credit; offering a seven-period day as opposed to the more typical six periods; and varying the staffing patterns to involve teachers, aides, student teachers, interns, parents, volunteers, and college students just preparing to teach. The conviction that these innovations would be helpful to students was expressed by one of the program developers who commented:

We believed that we could really get things done for kids. We were excited about working for kids. We could honestly try to meet individual needs of kids. We could do that because we believed, given the chance, kids would make the right choices. (68).

Guide teachers were available at Westridge to assist students and families in planning educational programs and in making choices. Responding to an in-house survey instrument administered in 1973-1974, after nearly two years of the new school's operation, the Westridge faculty expressed support for the guide group program and for the seven-period day but recommended that hiring additional staff was ". . . an absolute necessity" (79, p. 2).

In 1974, the Westridge principal, who was one of the original guide group program developers at the school, requested five extra F.T.E. to staff the school for the next school year. This request called for additional staff beyond the number supplied according to the district staffing ratio used in all of the community's high schools. Although unanticipated at the time, the Westridge request for five more teachers set the stage for the political confrontations which developed later and which resulted in the evaluation of the guide group program at the new school.

Unlike the other high schools in the community, Westridge's instructional program offered a seven-period day as opposed to the traditional six-period day. The collective bargaining agreement, although reflecting the increased aggressiveness of the

teachers' association, stipulated an eight-hour workday with a thirty-minute, duty-free lunch but left latitude for individual building differences in determining the periods in the day. Westridge teachers, while instructing somewhat shorter classes, actually experienced more student-contact time each day, due primarily to the period spend as part of the guide group program.

A major argument for the use of the seven-period day was to ensure that a wide range of curricular offerings was available throughout the daily schedule. The decision to ask for the five extra staff members reflected an administrative commitment toward maintaining a diversified, seven-period, academic program offering legitimate choices for all interested students. As the Westridge principal recalled, "We requested the five extra teachers for the seven-period day, not to run the guide teacher program" (80).

In November, 1974, the Westridge principal made a second request, this time for extended funding for the guide group concept operating at the school. In a memorandum communicating this request, the principal explained:

The Guide Teacher Program is to overcome the remoteness of school staff and members of the students' families and to develop a close student-advisor relationship. (81, p. 1).

Additional program funding was justified this way:

1. The Guide Teacher Program is to overcome the remoteness of school staff and members of the students' families by establishing a 1 to 20 ratio and developing a close student-advisor relationship.

2. Each Guide Teacher will make visits to the homes of 90% of his or her guide students during the school year. This will require approximately 27 hours in addition to regular preschool preparation time.
3. Informal reports from parents and students indicate strong support for the continued strengthening of school-home relationships and to personalize the students' relationship with the school staff.
4. Inquiries from other school districts indicate that there is a need nationally to strengthen the school-home relationship and to personalize the student's relationship with the staff. (81, p. 1).

The requests for the five extra F.T.E. and for the further support for the guide group concept were granted by the local school board. The philosophical underpinnings for the new school had specifically included recommendations for many of the operating features and programs available at Westridge. The elective curriculum, the seven-period day, the varied staffing patterns, the use of resource areas, and the nine-week classes received support and encouragement from the earliest planning committee meetings.

The inclusion of these operating components (none of which was available in the community's other high schools) resulted in a substantial increase in the per pupil costs at Westridge. At the annual budget hearings, questions were frequently raised about the added expenditures for Westridge High School. The introduction of the five extra F.T.E. and the guide group program added to the questions from school district patrons whose children

were not offered the same opportunities as those found at Westridge. This disparity did not generate heated criticism until 1977, but each year the Westridge guide group program provoked some questions within the community, particularly at budget meetings where all school district financing was scrutinized.

In 1974-1975, criticism of a different sort was directed toward the Westridge High School operations. During that period, three different types of evaluation were conducted at the school. One study was performed by the local school district in an attempt to measure the school's performances in respect to the stated goals established by the original planning committee. A second evaluation was performed by the regional accreditation association during an on-site visitation. The third appraisal was performed by the state department of education as part of its review of the district's compliance with the expected minimum standards. In all three studies, specific commendation was made regarding the operation of the guide group program. The state department study revealed:

One of the major instruments for providing guidance services is the guide system in which each professional staff member, including administrators and counselors, is assigned 15 to 20 students. Each counselor also acts as a guide resource person to approximately 17 guide teachers. A GUIDE HANDBOOK has been developed which outlines the specific duties of the guide teacher and the guide resource person. It is apparent from talking to students and staff that there is a total school commitment to the guide system. The guide system seems to result in expanded guidance services and positive relationships between staff, students, and parents.

However, more research needs to be initiated so that the overall effectiveness of the guide system can be determined. (82, p. 211).

During the next two school years, the program continued to operate as it had from the outset, emphasizing the home visit and the individual contacts between students and staff. At the budget hearings in 1974 and in 1976, heated attacks were directed at the Westridge guide group program, but the full intent behind the criticism was unclear. Each year, after hours of discussion, the budget committee included the guide group program at Westridge in the final budget offered to voters.

The opposition to the program was expressed in terms which suggested that the antagonism was primarily due to the inclusion of the concept at one school but not at the others in the community. The persons who addressed the budget committees did not express rejection of the guide group concept but wanted the funding among the schools equalized. Although lay persons occasionally criticized the committee and the local school board for permitting the program at one school and denying it at others, with the exception of a few staff members at a junior high school, no other school in the community had staff or administrative personnel express interest in trying the program.

The concern about equalizing the funding among the high schools continued into the next round of budget hearings in 1977. In February of that year, lay speakers before the local school board began to question the guide group program at Westridge and the

special benefits associated with it which were available exclusively in that one part of the community. One critic indicated, ". . . if equal support from the community is expected for the budget, there should be equal funding in all schools" (83, p. 10095). This citizen continued by observing, "The only way to get equal distribution of funds is for the Board to quit funding extra programs for individual schools" (83, p. 10096). This view stressed the need for equalized funding and illustrated an argument which was not based on the perception that the guide group concept would offer positive benefits to the other schools. The issue was not a desire for an opportunity to innovate but was, instead, a wish to redistribute the available resources.

This message was not lost on the board. One member commented:

I support the guide teacher program and am disappointed that we cannot have it throughout the District. With Budget Committee meetings coming soon, I am sure there will be discussions about equalization of equal funding. (83, p. 10098).

This concern expressed the board's growing awareness that some effort had to be made to equalize spending among the high schools in the community in response to the public outcry that the schools on one side of the city were receiving a disproportionate amount of the available money to the detriment of the other schools. In this vein, a student told the board, "The difference between the funding in the high schools seems unfair" (83, p. 10095).

A parent from the attendance area where a junior high school

staff had initiated a trial guide group program supported the effort and requested ". . . \$11,725 to provide for a teacher and inservice training" (83, p. 10095). A counselor at that same junior high school explained:

We have developed a guide program without any extra funding, yet we feel a need to expand this program to make it more effective. There are unique problems on the junior high level and we can notice a change in the behavior of the student who has been hostile in the past. (83, p. 10095).

In contract, the Westridge program received approximately \$20,000 for the extra per diem pay and mileage as part of the inservice days at the fall of each year.

The Westridge guide group program became a visible target for much of the community hostility, not because the program was demonstrably odious or outstanding, but because it was one more feature provided for the students and families in one portion of the city but denied to the people served by the other high schools.

Adding to the difficulty was the argument offered by the Westridge principal in defense of the guide group program. His explanation stressed a kind of domino effect which indicated that the guide group program could not and would not function without the necessary time to do the required tasks. That time, as has been previously explained, had been built into the teaching day of seven periods instead of six. The five extra F.T.E. added in 1974 had been needed not to operate the guide group program, according to the defense, but to provide a satisfactory elective curriculum

demanded by the seven-period day. Further confusing the issue was the explanation by the Westridge principal that some portions of the granted extra F.T.E. had been traded away for classified staff supplements to continue the operation of the staffed resource areas. These salaries, contended the Westridge principal, should be considered as part of the costs of operating a seven-period day and should not be added to the operating expenses for maintaining a guide group program. Essentially, this perspective linked all of the elements, suggesting that the denial of the five extra F.T.E., the elimination of the seven-period day, or the removal of the guide group program were all interrelated; to lose one would be to lose all.

At one point, critics suggested that the operating costs for the guide group program neared \$100,000, but faced with the Westridge principal's arguments, no one, except possibly the Westridge principal, seemed certain how much money was spent on the seven-period day and how much was spent on the guide group program. Because one of the seven periods in the day was for the guide group work, the separation of the two expense areas seemed very difficult.

Nonetheless, the superintendent pledged to clarify the per pupil expenditures among the high schools in the community. Shortly thereafter, on February 17, 1977, one of the assistant superintendents made a public explanation of per pupil costs. As the accompanying charts (Figures 2, 3, and 4) indicate, there was some disparity among the per pupil expenditures, but Southridge

(also a pseudonym) emerged as the community leader, exclusive of the guide teacher program costs which were not figured into the illustrated expenses. The discovery that the guide teacher program did not cost as much as critics had argued left one school board member "startled" (80) and a budget committee member indicated that she was "amazed" (84). The comparison of per pupil expenditures, exclusive of the guide teacher program at Westridge, however, left one board member somewhat unconvinced:

From my understanding, the guide teacher program is at the heart of everything. . . You can't just consider it in isolation. You couldn't just take it out. (84),

This view notwithstanding, the assistant superintendent's presentation supported the contention that the five extra teachers were meant to answer student demands for a full seven-period day of classes and that the extra staff members were not necessary for the guide group program to function effectively, although the counseling efforts involved would be very difficult but possible in a six-period day. Further, giving some warning of events to develop in the future, the assistant superintendent revealed that similar guide group programs could be implemented in the other high schools for approximately \$20,000 each.

