



8-1976

A Study and Analysis of Intern Training Experience at Western Michigan University's Community School Development Center

Henry Houseman
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Houseman, Henry, "A Study and Analysis of Intern Training Experience at Western Michigan University's Community School Development Center" (1976). *Masters Theses*. 2363.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2363

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF INTERN TRAINING
EXPERIENCE AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY'S
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

by

Henry Houseman

A Project Report
submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Specialist in Education Degree

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Persons in positions of leadership quickly learn how dependent they are on others for help and cooperation. Without them, in all likelihood the job will be poorly done, or not done at all, and the leader may be unable to demonstrate success.

And so it is with a project of this nature. I clearly recognize that many people have provided much needed help and cooperation. I wish to acknowledge this, and express my appreciation to:

Dr. Harold Boles, my advisor, and Dr. Gerald Martin, my supervisor, for their guidance and encouragement:

Dr. George Conti, my superintendent, for the granting of a leave of absence;

Many interns and former interns (particularly Bill Carmody) for their time and information;

John Conroy, my assistant, and Sandy Rice, my secretary, for willingly assuming added responsibilities during my absence; and

Last, but certainly not least, my family, for coping with an absent husband and father.

Henry Houseman

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

MASTERS THESIS

M-8986

HOUSEMAN, Henry Frank

A STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF INTERN TRAINING
EXPERIENCE AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY'S
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT CENTER.

Western Michigan University, Ed.S., 1976
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES	1
II	INTERN TRAINING: PURPOSE AND PROCESS	7
III	ACTIVITIES AND METHODS UTILIZED TO ATTAIN THIS INTERN'S OBJECTIVES	13
IV	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
	Conclusions	20
	Recommendations	32
	REFERENCES	38
	APPENDICES	39
	A. Internship Prospectus	40
	B. Log of the Experience	44
	C. Dr. Maurice Seay Letter	59
	D. Instrument and Cover Letter	61
	E. List of Cooperating Centers	64
	F. Names of Persons Having Secured Leadership Positions Subsequent to Training at Western's Community School Development Center.	66

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

A wag once made a rather sage observation that history was nothing more than one damn thing after another! To refute the logic of such a statement would be difficult, if not impossible. One might then be tempted to adopt a simplistic view of history, and conclude that acquiring a knowledge of it would be nonproductive, valueless, and a waste of time.

It is the belief of this writer that knowledge of "yesterday's" events can accomplish at least two things. First, possession of sufficient historical knowledge can contribute to an understanding of "today's" events and problems. Second, and perhaps idealistically, it can contribute to controlling "tomorrow's" events, and guiding them toward desired goals. It is hoped the reader will find historical perspectives to be of value, and not a waste of time.

A frequently expressed opinion holds that community education began during the mid-1930's in Flint, Michigan. For purposes of this project this can be accepted.¹ The two persons most often credited with these Flint beginnings are Charles Stewart Mott and Frank Manley, Sr. Both men were in apparent agreement with Hugo's mid-19th Century

¹It should be remembered that the genesis of community education has no fixed "birthdate" such as July 4, 1776. A brief historical discussion of the concept's origin can be found in the second chapter of M. F. Seay (Ed.), Community education: An emerging concept. Midland, MI: Pendell, 1974.

observation: "Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come."

As a seed is planted, so, too, was the idea of community education. As a seed in fertile ground sprouts and grows with proper nurturing, so, too, did community education in Flint. The "Flint Experiment" began to attract nation-wide attention, and visitors, to that city. With almost missionary-like zeal, the people in Flint tried to persuade the visitors and observers to "go and do likewise" when they returned home.

The need for a formalized training program became apparent. A major goal would be to prepare persons for positions of leadership in community education. These Flint-trained leaders would then not only be prepared to preach the gospel, but would, in turn, train others for leadership roles. In short, a "snow-balling" effect was envisioned.

In the mid-1960's, with Mott Foundation support, a Flint-based leadership training program for Masters (sic) fellows and doctoral fellows was established. The major purpose of the training program was, according to Coats (1970), "to help participants acquire the skills, understanding and attitudes necessary to affect the broad application of community education practices."

Seven Michigan universities² participated in the training program.