However, even when confronted by this report, the local school board members were uncertain about the issues which had developed and requested some answers regarding the effectiveness of the Westridge guide group concept. An evaluation, to be conducted

(Fig. 2)

NUMBER OF F.T.E. REQUIRED TO STAFF POPULATION OF 1656 STUDENTS

	EASTRIDGE		NORTHRIDGE		SOUTHRIDGE		WESTRIDGE	
	Student	FTE	Student	FTE	Student	FTE	Student	FTE
LANGUAGE ARTS	1661	14.5	1777	15.5	1892	16.5	1464	12.7
SCIENCE	954	8.3	872	7.6	1003	8.7	1053	9.2
MATH	740	6.2	888	7.4	1020	8.5	839	7.0
SOC. SCIENCE	1135	9.1	1349	10.8	1168	9.3	1382	11.1
FOR. LANGUAGE	411	3.7	345	3.1	395	3.6	461	4.2
PHY. EDUCATION	773	5.2	823	5.5	823	5.5	658	4.4
HEALTH	428	3.4	378	3.0	477	3.8	378	3.0
ART	362	3.3	313	2.9	395	3.6	543	4.9
MUSIC	263	2.7	296	2.0	411	2.0	559	2.0
BUSINESS ED.	526	4.1	790	6.1	658	5.1	494	3.8
IND. ARTS	428	3.9	411	3.7	395	3.6	378	3.4
HOME EC.	263	2.4	296	2.7	329	3.0	313	2.9
STUDY HALL	165	1.2						
CAREER CLUSTER	49	1.0	99	1.9	132	2.6	66	1.3
CAREER CLUSTER	263	3.5	477	6.4	526	7.0	543	7.2
PERS. FINANCE	263	2.1					296	2.4
TOTAL F.T.E.		74.6		78.6		82.8		79.5
# OF TEACHERS PER STUDENT		.045		.048		.050		.048

(Fig. 3)

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL POPULATION ENROLLED IN SUBJECT AREAS					
BY SUBJECT ENROLLMENT	SUBJECT AREA	% OF STUDENTS ELECTING THE SUBJECT			
		EASTRIDGE	NORTHRIDGE	SOUTHRIDGE	WESTRIDGE
23	LANGUAGE ARTS	101	108	115	89
23	SCIENCE	58	53	61	64
24	MATH	60	54	62	51
25	SOC. SCIENCE	69	82	71	84
22	FOR. LANGUAGE	25	21	24	28
30	PHY. EDUCATION	47	50	50	40
25	HEALTH	26	23	29	23
22	ART	22	19	24	33
	MUSIC	16	18	25	34
26	BUSINESS ED.	32	48	40	30
22	IND. ARTS	26	25	24	23
22	HOME EC.	16	18	20	19
28	STUDY HALL	10	0	0	0
10	CAREER CLUSTER	3	6	8	4
15	CAREER CLUSTER	16	29	32	33
25	PERSONAL FINANCE	16	-	-	18

HIGH SCHOOL COST ANALYSIS
INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL PROGRAM BASED UPON EQUAL ENROLLMENT

	EASTRIDGE	NORTHRIDGE	SOUTHRIDGE	WESTRIDGE
(1) PER PUPIL PERSONNEL COST	729.76	768.89	809.98	777.70
(2) PER PUPIL SUPPLY COST	<u>78.68</u>	<u>83.66</u>	<u>93.05</u>	<u>95.63</u>
TOTAL OF 1 & 2	808.44	852.55	903.03	873.33
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	23.5%	24.8%	26.3%	25.4%

(Fig. 4)

ACTUAL HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM COST

PER PUPIL COST	1145	1206	1271	1259 *
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	23.5%	24.7%	26.0%	25.8%

* EXCLUDING GUIDE PROGRAM

by the school district's Department of Evaluation and Special Services, was ordered to be carried out within the administration's current budget.

At this point, there were several perspectives from which the demand for program evaluation might be viewed. The Westridge High School guide group program was an educational innovation intended to "humanize" that secondary school. If humanizing meant trying to meet each individual's needs and attempting to structure an educational program so that all students felt known and cared for in some personal way, was the program successful? As an innovation, had known practices been followed? Had the program been implemented effectively and by what standards could that process be measured?

The emergence of clerical tasks rather than group interaction activities suggested that the program was operating but was it fulfilling the expressed functions identified by the program developers? Was the program addressing individual student concerns or was the program fulfilling some clerical needs in the school? Had the program changed?

The criticism directed toward the program appeared to be couched in terms which were based primarily on economic and political objections. The preponderance of the critics demanded that the funding of the community's high schools be equalized by some process but said little about the impact of the Westridge guide group program. How would the program evaluation treat the

criticism? How would the demands that all schools should receive equal funding be considered in an evaluation of a program which operated exclusively at one high school?

The guide group program's vulnerability was admitted by the Westridge principal, who observed, "The bottom line is that we became a political liability" (85). Recognizing this same reality and not wishing to get caught in any ensuing fall from favor, the district's evaluation personnel conducted the guide group program evaluation under considerable political pressure, both to show that the program was successful and not a waste of money and that the evaluators were successful themselves. This awareness was expressed in the first planning session held by the evaluators:

What does the board want? We'll ask board members what they need to know. We'll ask 'What do you want to know? What is important to you?' We can compare what the board thinks exists and what is out there. (86).

Each board member received an introductory letter in May, 1977, and then was contacted for a personal interview regarding the Westridge guide group program evaluation.

Westridge staff members were also contacted for ideas and were assembled at a May 25, 1977 "brainstorming" session focusing upon the evaluation task and the direction that such a study might take. During this meeting, there was a suggestion that, perhaps, the program could be evaluated on the basis of "Whether or not it did

what it had claimed to do---did it deliver as promised?" (87). This idea proved to be important in the development of the final evaluation design and led to the examination of what the program had promised. What claims had been made for it? How was the program to be assessed during its operation?

A more subtle dimension was then introduced. This element was the decision, made by the evaluators, to compare what the school board members perceived to be the program's operation versus the way the program actually worked. This approach created a kind of dualism whereby the guide group program would be judged against its own objectives and against those expectations held for it by the local school board members. This evaluation process might have posed little problem, assuming that clearly stated, and generally accepted, objectives existed and that the local school board members were well acquainted with the history of the program, understood its purposes, and agreed upon its standards of operation. None of these assumptions was entirely correct. As a consequence, the basis for the program evaluation shifted substantially away from the initial design.

The board members' comments and perspectives were summarized in a September 6, 1977 memorandum from the Supervisor of the Department of Evaluation and Special Services. The memo commented:

All but one member of the School Board interviewed concerning the Westridge Guide Teacher Program viewed it as a pilot program and, if successful, it should be extended beyond the walls of Westridge. (88, p. 1).

Two related areas were also introduced by the board members:

- (1) Can it be extended in view of the cost that the program would involve?
- (2) Can it be extended in view of the teachers in other school buildings? Are they willing, in other words, to accept this type program and operate within its constraints? (88, p. 1).

The attempt to answer these and other questions and to evaluate the overall program was not aided by "The lack of definitive program standards that are recognized and accepted by all involved . . ." (88, p. 2). As a consequence, the following decision was made by the program evaluators:

The measurements taken will be based upon the implied standards developed from the perceived perceptions held by teachers, parents, administrators, and School Board members. The measuring instruments will be developed by the Department of Evaluation and Special Services based upon information collected from the various parties involved. (88, p. 2).

Initially, the guide teacher program was to have been evaluated, at least partially, on the basis of its goals and objectives. This proved difficult because, with the exception of the philosophical goals stated in very general terms by the program developers, no goals or objectives for the overall program existed in written form. The only performance objectives located by the evaluators were in respect to the home visits:

1. All certificated staff members will attend a staff meeting to prepare for the home visits by guide teachers. The meeting agenda will

include an explanation of the goals and materials associated with the home visits.

2. Each guide teacher will contact 100% of his or her guide students to arrange a conference. 75% of the conferences will involve a home visit. A conference will be held at school with students not visited at home.
3. Each guide teacher will discuss each item on the conference check-list with each guide student including: graduation requirements, class schedules, grading system, parent handbook, attendance card, resource time, career goal development, and the district rules and regulations concerning student conduct.
4. Each guide teacher will attend a meeting to critique and evaluate the home visits and to hand in completed checklists to counselors. (81, p. 1).

Not surprisingly, with the absence of clearly written and accepted goals and objectives for the total program, wide disagreement surfaced regarding the guide teacher program and the expectations held for it. A mixture of views, representing school board members, parents, teachers and administrators, was used to determine the standards eventually used for the evaluation process. The evaluation design shifted focus to areas and types of conclusions which could be drawn:

<u>AREA</u>	<u>TYPES OF CONCLUSIONS</u>
1. Identify perceived standards toward which personnel are working.	1.1 Identify common standards to be used to measure accomplishment.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 2. Identify perceived standards held by parents and students for the Guide Program | 2.1 Identify common standards. |
| | 2.2 Match and/or identify discrepancy in the standards held by parents, students, and teachers. |
| 3. Identify the amount of actual teacher time spent in guide teacher activities and the activities involved. | 3.1 Match the time spent and the activities involved to the standards to determine if they have been met. |
| 4. Identify perceived quality of service. | 4.1 Indicate the services that appear to be most useful. |
| 5. Compare the students and parents knowledge of school requirements to those of other schools. | 5.1 Determine if Guide Teacher Program is increasing the knowledge of parents and students above those of other schools. |
| 6. Compare number and types of student related needs and the handling of these with those of the other schools. | 6.1 Indication of a trend of the Guide Teacher Program to affect behavior of students in a positive manner. |
| 7. Determine the relationship of the Guide Teacher Program to course offerings and the seven-period day. | 7.1 Classification of the Westridge Program and their interrelationships. (88, p. 3). |

These seven areas and types of conclusions became the starting point for the development of the evaluation procedures to be employed. Because of the absence of goals and objectives, the evaluation process was described as "goal-free" (88, p. 4). This procedure was further explained:

Goal free evaluation takes place when explicit goals or standards are not available, and what has to be done is to begin developing them at the same time measurements are being taken and to match at a later date when possible. (88, p. 4).

The design of this evaluation indicated the absence of clear, acceptable goals for the program, thus making its performance standards dependent upon the perspectives of individuals involved with the program or served by it.

Randomly sampled groups of parents, teachers, and students were interviewed and their perceptions of the program were recorded. The commonalities across the groups' responses were identified and summarized. The summary statements became the standards which were used in the program evaluation. These standards of performance were:

1. The overall purpose of the Guide Teacher Program as viewed by both parents and teachers, is to do the following tasks:
 - Schedule students.
 - Track student progress toward graduation.
 - Counsel students on classes.
 - Provide consistent adult contact through a one-to-one relationship.
2. The second standard of the Guide Teacher Program was: parents would receive a home visit once a year by the guide teacher and information on their son or daughter's progress in school on a nine-week basis.
3. Parents, students, and teachers expect the guide teachers to deal with student problems relating to:
 - Scheduling;
 - Attendance;
 - Academics such as grades, graduation requirements; and

-Student behavior as it affects that student's progress in school.

The term "dealing with" in the standard means to teachers and parents that the guide teacher will meet with the student involved, discuss the problem, and try to develop a solution to the problem.

4. Teachers, students, and parents feel that it is the responsibility of the guide teacher to keep all records needed to monitor student progress towards graduation. These records include such things as number of credits, CPI's passed, courses taken, and courses needed for graduation. Secondly, it is the responsibility of the guide teacher to make a periodic determination of a student's progress toward graduation.
5. In order to help students fulfill their graduation requirements, the guide teacher is expected to suggest courses and/or alternative courses; suggest courses that will enable students to pursue their goals; communicate course selections and relationships between the courses and the graduation requirements to both the parents and the students.
6. Teachers are expected to assist students in setting long-range and short-range goals, counseling and answering questions concerning the development of career or post-high school goals.
7. The guide teacher is expected to know the course offerings and requirements for the courses that are offered at Westridge High School.
8. Parents are expected to have greater knowledge of Westridge policies and operation than if there were not guide teachers.
9. Parents of Westridge High School students have a greater knowledge of graduation requirements than parents of students in the other . . . high schools. (89, pp. 3-5).

The next step in the evaluation process was to survey a new set of randomly selected parents and students, who were in

contact with the guide group program, to determine if the services, indicated by the standards of performance, were actually delivered. An additional survey was given to random sample of parents throughout the district to determine the accuracy of standard #9. The various survey responses were tallied and the conclusions about the program were reached, using the performance standards from the interviews as measurement.

On February 28, 1978, the final evaluation report was given to the school board. This report, delivered by the Supervisor of the Department of Evaluation and Special Services, indicated that all nine perceived standards for the program were being met satisfactorily. There was, however, one school board member who criticized the report. His objections included:

1. If there is conflict between expectations as viewed by the school board and Westridge staff--- what are they?
2. What is the role description of the guide teacher? Is it documented?
3. How many parents were sampled?
4. What were the confidence limits?
5. Sequence of events to determine standards of performance indicates that there were none until the study was performed.
6. If the role of the guide teacher has been discussed with parents---why was it not presented in the report?
7. The use of statistics to describe effectiveness . . . is misleading.
8. The term "majority" is used in some places

while some statistical support is offered in others. Why isn't the report consistent in style? The way it is written is misleading and confusing.

9. I'm used to scientific reports which provide an introduction, summary and conclusions, and then the support data and discussion. The guide teacher evaluation was poorly done. (90).

This board member's objections to the report, more than to the actual program itself, represented a vocal minority position. The evaluation report was accepted by the school board and trumpeted to the community under headlines which read "Counseling Program Gets High Marks. . . " (91). Addressing the political impact of the study, the newspaper article remarked, "The value of the program is certain to be a factor in budget committee deliberations beginning March 9" (91).

Certainly, the evaluation of the Westridge guide group program produced some answers but to what questions? Were the right questions asked? What was revealed by the evaluation that the local school board members could not have known without it?

The Westridge Planning Committee had been charged with the task of trying to design a new high school program but school board approval had been necessary before any of the committee's recommendations could become part of the new school's operation. The seven-period day, the elective elements of the curriculum, and the entire guide group program all had received school board approval and had been features of the school's operation since its conception. The additional five F.T.E. were added along

with the expanded funding for the guide group program, but both of these changes had been given school board approval. Each year, the Westridge guide teachers had made the home visits and had received extra per diem pay and a mileage differential for that task, accounting for the approximately \$20,000 about which the board had full knowledge. After the home visits each fall, the Westridge faculty had submitted brief reports of the visits, the families contacted, the time invested, the topics discussed, and the mileage driven. All of this information was available within the district, and much of the reported material was used to determine the annual expenses for the program. Why, then, call for an evaluation, particularly one which attempted to stress a cost-benefit thrust to determine where the district's money for the program had gone?

The exploration of the economic aspects of the guide group innovation prompted the question: "If the program costs were already known, what was the real purpose of the evaluation?" The evaluation concluded that the Westridge program cost the district \$20,000 and that this expense was ". . . a result of three additional workdays required for staff to make home visits at the beginning of the school year" (89, p. 22).

Although this information had been clearly established before the evaluation effort, less well-known was the role of the extra five F.T.E. in the accounting of costs for the guide group program or the seven-period day. The evaluation indicated:

Once the seven-period day was created and the decision was made to let students take classes during the 'seventh period,' it was necessary to staff the school for whatever percent of students elected to take seven classes a day. In the first semester, enough students to warrant 1.6 additional FTE took seven periods. (89, p. 20).

How did the evaluation account for the other 3.4 F.T.E. allocated to Westridge? The explanation stated:

. . . this FTE is mostly comprised of clerical assistance. These people are used to supervise the four resource rooms during the school day, provide assistance in the library because of additional student use, and to provide additional clerical help in scheduling students every nine weeks. If the resource rooms were not put to their intended use, student access to the library restricted to before and after school or with a pass from a classroom teacher, and courses changed from nine weeks to 18 weeks in length, the District could save 3.4 FTE.

If students were denied the opportunity to take seven periods, the District could have saved approximately 1.6 FTE in the first semester of this year.

If the District were to drop the guide teacher program, it would not save any FTE. The only dollar savings possible with the guide teacher program is the \$20,000 used to bring staff on early. (89, pp. 20-22).

These conclusions represented the economic areas involved in the program evaluation and provided some additional clarification of the cost-benefit issues faced by the budget committees at their annual meetings.

The budget processes reflected the growing acceptance of the national trend toward demanding program accountability. From

this perspective, was the Westridge guide group program evaluation a kind of post hoc PPBS (program, planning, budgeting, system) effort meant to shore up a program which had been operating for several years? This possibility received some support from the current Westridge principal, who observed:

We became zero-based and had to justify everything, not by needs or staffing, but by programs. They changed the rules. (76).

This shift in budgeting processes did not reflect negatively on the entire Westridge program, as the principal explained:

The change to program staffing also had an effect on us. We actually looked pretty good. Our seven-period day had lots of kids involved in programs, such as art. For a certain number of students, we received an art teacher. We looked good. (76).

The examination of the guide group program as an educational innovation generated the question: "Was the program assessed in terms of its original intents and stated objectives?" There is no available evidence to suggest that the local school board members were hostile to the program, but the goal statements were found to be unacceptable, largely because "The expectations listed. . . differ from the School Board in their specificity" (88, p. 2). The board could not determine the level of accountability for a program described as attempting

. . . to overcome the remoteness of staff and families, to strengthen the school-home relationships, and to

personalize the students' relationships with the staff. (81, p. 1).

Consequently, the evaluators structured the program assessment to meet school board expectations and ignored the original intents described by the developers.

The personal interviews, used in the evaluation process, elicited perceptions of what students, parents, and staff assumed to be appropriate standards of performance for the guide group program. These standards emerged as the evaluation was conducted, a process the evaluators described as "goal-free" (88, p. 4) and associated with the work of Michael Scriven who developed the technique as the result of an attempted evaluation of educational products being considered for possible dissemination. Initially, Scriven and his associates tried to rate the goals involved and the degree of success in achieving them, but the task later prompted Scriven to observe:

Reflecting on this experience later, I became increasingly uneasy about the separation of goals and side effects. After all, we weren't there to evaluate goals---that would be an important part of an evaluation of a proposal, but not (I began to think) of a product. All that should be concerning us, surely was determining exactly what affects this product had (or most likely had), and evaluating those, whether or not they were intended.
(67, pp. 34-35).

Scriven's support for goal-free evaluation grew, at least in part, out of his recognition of the importance of side-effects, both those intended and those unintended. There was, however, one

important distinction between the way Scriven suggested that goal-free evaluation be used and the manner in which the technique was employed in the guide group program evaluation: Scriven did not propose that the standards for the program undergoing evaluation be inferred from the perceptions of those people involved with the program or served by it.

Nonetheless, the implied standards, based on individual perceptions about the program, became the basis for measurement in this particular evaluation, which was conducted by district personnel operating within the school system funding the program. In addition to the difficulty of remaining objective in the search for information about the program, the evaluators, working under those circumstances, faced serious political consequences themselves.

The evaluation department was closely aligned with the district's central administration and was often expected to provide information directly to the local school board. Test scores and evaluation reports were frequently used to indicate that the school district was functioning effectively and that high quality educational opportunities were being provided for the community's youth. The use of test scores and evaluation data for public relations did not characterize school systems in one particular area but where annual voter approval of the school budget was a political reality, the impact of such efforts cannot be comfortably ignored.

In respect to professional and bureaucratic controls operating during the evaluation of the guide group program, some additional

questions were raised. Did the board want some justification for ending the concept at Westridge High School? Did the board want some evidence which could be used to defend, perhaps even to disseminate, the Westridge innovations, including the guide group program? Because the individual board member's perspectives in regard to the evaluation were unknown, the evaluators decided to ask the board members for their views and expectations. As one evaluator remarked, "We did the only thing we could. We punted" (92).

Also uncertain about the board's intent in respect to the evaluation were the members of the Westridge staff. The faculty had already experienced three evaluations: one by district; one by the accrediting association; and one by the state department of education. In each of these evaluations, considerable staff involvement and commitment of time had been required. When notified that another evaluation effort was to be mounted, this time addressing the guide group program, many faculty members were disheartened and expressed concern that, once again, Westridge's programs were to be singled out for scrutiny by evaluators, apparently bent on trying to discredit the teachers' efforts.

It is interesting to speculate about the social-psychological possibilities stemming from the guide group program evaluation. The earlier evaluations performed at Westridge indicated staff, student, and parent support for the operation of the guide group program and there appeared to be little reason

for another evaluation of that innovation. The Westridge staff members were not unaware of the possibility that if the evaluation were to illustrate that the guide group program was dysfunctional in some way, there would be the potential for the loss of that program, the seven-period day, the nine-week classes, the staffed resource areas, and the additional five F.T.E. After all, the Westridge principal had used that argument before the school board and many of the Westridge teachers had been involved in the defense of the program when its funding had been questioned at budget hearings.

Whether or not these teachers carried out their respective guide group responsibilities more energetically is unknown, but the faculty at Westridge was very much aware of the evaluation effort and prepared for it. They, too, knew the accuracy of their principal's observation:

The guide program saved us from lots of really dumb first-year moves. The guide program saved us time and time again. (93).

The final evaluation report indicated that the Westridge guide group program was meeting all of the standards identified for it, much to the apparent relief of all concerned. The Westridge teachers, students, and parents, the administrators at Westridge and in the district's central offices, the evaluators and the school board members had all played different roles in the evaluation process; but there was no indication that anyone tried to torpedo the effort.

Actually, what did the report prove? Standards for the program performance were taken from the perceptions of a random sample of people involved with the program or served by it. The perceived standards were then checked by contacting another sample of parents and students within the Westridge High School attendance area to see if those people were receiving the same guide group program services.

With the exception of the population used to check the standard regarding knowledge of graduation requirements and CPI's, all of the evaluation population contained subjects involved with providing guide group services or with receiving them. One part of this population established the standards, based on personal experiences and perceptions regarding the manner in which the guide group program affected them, and the other part of the evaluation population verified similar treatment.

The evaluation report suggested that the teachers were providing the services they claimed, at least to the extent that the teachers' performances met the perceived standards of acceptability held by community members who were recipients of the program's services. The evidence cited in the evaluation report supported arguments defending the seven-period day, the elective aspect of the curriculum, and the extra five F.T.E. but said nothing about a guide group program in terms of its original purposes.

No measurement was conducted to determine the degree to which the remoteness of school staff and members of the families had

been overcome. The extent to which the school-home relationships were strengthened was not assessed. The school board's rejection of these standards substantially assisted the evaluators, who had wrestled with the task of trying to draft an evaluation design which would measure the vague criteria offered as the original goals for the program.

The perceived standards, which were used in the evaluation, were not particularly congruent with the original goals and certainly did not speak to the NASSP Model Schools Project's desire to humanize the schools. Although the Westridge guide group program was evaluated, using the design discussed in this study, and was shown to be successful by the perceived standards, it would have been quite another matter to have attempted to show that the use of the guide group concept had significantly humanized that high school.

A curious blend of economic accountability and educational politics apparently generated the demands for the evaluation of the guide group program. If the intent of that evaluation had been to silence critics within the community and to avoid additional controversy, then the assessment, at first, appeared to have accomplished that task.

The budget committee meetings in the spring of 1978 involved considerable discussion about the differences in funding among the community's high schools but did not focus upon the Westridge guide group program as directly as in previous years. Nonetheless,

additional difficulties and political machinations affecting the guide group program developed with eventual impact not only on Westridge High School but on the entire district.

The actual sequence of events can be traced back to the fall of 1977 when the guide group program evaluation was initiated. The Westridge guide group program funding, the extra five F.T.E., and the seven-period day had publicized the disparity between the way the new school was financed and the way in which the other high schools in the community were supported. With four high schools in operation and the fifth scheduled to open in the fall of 1979, the school board and the superintendent requested principals to assist in the examination of differences in operation.

Among the problems discussed, in addition to the Westridge guide group program, were enrollment imbalances, six- and seven-period schedules, curriculum differences, student supervision and control philosophies and procedures, guidance services, and individual building needs. In each of these areas, substantial differences existed in respect to the ways in which the high school principals managed their buildings and programs.

On November 21, 1977, these principals were summoned to the first of many difficult meetings to deal with these issues and to draft plans for equalizing the secondary schools within the community. Most of the problems were left unresolved for several months although enrollments were stabilized somewhat by

the decision to move ninth grade students to the high schools as part of an attempt to convert the district structure to four-year high schools fed by junior high schools.

On February 28, 1978, the evaluation of the Westridge guide group program was presented to the board. This report also included information regarding the use of the extra five F.T.E. and the operation of the seven-period day, which were additional issues of concern in respect to equalization efforts in the district.

On March 7, 1978, a presentation was made to the school board by teachers supporting the six-period day for the high schools, all of which, except for Westridge, operated on that system. The presentation indicated that high school teachers, exclusive of those at Westridge, were polled with ". . . 179 in favor of the 6-period day; 17 in favor of the 7-period day, and 5 undecided" (94, p. 12588).

The six-period day offered fewer class and credit opportunities but provided 55 minutes of daily instruction. The seven-period day offered more classes and credits each year, but the periods provided 50 minutes of daily instruction. The school board faced the task of trying to reconcile these differences. A report was scheduled for November, 1978, when the school board would have the opportunity to consider the impact of the changes necessary for equalization among the high schools.

However, additional information relating to the six- and

seven-period daily schedules and to the utilization of the guide group program was provided at the March 14, 1978 school board meeting when a facilities study was discussed. This report indicated:

As it stands currently, in many of our high schools, if a room is used for five periods, the sixth period is probably used as a work station for the teacher. Six periods versus seven periods criteria can be treated independently in some ways in clock time and teaching periods. A question is [sic] of how to deal with student unscheduled time for those who take five, six, and seven periods. Where do they go the additional times? Westridge provides for it in many ways, like counseling, or other activities. (95).

The school board had formed a sub-committee chaired by a board member to study the issues involved in equalizing the four existing high schools and adding a new one in 1979. With guidance from building principals and district officials, this committee eventually reached agreement on a set of recommendations which were presented to the full board:

The Committee recommends that the Board direct the administration to budget certificated staff at the senior high schools for the 1979-80 insofar as possible in accordance with the following guidelines:

- a. Each school will be staffed on the same ratio.
- b. The regular classroom staffing ratio will be 1 teacher to 24 students.
- c. The normal teaching schedule for a full time senior high teacher will be six periods of class and one period of preparation time.

- d. Each school will operate on a seven period day.
- e. Each school will operate a guide teacher program. (96).

The school board member who chaired this committee remarked, "Such a system would bring equality and comparability to the five high schools" (97).

Board action on this committee's recommendations was planned for the following week, but staff reactions were solicited during the brief interim period. Quick action was planned by the board to provide adequate time for the superintendent's budget message to incorporate these new program outlines.

The community was informed of the recommendations and one of the local newspapers responded on December 19, 1978 by publishing an editorial which argued:

SENSITIVE APPROACH VITAL TO SEVEN-PERIOD DAY

The switch from a six-period to a seven-period day in . . . high schools is too complex an issue to be introduced one week and voted upon the next. But that is the announced intention of the . . . School Board with the decision scheduled tonight.

The proposal, made in bare outline by the School Board's Committee on Personnel, reached teachers last Wednesday. They had until Monday noon to provide written comment. The proposal leaves many questions unanswered.

It is intended to create more equality of educational opportunity among the five high schools next year. It also is intended to reduce costs. These are laudable objectives. But implementing them fairly isn't a simple matter.

The School Board would like to get the matter settled quickly so it can proceed with the formation of next year's budget and the structuring of program at the new . . . High School.

At present, only Westridge High School operates on a seven-period day. A teacher instructs five periods, has one period for lesson preparation and one period to administer the guide teacher program. The guide teacher program is unique to Westridge, although it has been introduced in a modified form at other schools. It calls for teachers to visit the homes of students before the school year and to counsel those students throughout the year.

The extra period and the guide teacher program raised the cost of instruction at Westridge. This was justified when Westridge was started seven years ago as an experiment which could be used later by the other schools.

The significant difference in funding levels can no longer be by [sic] justified on that basis.

The School Board committee proposal would add one instructional period to each high school teacher's load. At Westridge, this would mean the elimination of the period devoted to the guide teacher program.

All other high schools would add a guide teacher program---but without the extra period during the day to administer it, as is the present policy at Westridge.

As presented early last week, the plan would cut 31 teachers at a saving of \$600,000. Later estimates have reduced this to around \$450,000 because of the extra money needed to pay for the pre-school year home visits by the teachers and other modifications.

The extra class per teacher means more than extra papers to grade and more instruction time. For many teachers, this will mean one more subject to teach without more lesson preparation time.

We endorse the spreading of the guide teacher program. But we recognize that what is being done at Westridge, with teachers who volunteered for such a program, will not work as effectively with all high school teachers and without the one period a day allocated at Westridge.

The task of sustaining the best of the Westridge-type program at that school and utilizing it throughout the district is too important to be accomplished by a quick decision by a School Board committee. The board should avoid creating polarized positions from which it is difficult to create the modifications and the cooperation necessary to make the new program work. (98)

While providing a note of caution, this editorial also acknowledged correctly that there were at least two areas of serious concern to the district's teachers. The staff members had little time to respond to a series of recommendations which would potentially eliminate 31 teaching spots and would add one period of instruction per teacher without additional compensation.

At the December 19, 1978 school board meeting, the recommendations were accepted by a 5-2 vote. This action was announced the next day under headlines which proclaimed, "All. . . high schools to have 6 period days; class size boosted" (99). The article commented:

The board voted 5-2 to make all high schools--- there will be five next fall---have the same number of class periods a day and for all teachers to teach the same number of classes a day. (99).

Additional board action, also by a 5-2 vote, resulted in the following:

. . . the board established the six-period day as the district standard and the teaching load at five periods a day. Attached to that motion was an amendment to increase the average class size to 25.5 students, compared to 23.7 in this year's budget. (99).

This time, however, the Westridge guide group program did not appear to have survived the school board scrutiny, which had focused primarily upon the home visit component:

Unanimously, the board salvaged the portion of the Westridge program that brings teachers to work several days before classes start to visit students in their homes and work out class schedules with students and parents. (99).

The home visit notwithstanding, the overall impact of the school board action appeared to be a harsh blow to the guide group program, perhaps dooming it entirely by the elimination of the seven-period day schedule which had provided teachers with additional time to complete the guide group duties.

Following the decision, one board member commented:

Admittedly, Westridge will suffer. But I will continue to support a plan that will allow all students to have the same opportunities. (99).

The board chairman also discussed the inequities, observing:

It's been a specific issue the last three year's budget hearings. It's not a new issue, and it's not a new proposal.

I think it's time that we have a standard-length class day and the same number of periods in the day. We can't afford the model program any longer. We must weigh what we can afford.

I agree that it doesn't bring equity by itself, but if we don't do this, we can't get equity at all. (99).

The next day, December 21, 1978, the school district released a summary of the board action and indicated, "The issues of class size and guide teacher program will be examined more in the months ahead" (100).

The Westridge administrative team was uncertain at this point, about how to interpret the school board's action and the apparently conflicting aspects it contained. Quietly, the principal worked to muster support for the guide teacher program. On January 2, 1979, extremely visible support came from the editorial board of one of the local papers. The editorial headlined "Encourage extra teacher effort" (101) and explained:

If the innovative educational program at Westridge High School were to be eliminated because it had failed, there could be no objection. Instead, it is in grave danger of being eliminated because its success is an embarrassment.

We're sympathetic with the . . . School Board's dilemma. Seven years ago, it allowed the new Westridge High School to initiate flexible scheduling to permit each student to develop a study program fitted to his individual needs. Resource centers were provided to help students use free time to greater advantage.

A guide teacher program was included, to give each student more personal counselling.

While some students haven't been able to use this extra degree of independence wisely, most have responded well. Students from other parts of the district transfer to Westridge to take advantage of it.

Fads and fashions in education change. In these past seven years, the primary attention has moved away from developing each person to his best ability and has concentrated instead on 'back to basics' and the battle to stop the slipping test scores of the vast majority.

This, coupled with public resentment against rising school costs, has dimmed the dream of transferring the advantages of the Westridge program to the rest of the district.

The Westridge program became the 'hot potato' for the School Board. It costs more than other high school programs, creating resentments in the rest of the district. On the other hand, it would be very expensive to create the resource centers in the older buildings and to extend the extra costs to the other high schools.

In addition, the philosophy of high school principals vary. Some disdain the Westridge-type program. Not all teachers like the idea of visiting students' homes and the direct, personal counselling it involves.

The Westridge teachers have volunteered for the extra 'kid-contact' that goes with the guide teacher program. They support what's happening in their school.

Two weeks ago, the Personnel Committee of the board recommended extending the Westridge-type seven-period day and the guide teacher program to all high schools. But when the board came to vote on the issue the pendulum swung in the opposite direction. Elimination of the seven-period day at Westridge was ordered, to bring it into conformity with the rest of the district.

We sincerely hope that, in practice, this can be modified to preserve the essence of the Westridge program. The goal of allowing students to reach their potential should not be abandoned.

Giving greater attention to providing equality of education opportunity needn't bring district-wide conformity.

School Board policy should encourage Westridge teachers and any others who are willing to make an extra personal effort in the performance of their responsibilities. (101).

Two unlikely allies combined to defeat the seven-period day proposal supported by the Westridge staff members. As the editorial correctly identified, the other high school principals in the district did not feel comfortable or supportive in respect to the seven-period day or the Westridge philosophy. The innovations at Westridge were not all attractive to the other high school principals in the community. While not necessarily in total agreement philosophically, these principals were opposed to the seven-period day and resisted the conversion of all of the high schools to the Westridge model.

The teachers, also in the other high schools in the community, represented another obstacle to the seven-period day proposal. The arguments for the six-period day were couched in terms which suggested that the primary opposition to the seven-period day was based on academic considerations, particularly the need for 55-minute classes, but there were some other factors involved, although not discussed in the editorials.

As a matter of local custom, the first half hour and the last half hour of the school day in these high schools belonged to the teachers to use as they wished. This combined hour, the guaranteed preparation period, and the 30-minute, duty-free lunch represented one-fourth of the teachers' workday. The change to a seven-period

day would eliminate most of this previously unassigned time, requiring, instead, about 25 minutes more student contact time per day. The increase in student contact time was no more attractive than the additional teaching period within the eight-hour workday and staff members from all of the high schools, exclusive of Westridge, argued against the seven-period day.

Opposition to the seven-period day and to the Westridge guide group program was manifested within the teachers' association leadership, too. Following the board decision, teachers received this report from their association president:

Subsequently, the Board established a six period day and five period teaching assignment for all high schools. This position will, unfortunately, have the impact of reducing the program at Westridge High School. (102, p. 3).

The willingness by the teachers' association to abandon the Westridge programs and staff apparently was a decision which only slightly diminished the relief which followed the defeat of the seven-period day proposal. The teachers' association position was further explained:

In summary, the Personnel Committee recommendation would have been accepted had it not been for the input provided by a great many teachers. The Board has shown that, at least on some occasions, it will take into account the concerns of teachers. Your collective efforts, coupled with a reasoning posture on the part of the Board, defeated a potentially devastating recommendation. (102, p. 3).

In what seemed to be a pretty transparent attempt to curry

favor from, or at least to appease the angry and, in some cases, dejected Westridge teachers, the association president sent a somewhat curious memorandum following the board action. This association message stated:

It is apparent to most of us in the District that the Westridge program is one that is unique . . . , yet one that has the total support of its staff. And it is probably apparent to you that it is becoming more and more fashionable for segments of the community to use Westridge as a target in speaking of the 'frills' of education.

Because Westridge has been a target of criticism and because the Superintendent has raised a number of significant issues as they relate to equalization, I believe that it is necessary for teachers to get actively involved and give some input to the powers that be. (103).

Among the issues the association president identified were: magnet schools, class size, role of department leaders, and any issues the staff wanted presented to the school board by the association. The president, while not openly rejected by the Westridge teachers, was unsuccessful in his attempts to generate much enthusiasm for new battles. Equalization had come to mean, for the Westridge staff, that the innovations at the new school would be dismantled and that the association would not stop that effort.

Despite the efforts of the Westridge teachers, administrators, and a few parents, the professional and bureaucratic controls which operated at the time appeared too powerful and effectively influenced

the school board's decisions. The combined forces of other high school administrators, teachers, association leaders, and lay critics defeated the Westridge proposals and apparently doomed the guide group program and the seven-period day. However, not all of the support for the Westridge guide group program and seven-period day had been exhausted.

February 27, 1979, was a key day in the events which transpired. At noon that day, a service organization, composed of many prominent women in the community, hosted a massive luncheon for leaders from businesses and professions throughout the city. School district administrators and board members attended, partly because the organization hosting the event contributed several thousand dollars worth of clothes for needy children referred to it by the district, and partly because this annual event provided a public relations opportunity which was widely recognized and used.

At this gathering, the Westridge principal was engaged in conversation with two school board members while the superintendent appeared to be attempting to separate them. One observer commented, "The superintendent tried to prevent [the Westridge principal] from discussing issues with the board members" (104). The superintendent's attempts were not totally successful and were finally thwarted entirely when two of the hosting women, who were also parents of Westridge students and were supportive of the school's programs and administration, joined the conversation group. One of these women explained, "We saw what was happening and went up and talked" (105).

At the end of the luncheon conversation, the superintendent told the women:

It's not necessary to send anyone to the board meeting tonight. The six-period day and the guide teacher program won't be on the agenda tonight. (105).

This comment marked the end of that conversation and the group dispersed. The women and the Westridge administrators accepted the superintendent's statement and made no special effort to construct a presentation for the school board meeting scheduled for that night.

That meeting lasted quite late as members struggled with a wide variety of agenda items. Toward the end of the meeting, the superintendent said:

The matter of the six-period day in the senior high schools for next year needs to be discussed at this time. Direction is needed from the board. (106, p. 13660).

At the superintendent's suggestion the board began discussion of the possible plans for structuring the six-period day schedules at the high schools. Action taken by the school board at the December, 1978 meeting had established six periods as the standard for the instructional programs in the high schools, but the exact time schedules had not been determined. Two of the high schools' principals had presented plans for 50-minute periods while three other schools' principals had chosen 55-minute periods for school year 1979-1980. The Westridge plan was one of the 50-minute

operations but also provided another possibility for continued guide group program functions. The Westridge plan offered the following:

Regular Schedule

1. 8:35 - 9:25
2. 9:30 - 10:20
3. 10:25 - 11:15
4. 11:20 - 11:50
- 11:55 - 12:15
- 12:15 - 12:45
5. 12:50 - 1:40
6. 1:45 - 2:35

Teacher Prep. 2:40 - 3:30 (107, p. 1).

This schedule permitted five periods of instruction from each teacher within a six-period day but also provided for the continued operation of the guide group program. The plan was explained in a memorandum from the Westridge principal to an assistant superintendent. This message explained:

Teachers would teach five periods and have one period designated as guide time during student contact hours. Teachers would be available for student conferencing, schedule building, graduation requirement monitoring, and academic counseling during the period assigned for guide functions.

Teacher prep time would be a common time for all teachers and would come during the time now assigned to seventh period. (107, p. 1).

This plan also introduced another dimension to the problem of comparability. The district superintendent spoke to this problem at the February 27, 1979 board meeting, commenting:

An issue is that at two high schools there would be six 60-minute periods, and at the other three high schools there might be six 55-minute periods, which means there is 30 minutes of additional instruction per day in some cases. Multiply that over weeks and months and they are back to the old issue of comparability. (106, p. 13661).

Following this observation, lively school board discussion developed. Regarding the Westridge plan, one local school board member said:

This appears to me to be consistent with policy determination made some time ago. I see nothing sacred about the learning process in fifty or fifty-five-minute periods. (106, p. 13661).

A motion was introduced that the senior high schools establish 55-minute, six-period daily schedules but this motion failed. A second motion was presented to accept the 55-minute schedules. In the discussion of this motion, the board chairman offered the following alternatives regarding the definition of "equal" and the ways in which the term could be applied to the high schools:

1. The same number of minutes in a period.
2. Flexibility in the number of periods, but over a semester that the instructional minutes per period be the same.
3. As long as it is in a tolerance of 'x' minutes, that it is close enough to say it is equal. (107, p. 13661).

The motion was defeated. A third motion followed suggesting that flexibility in the number of minutes in a period be permitted but, over an academic quarter, the total minutes be the same. This compromise attempt failed. A request for reconsideration of one of the earlier motions died without a second. The final effort was a motion that the superintendent be directed to schedule the six-period day with 55-minute classes. This last attempt was defeated and the board abandoned the entire issue, adjourning at 12:45 A.M.

The next morning, February 28, 1979, the high school principals were called to a meeting where they encountered the message, "You will all be the same" (108). The Westridge proposed schedule was rejected at that meeting but a form of the guide group program was retained, intended to provide academic counseling and some home contact. No time period during the instructional day was provided and there was no plan to include the home visit.

In essence, this modified program constituted more work for teachers without corresponding payment or time to do the work, other than at the beginning of the school year. One Westridge administrator expressed the view that the program had become a ". . . \$100,000 P.R. Program" (108). The Westridge guide group program was the only one of its kind in the community and had been of great interest to many educators who visited the school or who sent teams of teachers and parents to visit. Within its own system, however, the Westridge program did not gain support from other administrators and was rejected as a model for district adoption.

At that same meeting, the Westridge principal received additional instructions not to discuss any of the issues with school board members or to attempt to mobilize local school advisory committee members or parents in defense of the school's operations. One of the assistant superintendents at that meeting indicated that, "The building principals had too many allies and political allegiances. Perhaps it is time to think about rotating principals" (109).

Westridge parents, however, were free to act on their own in support of the school's programs and three of those parents scheduled a March 1, 1979 meeting with the editor of one of the community's newspapers. The three parents, mothers of Westridge students, knew the editor, had worked with his family in efforts to salvage school programs for the talented and gifted children, and generally felt confident that he supported high-quality educational programs.

The three women wanted somewhat different goals accomplished but were eager to work together to defend Westridge High School. Two of the women wanted the reinstatement of the seven-period day schedule which offered a broader range of academic electives and flexible scheduling possibilities. The third mother's family had received a three-hour visit from her son's guide teacher. Because they were so impressed by that staff member's efforts, the family became committed to efforts to support the school and its programs. All three women had been visible and active for many years in budget

committee work, parent advisory group involvement, student activities support, and numerous other forms of community service for the schools. As one member of the trio remarked:

We had worked long and hard for the school district trying to make this a good community for schools. (105)

Another parent in the group provided an additional perspective regarding the trio's involvement:

We wanted to save what we could save. We wanted to keep one school left as an alternative. We didn't want to have all five of the schools the same. (105).

This desire to support the Westridge operation as an option was further explained in respect to the group's concern about the criticism directed at Westridge. Having made presentations at budget meetings as well as at school board meetings, the trio's members expressed some frustration about the lack of support for the school and its innovations. One mother commented:

We were totally frustrated. There hadn't been enough support for Westridge at the budget hearings and we wanted to do something to help, so we went to the paper. (105).

That was the decision made by the women that afternoon, but they did not remain content with just that effort.

The women left the newspaper offices following the meeting with the editor, who assured the trio that he would support alternative school operations within the system and promised to

write an editorial to that effect, which he did a few days later.

The women wanted to accomplish something more but had no established plan. They explained:

It was a spontaneous day. Everybody wants to know how the newspaper will cover something. After our meeting with the editor, we said, 'Let's go meet with the superintendent.' (105).

They went, without appointment or advance warning, and found that the superintendent had a meeting scheduled. Instead of leaving his office, the three women remained to see if there would be any chance to see the superintendent, if only for a few minutes. When told that the three women were still waiting to see him, the superintendent canceled his prior commitment and met with the Westridge supporters for approximately 45 minutes.

From the trio, he learned that they had been to see the newspaper editor. He also received some other information from the women; as they explained:

We told him that we had been part of an active committee for several years before he came into the district. We explained that we had wanted to make some administrative changes but knew that we had to wait for a couple of years for a new superintendent, so we did little at that time.

Then we told him that he came in as the new superintendent with lots of new ideas and pep. We had given him his chance and it now looked as if it was time for us to get organized again. (105).

Having delivered that message as the conclusion of their presentation

recommending retention of the Westridge programs, the women thanked the superintendent and left his office.

That evening, the high school principals were called and told to report for a breakfast meeting the next morning. At that 7:30 A.M., meeting, the superintendent informed the high school principals that they would all have guide group programs. As the Westridge principal recounted:

At 4:00 one evening, the guide teacher program was out. I got a call about 8:00 that night that we were going to have a 7:00 A.M., breakfast meeting the next morning, March 2. The superintendent gave his pitch about guide programs and they were in---just like that, without a word of discussion from anyone! (110).

The high school principals and district administrators spent the day drafting various plans for the guide group adoption and operating schedule to be utilized at each school. By the end of that day, agreement was reached in the development of comparable high school programs for the 1979-1980 school year. Unanimously supported recommendations included:

Pre-School Counseling

Teachers will be brought back two days early in the fall to:

1. Make home visits to students new to the school.
2. Orient students to programs and graduation requirements.
3. Provide students with academic and career counseling.

4. Assist students in transitioning from the middle school to high school.
5. Conference with parents and become aware of their priorities.
6. Finalize registration and schedule.
7. Provide necessary information to students and parents for decision making.

Teacher's Advisory

One unit of time daily will be available to teachers to advise students with academic problems and special needs. This guide teacher program will be similar to the one at Westridge in years past. It will be provided at all five high schools in 1979-80. Some functions and activities to be conducted during this period are:

1. Academic counseling.
2. Monitoring guide student performance in classes.
3. Help solve problems as they come up.
4. Arrange for special help as needed.
5. Maintain a folder on each student tracking academic progress.
6. Maintain a personal contact with students and parents.

Schedule

All high schools will offer six periods to students fifty-five minutes in length.

Teachers will teach five periods and have one advisory period daily. All teachers will have a fifty-five minute planning period. This will be a common planning period held at the end of each day. There are some real educational advantages to providing teachers with a common planning period. See attached schedule as an example of what each high school would have next year.

In addition, the principal may have, on a need basis, a special schedule for the day, to allow time for special teacher meetings, inservice, group counseling, etc. This is commonly referred to as an accelerated or "X" schedule. It merely shortens each period a few minutes on a given day to provide the needed time at the end of the day.

The aforementioned program will be evaluated near the end of next year to determine its feasibility and effectiveness and whether it should be continued. (111, pp. 1-2).

The Westridge principal was not the only person who was surprised by the turn of events prompted by the superintendent's announcement. The three Westridge parents who had been most directly responsible for the political muscle used to save the guide group program did not anticipate that the district would require implementation of guide group programs in all of the high schools. As one of the women commented:

We were just three housewives trying to do something to help keep the guide teacher program and the seven-period day at Westridge. We didn't want to force programs down the throats of the other schools. We just went for Westridge. (105),

The immediate prospect of having all teachers involved in the implementation of guide group programs did not receive support from the leadership of the teachers' association. The initial reception to the plan was not openly hostile, but teacher opposition quickly became evident. At the March 13, 1979 school board meeting, the president of the teachers' association spoke directly in respect to teacher concerns about the implementation of the guide teacher program:

The high school teachers have varying perceptions as to the plans for the program. Each of the high schools has followed a different process to inform staff. There are two issues of concern to the teachers: (1) Teacher preparation period within the student contact day must be maintained and cannot be eroded in any way; (2) That if guide programs are to be implemented in high school, then the school community should be allowed, as Westridge has rightly been allowed, to develop and determine those sound educational components of the program that they are most comfortable with and implement that program.

The preparation period is a highly emotional issue with teachers. It is defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for one instructional free period from other duties and responsibilities for utilization as preparation time. It is not certain that this period can be effectively accomplished at the end of the student contact day. For one thing, it conflicts with athletic programs, all after-school activities, curriculum development and revision work. The time after the regular school day is when many teachers work with students in their instructional problems and issues. The top priority is to have a quality educational program. The preparation period is an integral part of maintaining instructional excellence. (112, p. 13693).

To this teacher position, the school board chairman responded, by saying:

The Westridge program started as a pilot program and the concept for a pilot program is to test it and then evaluate that program and decide whether it is of benefit to children and if it is to try to implement it within the budget constraints, and, if not, eliminate it. The pilot program at Westridge has been in existence for seven years and there have been many evaluations, and has been considered successful, so it then comes to budget considerations across the District. The Board

made a decision to implement the proposed guide program in all the senior high schools for next year, and it is the task of administration and staff to bring about that transition as smoothly as possible and make it work. As to the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the new plan is for 1979-80 and therefore can be worked out at the bargaining table this spring. (112, pp. 13693-13694).

The teachers' association president countered by explaining:

We have not taken a position of opposition, but there is a negotiated agreement in which there are things that teachers consider important and one of those is preparation time. Teachers support the continuation of a preparation time within the student contact day. (112, p. 13694).

When asked about specific areas of objection, the association president indicated teacher concern regarding the preparation time and the extension of the contract year involving pre-school counseling. He also admitted that some staff members objected to the home visit component of the program. This resistance to the school board's decision brought heated comment from one of the board members, who charged:

There are other districts for your teachers to work in if they don't like policies in this district. Teachers appear more concerned with welfare of teachers than students. (113).

The association president responded, "Teachers' major concern is for the welfare of students--I resent the implication that it's not" (113).

Later in that board meeting, the recommendation regarding the six-period day and the implementation of the guide teacher programs

was accepted. Westridge High School had lost the seven-period day battle and with it the chance for a more flexible schedule of academic offerings, but the guide teacher program had been saved. The Westridge administration had argued from the beginning that without the necessary time in the teacher day to perform the guide teacher program tasks, the program could not function. The board action had appeared, at first, to doom any chance of retaining the guide teacher program as it operated at Westridge, but the superintendent's reversal and subsequent board support preserved the Westridge guide teacher program even though the seven-period day was sacrificed.

The teachers' association response was communicated the next day in a memorandum which contained the following:

SCHOOL BOARD ATTEMPTS UNILATERAL CHANGE IN
TEACHER WORKING CONDITIONS: INJECTS STRIKE
ISSUE INTO CURRENT ROUND OF BARGAINING

. . . Executive Board, meeting less than 24 hours following the School Board's announcement that the District intends to reduce senior high school teacher preparation time, has sent a formal letter to the District demanding (1) rescinding of the Board's action, and (2) bargaining in good faith on the issue. The letter gives the District 15 days to comply. If the District does not comply, . . . will refer the matter to counsel for appropriate legal action.

The Board has announced that the teacher's preparation time will be converted to an "advisory period." The displaced preparation period would be moved to after school work time.

'Any person who knows anything at all about senior high school operations knows many reasons why "after school preparation time is unworkable."'

The Board also announced that senior high teachers will be required to return to duty two days early for guide responsibilities. 'Although many teachers will be paid additionally on a per diem basis for the extra days and may even welcome the opportunity to help the kids, the District must bargain those conditions with the Association.'

Many teachers believe that the Board's action increases the chances of a teacher strike. . .
 "If preparation time is not a strike issue, then there are no strike issues." (114, p. 1).

The association was placed in a nearly untenable position because the district retained the right, under the collective bargaining agreement, to determine the teacher workday not to exceed eight hours. The teachers were entitled to a 30-minute, duty-free lunch and to a preparation period within the workday. Extra-duty days were to be paid at per diem. All of these conditions were met by the board's decision to implement the guide group program using a common preparation period at the end of the day.

The initial objections to the seven-period day stressed the desirability of 55-minute classes, which were retained, as well, under the board plan. At every turn, the association was faced with the task of trying to find objections to the decision without acknowledging that the extra time had been available all along but that it had been unstructured and not necessarily applied to student help.

Even the objections to the end of the day use for preparation

were dangerous, because those staff members who faced conflicts with extra-duty assignments and activities could be charged with receiving double pay for that portion of the day when teachers were supposed to be involved with the regular instructional aspects rather than in extra-pay activities. The only apparent avenue available to the association was the one selected, involving strike rhetoric and considerable leadership posturing, but no grievance was possible under the existing contract and the 1979-80 agreement had not been negotiated.

The next month, the school levy was approved by the community, and negotiations began seriously between the teachers' association and the district. Economic issues dominated but considerable teacher concern remained regarding the topic of preparation time in the senior high schools. Adding to the pressure was the real possibility that teachers state-wide would strike simultaneously in the large districts, including the one where Westridge was located. The teachers' association made no secret about that strategy, and local school districts revealed that administrative teams would meet at a large inservice conference to draft strike plans during the summer.

In the community where Westridge was situated, the local press provided regular coverage of the negotiation process. One editorial indicated:

Teachers are resentful of the School Board's imposition of the Guide Teacher program throughout the high schools, in that it would take away a lesson preparation period within the school day.

Underlying this debate is the issue of management right to determine policy.

We believe the community is supportive of the School Board's effort to have high school teachers be responsible for counseling on an individual basis with an assigned list of students and of teachers meeting with parents.

Personalized counseling and more parent involvement are worthwhile objectives.

At the same time, we can understand the teachers' needs for lesson preparation time within the school day, at a time when they are undisturbed.

When the School Board decided on a six-period, instead of a seven-period day, while expanding the Guide Teacher program throughout the district, this problem of overlapping needs was created.

If the individual schools are allowed enough flexibility in the use of available time, this confrontation probably can be avoided. But the trend is toward uniformity within the district, rather than flexibility. We feel this pendulum is in danger of swinging too far toward mandatory uniformity. (115).

This hope for moderation was given additional support when the state returned to individual districts excess property tax revenues. This money was available to districts and many chose to redistribute the funds as rebates or as offsets against the school levy. In the school district featured in this study, the money was partially used to settle the economic concerns introduced in the collective bargaining process. This decision left incidental issues and the preparation period as areas for possible disagreement. When the economic package was accepted, the other concerns were quickly settled.

Despite the resolution of the negotiation issues, an unmistakable trend had emerged in respect to the operation of the local high

schools. A local newspaper provided a two-part series addressing some of the concerns associated with this new direction. The series began by remarking:

Call it what you will---comparability, uniformity, standardization---some persons believe . . . high schools are becoming look-alikes.

All five high schools next year will have six-period school days and 55-minute classes. All high schools will have a guide teacher program.

A uniform discipline policy will be in effect next year. The attendance policy is under review. A standardized curriculum for grades 1-12 is in use.

The same teacher-pupil ratio exists at all high schools.

This article further commented:

Some look at the trend and see equal educational opportunity, particularly comparable spending per school after years of suspicion that Westridge was the rich relation compared to other high schools. They see a more consistent education program and more accountability.

Others see a stifling of creativity, a 'psychological downer,' if not outright danger in comparing schools. (116).

The critics' view received this clarification:

Because the school district cannot afford to apply what works best at each school district-wide, the consequence is an equal level of mediocrity. (116).

One school board member expressed this view:

We're assuming sameness means equality--- if we didn't have open enrollment (allowing high school students to select the school of their choice) it would seem more rational.

The past dozen years, the pendulum has made a complete swing from 40-plus school 'fiefdoms' to just the opposite.

I saw 46 little fiefdoms---principals could do anything they wanted to. School principals, frankly, paid little attention to district policy. The building principal was the end of the line.

In the past 10-12 years, we've gone from too much independence to too little. The attitude often is 'By God, you can't have anything I don't have.' (116).

Another board member, who first raised the issue, argued:

Moves toward standardization are important for equal educational opportunity. Schools still have plenty of latitude. (116).

The superintendent offered this explanation:

There was a point in time when every school did its own thing. A lot of that was done in the name of innovation.

Now the consensus is that some basic things are important to all students so the youngster doesn't get short-changed because of the neighborhood he lives in. (116).

The school most obviously out of step was Westridge which, it is important to remember, had been planned to be just that kind of school. Slowly, the erosion of the Westridge innovations and operations had occurred, much to the consternation and anger of staff members, students, and parents who enjoyed the style and

options which had prevailed at that high school. The Westridge principal contended:

Even when the other schools were making so much noise, they weren't saying 'Take this away from Westridge.' They were saying 'let us have what Westridge's got.' (85).

Additionally, this administrator took some of the responsibility personally, reflecting:

My big mistake was in requesting the five extra F.T.E. in 1974. That drew too much attention to how we were staffed. (85).

This program developer's analysis expressed a note of regret, but was certainly debatable. Many issues contributed to the difficulties encountered by the Westridge High School guide group program. Nonetheless, the Westridge program was used as the school district's model when teachers reported two days early in the fall of 1979-1980. The controversial guide group program was implemented, thus ending a rather extensive struggle within the community.

The initial concerns had focused largely upon the question of the effectiveness of the guide group program in terms of cost-benefit. The program evaluation introduced several new issues but did not clearly establish the program's educational impact, although obvious Westridge support was manifested. Continuing difficulties plagued the guide group program and made it the subject of considerable political maneuvering. The attempts to force district-wide comparability among the high schools added new problems for the innovative program and,

at first, seemed to doom the Westridge model. The intervention of three women who believed in the guide group program and in the seven-period day contributed to another aspect of the program's evolution. The change in the superintendent's leadership trend led to agreement among the high schools' principals. That agreement resulted in the 24-hour transformation of the Westridge program from one about to be abandoned to one about to be superimposed on all of the community's high schools, even at the risk of a potential teachers' strike. That final decision regarding the guide group program, an important innovation operating at Westridge High School, revealed a conclusion reached for reasons which dealt almost entirely with the politics of education.

CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS

The Westridge High School guide group program was introduced initially as part of the operation for a new, innovative high school. This school was one of many which were developed throughout the nation during a period when educators tried to accommodate, not only the post-Sputnik curriculum innovations, but also the demands for increased personal attention, program planning, evaluation, and counseling. The guide group concept provided a way to meet these perceived needs, and the program was touted as an example of the "humanism" inherent in the NASSP Model Schools Project offerings.

This study of the Westridge guide group program included investigation into the history of the program's operation, the forces which affected it, and the educational and political issues which concerned it. Heuristic theory assisted in the explication of these issues and in the ordering of the narrative required to illustrate the chain of events. This study offers several possible conclusions for those persons interested in how schools ought to operate and in how they do operate.

The conclusions are presented in the form of judgments based on the analysis of the assembled data. It is with the hope this research will assist in the improvement of schools and schooling practices, that these conclusions and additional questions which follow are presented.

1. The judgment that the guide group program changed from its original purposes:

The Westridge guide group program was predicated on the developers' beliefs that powerful relationships would develop among students, staff, and parents. Although the program was defended in terms which stressed interpersonal relationship possibilities, there was little evidence of concerted efforts to assist students and staff in the development of significant relationships.

Some group process activities were attempted but were met by staff rejection. Why, then, was the guide group program explained in terms which suggested that staff, students, and parents would interact if the teachers were unwilling or unprepared to perform that function in any systematic way? Did the faculty at Westridge ever accept the interpersonal relationship aspect of the program? Was the home visit simply a chance to talk about the year's schedule, to plan an academic program, and to explain the school's procedures? Was the purpose for the guide group program really one of performing routine, clerical tasks, albeit in a novel manner?

The daily activities and the suggested topics for discussion during the home visit provided the opportunity for students, staff, and parents to interact personally but stressed tasks which appeared to emphasize record-keeping. The use of the guide group program in response to the increased demands for records of student grades, courses, credits, and competencies introduced the possibility that clerical tasks took precedence over interpersonal communication

activities.

2. The judgment that known innovation practices received inadequate attention:

The inclusion of the guide group program in a new school with a new staff represented an innovation attempt of substantial complexity. Known practices reveal that innovations require ownership, involvement in decisions, participation in planning and implementing, staff development, and inservice experiences. How did the school district's administrators prepare the Westridge staff members for their involvement in the program?

Without the chance to participate in the planning for the guide group program, many Westridge faculty members learned what was expected of them from the first edition of the school newspaper and from some early staff meetings. The teachers' responsibilities were explained, but the necessary skills and training were left unattended. What activities should be included, as an educational practice, to provide for the needs of a general faculty involved in educational innovations? Without the opportunity to participate in the formulation of new programs, can staff members be expected to support what they do not help create?

This problem becomes even more troublesome when some staff members are "draftees," facing transfer to an unwanted assignment or release from the district. As a matter of educational practice, this issue also prompts several questions. How should a district accommodate the needs of these employees? What level of commitment

can be anticipated or required? What processes would be most helpful in the efforts to assimilate these staff members into the general faculty?

As personnel changes occurred at Westridge, the absence of inservice continuity regarding the guide group program became evident. Fewer people remained who had been involved in the early dialogues with the program developers. How were the developers' philosophical ideals to be perpetuated? Who was to care for the program and to continue it? What provisions had been made to maintain the innovation and to work for staff commitment?

Another consideration involves the possibility that the program developers did not know how to provide adequate inservicing in the fulfillment of the guide group role for staff. Clearly, there existed an absence of faculty training in group processes and interpersonal communication skills. The guide group program was an innovation embracing personal values, beliefs, perspectives, and behaviors. These issues, too, remained largely unaddressed in any formal way.

Despite the lack of substantial training in all aspects of the guide group role, the Westridge faculty defended the program, particularly when it was attacked. A close examination reveals that the innovation had changed from what was intended, but faculty support was apparent as teachers banded together against their critics. However, the innovations and opportunities at Westridge were so numerous that it would be difficult to attribute all of the staff

reactions to concern only about the guide group program.

Nonetheless, the Westridge program survived, although the seven-period day was lost. The events which led to that compromise revealed the continuing need for more adequate attention to known innovation processes.

Perhaps the program was successful for better record-keeping? The guide group program was not evaluated on that basis but was a convenient, and frequently used, vehicle for the performance of many administrative tasks involving students and staff.

Although the guide group program developers at Westridge had expressed the hope that the program's impact would build relationships, most of the expected guide group activities were clerical and were increasingly added to present the operation of the innovation. Even though the Westridge administration might have felt otherwise, the guide group program did not appear to attend to humanistic concerns in any organized fashion.

3. The judgment that the guide group program evaluation was politically motivated:

One dimension of the political emphasis directed toward the guide group program involved the school board's request for the evaluation of the program's operation. The Westridge guide group program had been scrutinized as part of three prior evaluations conducted at the school and had been specifically listed as a commendation. Moreover, one of the previous evaluations had been directed by the local school district as a study of the Westridge

experiment, incorporating the operation of the guide group program.

Why request another study?

Apparently, in response to political realities, the local school board members wanted to finish the subject once and for all by commissioning what they hoped would be a thorough investigation of the Westridge guide group program. Interestingly enough, this evaluation was also required to conform to the individual board member's perspectives regarding what the program was supposed to be accomplishing. This approach to program evaluation suggests that the program was expected not only to be functional, but also to be fulfilling the expectations of elected officials needing to demonstrate to their constituents that all was well and money was not wasted.

The district's evaluators decided to interview each school board member to find out what was expected. The evaluators were sensitive to the conflicting expectations regarding the program and also appreciated the pressure generated by the school board, the superintendent, and the Westridge principal. Additional reporting and perception-checking occurred as the evaluators pursued their various tasks, being careful not to seek unwanted or unnecessary information, but also watchful not to neglect any pertinent areas of study. The result was an evaluation which, apparently, was useful to all but one board member, whose displeasure with the process and with the product has been noted.

There were so many innovations at Westridge, that it was virtually impossible to perform a complete evaluation of the guide group

program in isolation from other programs. It is unlikely that the final evaluation report illustrated any more than the most imprecise estimation of what the evaluators perceived to be what the individual school board members wanted to know. If the evaluation had been conducted under circumstances which would have permitted the exploration of all perspectives, then, perhaps, the investigation might have served some loftier purposes, and had far different results.

As it was, however, the result of the evaluation effort was largely to confirm that some people were served by the program to the same level of general satisfaction as some other people. This is a very uncertain basis for rational decision-making regarding this educational program or any other.

The conclusion is to view the process as being politically motivated, and not prompted by any desire to seek additional information about the program's educational merits or deficiencies. The quick release of the report to the public further suggested that the school board's real intent had been to silence vociferous critics.

4. The judgment that the original program intents were ignored:

The Westridge guide group program was defended as an innovation offering important contributions to the quality of life in that particular high school. This belief was clouded somewhat, however, by the great difficulty experienced by the Westridge staff and the

district's program evaluators in attempting to prove these influences and to link them to the direct impact from the guide group program.

Part of that difficulty resulted from the absence of clearly defined, and generally accepted, goals for the program. The obvious lack of carefully articulated, and publicly accepted, program goals constituted a major obstacle from implementation to evaluation. As a natural consequence, the extent to which individual students experienced reductions in the remoteness between their families and the school staff remains unknown. No additional information was provided about the strengthening of school-home relationships. The degree of personalized education made available is a matter of conjecture. Nonetheless, these three areas constituted the major arguments for the inclusion of the guide group program at Westridge High School.

These three areas also represented the language used by the Westridge administrators to illustrate that the guide group program was "humanistic." The absence of clearly stated program goals was compounded by the lack of agreement about what "humanistic" meant, how it was to be achieved, or by what standards it could be measured.

Perhaps the initial program developers shared some common agreement among themselves in respect to what "humanistic" meant, but no definition was provided in writing or offered in any material discussing the guide group program. The lack of a definition for "humanistic" and the absence of clearly defined goals for the

Westridge guide group program became particularly important during the evaluation.

The difficulty becomes even more acute when the program is credited with achievement of the ideals held initially for it, exclusive of any impact from any other variables. It is virtually impossible to produce evidence to support the claim that the operation of the guide group program was singly responsible for humanizing Westridge High School. There exists no ready criteria by which Westridge High School, or perhaps any other, can be said to have been humanized, let alone as the result of one isolated program.

Apparently, program evaluation was not a concern to the program developers or, at least, the definition of program goals which could be measured clearly in any evaluation effort did not constitute a priority. As a result, the original intents for the program were ignored and the guide group program was measured only against perceptions held regarding it. The theoretical underpinnings for the Westridge guide group program were not mentioned in the final evaluation report, nor in the educational decisions which followed its release.

5. The judgment that educational decisions were controlled by economic and political considerations:

This study presented several perspectives regarding the development and operation of the Westridge High School guide group program. An additional consideration involves the political and economic realities, both at the time the school was planned, and during the

difficult periods of in-fighting which emerged.

The initial hope that Westridge would remain operating as one of this country's innovative schools proved impossible. The administrative energies at the school were gradually channeled into attempts to preserve what existed.

It would appear unlikely that Westridge now could be considered substantially different from most other high schools, although the guide group program is still intact. There were so many forces having impact on the school and its numerous innovations that the humanistic aspects and ideals were over-shadowed by decisions which demanded non-humanistic outcomes. At a time when "comparability" and the "back-to-the basics" movement received increased attention, controversy quickly engulfed the Westridge innovations, particularly the guide group program.

The extension of the guide group concept to all of the high schools in the district was not based on the evidence that the Westridge innovation effectively met the developers' expectations because that possibility was never assessed. Rather, the decision to place guide group programs at all high schools in 1979-1980 appeared to have been a decision reached for political and economic reasons. All schools would be treated equally even if some administrators and teachers objected.

The Westridge High School supporters lost the seven-period day and the elective options it provided. Students and parents in the community gained the addition of guide group programs without losing

the advantages of the six-period daily schedules which had operated in the other high schools. Staff members in those schools maintained their former schedules, but were required to operate the guide group programs, which included extra duty days before school opened, and the use of previously unstructured time during each school day. These decisions, which were discussed in this study, suggested that educational practices were controlled by economics and politics, rather than by what was believed about teaching and learning.

This study attempted to trace the numerous issues associated with the Westridge High School guide group program. In this effort, substantial attention was directed toward the realm of educational politics because, at least in respect to this particular innovation effort, these were the considerations which ultimately determined the course for the program. Its educational merits or deficiencies will remain, as before, the subject of heated debate, but the Westridge guide group program, an example of innovation in a secondary school, survived many challenges, and the Westridge supporters prevailed under circumstances which suggested that victory might be quite elusive.

The destiny of the Westridge guide group program depended less upon its educational contribution than upon the success of the Westridge supporters in respect to the political intrigues operating within the school system and its community. It is particularly in this regard that this study is offered, both as testimony to what happened, and to what might be learned for future educational

practice about the subtle workings of an educational system and the political overtones associated with it.

Based on this investigation of the Westridge guide group program, therefore, the following recommendations are offered for consideration regarding improved educational practices:

1. Because innovations are subject to change from their original designs, staff development and inservice activities should be provided if programs are to remain consistent with the ideas presented by the developers.
2. Staff development and inservice experiences should be offered in keeping with known innovation practices.
3. Evaluations of innovations should be based on educational issues rather than on political pressures.
4. Original program intents and goals should be carefully established and observed.
5. Decisions about innovative programs should be based primarily upon their intents and goals rather than on economic and political controls.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Pounds, Ralph L., and Bryner, James R. The School in American Society. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1973.
2. National Association of Secondary School Principals. This We Believe. Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1975.
3. National Association of Secondary School Principals. The Mood of American Youth. Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1974.
4. Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.
5. National Association of Secondary School Principals. The 80's Where Will Schools Be? Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1974.
6. Erickson, Kenneth; Benson, George; and Huff, Robert. Activism in the Secondary Schools: Analysis and Recommendations. Eugene, Oregon: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1969.
7. Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.
8. Kohl, Herbert R. Open Classroom. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.
9. Kozol, Jonathan. Death at an Early Age. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1970.
10. Illich, Ivan. De-Schooling Society. New York: Harper and Row Pubs., Inc., 1971.
11. Georgiades, William, and Trump, J. Lloyd. Model Schools Project: The Teacher Advisor. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1973.
12. Tamminen, Armas, et al. "Teacher-Advisors: Staff Training for Developmental Guidance Skills." Pupil Personnel Services Journal, 5 (Fall, 1976), 17-27.
13. Cowles, Robert J., and Hawkins, Mary L. Discussions & Things. ESEA Title III Project, Ferguson-Florissant School District Florissant, Missouri, 1974.
14. Pantesco, Victor F. "Things That Work: Advisor Program." The School Counselor, 23 (May, 1976), 368.

15. Pilkington, R. A., and Jarmin, H. R. "Is There a Difference" Teacher-Advisor or Teacher-Counselor." NAASP Bulletin, 61 (April, 1977), 80-83.
16. Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Pub. Co., 1967.
17. Holt, John. How Children Learn. New York: Pitman Pub. Co., 1967.
18. Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row Pubs., Inc., 1969.
19. Neill, A. S., Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Hart Pub. Co., 1960.
20. Jackson, Phillip W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968.
21. Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte, 1969.
22. Leonard, George B. Education and Ecstasy. New York: Dell, 1968.
23. Samples, Bob. The Metaphoric Mind. Reading, Maine: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.
24. Jencks, Christopher. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family & Schooling in America. New York: Harper and Row Pubs., Inc., 1973.
25. Reimer, Everett. School is Dead: Alternatives in Education. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
26. Spindler, G. D. Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1974.
27. Wolcott, Harry F. Teachers Versus Technocrats. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977.
28. Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1971.
29. Goffman, Erving. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1961.
30. Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

31. Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
32. Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.
33. Webb, Eugene J., et al. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966.
34. Goode, John W. Readings in Educational Management. New York: AMACOM, 1973.
35. March, James G. Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.
36. Murdick, Robert G., and Ross, Joel E. Information Systems for Modern Management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
37. Hicks, Herbert G. The Management of Organizations: A Systems and Human Resources Approach, 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.
38. Johnson, Rossall J. Executive Decisions. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Pub. Co., 1963.
39. Wirt, Frederick M., and Kirst, Michael W. The Political Web of American Schools. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Co., 1972.
40. Tyack, David B. The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.
41. Johns, Roe L., and Morphet, Edgar L. The Economics and Financing of Education: A Systems Approach. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
42. Reischauer, Robert D., and Hartman, Robert W. Reforming School Finance. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1973.
43. Benson, Charles S. Perspectives on the Economics of Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.
44. Goldhammer, Keith, and Pellegrin, Roland J. Jackson County Revisited: A Case Study in the Politics of Public Education. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.

45. Brickell, Henry M. "State Organization for Educational Change: A Case Study and a Proposal." Innovations in Education. Edited by Matthew Miles. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
46. Carlson, Richard O. Adoption of Educational Innovations. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.
47. Carlson, Richard O., et al. Change Processes in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1965.
48. Carlson, Richard O. "School Superintendents and the Adoption of Modern Math: A Social Structure Profile." Innovations in Education. Edited by Matthew Miles. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
49. Woods, Thomas E. The Administration of Educational Innovation. Eugene, Oregon: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1967.
50. Miles, Matthew, ed. Innovations in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
51. Eurich, Alvin C. Reforming American Education. New York: Harper and Row Pubs., Inc., 1969.
52. Charters, Werrett Wallace, et al. Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences. Eugene, Oregon: CASEA, 1965.
53. Hubel, Keigh, and Beaty, Mary Jo. "The Role of the Counselor in the Teacher/Advisor System," Pupil Personnel Services Journal, 5 (Fall, 1976), 28-33.
54. Hubel, Keigh H., et al. The Teacher/Advisor System. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., 1974.
55. Larson, R., and Mable, T. "The Teacher-Advisor Role in an Open Secondary School." NASSP Bulletin, 59 (April, 1975), 37-43.
56. Pine, G. J. "Let's Give Away School Counseling." The School Counselor, 22 (November, 1974), 94-99.
57. Ohlsen, Merle M. Group Counseling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1970.

58. Hubel, Keigh H. The Teacher/Advisor System in Action. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., 1976.
59. Cowles, Robert J., and Hawkins, Mary L. Discussions & Things To Do. ESEA Title III Project, Ferguson-Florissant School District, Florissant, Missouri, 1974.
60. Cowles, Robert J., and Hawkins, Mary L. Just a Little Care. ESEA Title III Project, Ferguson-Florissant School District, Florissant, Missouri, 1974.
61. Cowles, Robert J., and Hawkins, Mary L. Team Leader's Guide. ESEA Title III Project, Ferguson-Florissant School District, Florissant, Missouri, 1974.
62. Cowles, Robert J., and Hawkins, Mary L. To Do. ESEA Title III Project, Ferguson-Florissant School District, Florissant, Missouri, 1974.
63. Clay, Katherine. "A Student-Selected Teacher-Adviser Program in an Open Plan School." NASSP Bulletin, 61 (April, 1977), 84-88.
64. Goldberg, Mark F. "House Group: A Guidance Role for the Teacher." NASSP Bulletin, 61 (September, 1977), 61064.
65. Trump, J. Lloyd. "NASSP's Model Schools Project: How the Project Evolved and Developed." NASSP Bulletin, 61 (November, 1977), 1-4.
66. Gillies, Cliff. "Mariner High School." NASSP Bulletin, 61 (November, 1977), 51-61.
67. Scriven, Michael. "Evaluation Perspectives and Procedures." Evaluation in Education. Edited by W. James Popham. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Pub. Corp., 1974.
68. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, April 14, 1979.
69. Letter to Westridge Planning Committee, April 23, 1971.
70. Statement of Westridge High School Philosophy, 1974.
71. Letter to Westridge Planning Committee, January 5, 1972.
72. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, April 23, 1978.
73. Westridge High School Newspaper. Article, August 14, 1972.

74. "Westridge High School: Counseling and Guidance Services."
Undated.
75. Westridge District. Staff Bulletin, September 14, 1972.
76. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, April 6, 1978.
77. Westridge Administrator. Private Interview, April 9, 1978.
78. Summary of Guide-Teacher Visits, 1977-1978.
79. Westridge Questionnaire, 1975.
80. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, April 9, 1978.
81. Westridge Developer. Memorandum, November 25, 1974.
82. Evaluation Report of the Westridge District, August 28, 1975.
83. Westridge District. School Board Minutes, February 8, 1977.
84. Local Newspaper. Article, February 18, 1977.
85. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, January 20, 1979.
86. Notes from evaluation planning meeting, May 12, 1977.
87. Notes from Westridge staff meeting, May 25, 1977.
88. Evaluation Supervisor. Memorandum, September 6, 1977.
89. Evaluation Report: Westridge Guide Teacher Program, 1978.
90. School Board Member. Private Interview, April 10, 1978.
91. Local Newspaper. Article, February 28, 1978.
92. Westridge District Evaluator. Private Interview, March 1, 1978.
93. Notes from Westridge faculty meeting, September 1, 1978.
94. Westridge District. School Board Minutes, March 1, 1978.
95. Westridge District. School Board Minutes, March 14, 1978.
96. Westridge District Personnel Director. Letter, December 13, 1978.
97. Westridge School District. News Release, December 13, 1978.

98. Local Newspaper. Editorial, December 19, 1978.
99. Local Newspaper. Article, December 20, 1978.
100. Westridge School District. News Release, December 21, 1978.
101. Local Newspaper. Editorial, January 2, 1979.
102. Teachers' Association. Newsletter, January 10, 1979.
103. Teachers' Association. Memorandum, January 16, 1979.
104. Westridge Administrator. Private Interview, February 27, 1979.
105. Westridge Parents. Private Interview, August 11, 1979.
106. Westridge District. School Board Minutes, February 27, 1979.
107. Westridge Developer. Memorandum, February 27, 1979.
108. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, February 28, 1979.
109. Westridge Administrator. Private Interview, March 2, 1979.
110. Westridge Developer. Private Interview, May 11, 1979.
111. Superintendent. Memorandum, March 2, 1979.
112. Westridge District. School Board Minutes, March 13, 1979.
113. Local Newspaper. Article, March 14, 1979.
114. Teachers' Association President in Teachers' Association
Newsletter, March 26, 1979.
115. Local Newspaper. Editorial, May 12, 1979.
116. Local Newspaper. Article, May 12, 1979.