²Central Michigan*, Eastern Michigan*, Michigan State, Northern Michigan*, University of Michigan, Wayne State, and Western Michigan. The three marked with an asterisk (*) did not offer doctoral training.

It was a consortium-type arrangement, allowing the students from the different universities to participate in cooperative seminars, learning experiences, etc. Liaison among the students and universities was maintained by one or more representatives from each of the cooperating institutions.

Student recruitment was conducted on a nation-wide basis. Qualified candidates, showing the potential for advanced degree work, were admitted following an intensive interview and selection process. The number of students chosen each year varied, with an average perhaps being between 50 and 70. Given the diverse backgrounds of the students, the previously mentioned seminars and other learning experiences provided many opportunities for the exchange of ideas and information.

In addition, throughout the year-long experience, other components of the training program proved to be of value to each group of interns. Coats (1970) found these reported as: (a) colloquium, (b) experience with advisor, (c) formal contact with colleagues of own institution in an academic setting, (d) informal or voluntary contact with colleagues of own institution for purpose of exchanging ideas, socializing, studying, etc., (e) living in the Flint community, and (f) informal structure, that component of the program which allows for flexible, individualized programs.

Doctoral candidates having successfully completed initial training in Flint were then eligible to return to their universities to complete degree requirements. Given the relatively large numbers of students who were so affected, a Community School Development Center such as the one at Western Michigan University had a large

"pool" of well-qualified candidates from which to choose.

The Center at Western was established in 1967. It was part of the College of Education, and was under the direction of Dr. Gerald Martin. At the time, Western was the only university in the United States which had a doctoral training program in Flint as well as an on-campus Center.

Three identifiable purposes of the Western Michigan University Community School Development Center were (and are) to: (a) disseminate information about the Community School concept at Western Michigan University and in southwestern Michigan and assist in its dissemination in Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin and throughout the nation; (b) assist in the implementation of Community School related programs and processes in local communities, at institutions of higher education, and at state, regional, and national leadership levels; and (c) provide training opportunities for Community School leadership personnel at all levels of relevant activity: neighborhood, community, state, regional, and national.

Data are available which indicate the Center accomplished these purposes. In 1967, for example, the Community School Development Center had an intra-state working relationship only, servicing five local school districts in southwestern Michigan. By the mid-1970's the Center had established both inter- and intrastate relationships, servicing cooperating centers in a six-state area,³ and approximately 80 local district Community School Programs in western Michigan.

³See Appendix E for complete list.

The Center was able to initiate and maintain this rapid expansion for a number of reasons. One of the most significant factors, from the present writer's point of view, was the large number of Flint-trained interns⁴ who completed degree work at Western. Possessing human, conceptual, and technical skills, as outlined by Katz (1955) and which were related to community education, the interns were able to make significant contributions to the Center's growing responsibilities.

At the same time increased demands were being placed upon Western's Center, however, problems began to surface in Flint. The Mott Foundation had, over the years, invested substantial amounts of money and resources in the training program. This investment, coupled with the university consortium arrangement, had undoubtedly yielded many successes. Yet, personnel associated with the Foundation began identifying factors which indicated that "all was not well in Denmark."

For example, there was a concern that the universities were doing too many things autonomously. Each university held separate classes for its students, resulting in each individual having to return to his or her respective campus. Little was done in terms of credit reciprocity among the universities.

Leadership in the National Center changed frequently, which created a continuity problem. Criticism aimed at the seven Michigan universities, charging them with trying to "run the whole show," came

⁴See Appendix F.

from center directors in other parts of the United States. Ineffective leadership was displayed by some Michigan university representatives in Flint.

As additional Regional Training Centers were established throughout the United States, it appeared to many that the National Center for Community Education should assume a different role. Community education, both in theory and in practice, was changing. Borrowing from Minzey and LeTarte (1972), a change from "program to process" was occurring. Changes called for a modification of the then existing, and well established, training program. There were indications that training needs were not being met adequately.

These kinds of things were perceived by the Foundation's Board of Trustees as contributing to an inefficient operation. Members of the Board eventually concluded that the year-long training program in Flint should cease. The decision to change training patterns was made. Year-long intern training was now to be conducted in on-campus university centers, such as the one at Western. 1973-74 marked the end of an era and the beginning of another.

CHAPTER II

INTERN TRAINING: PURPOSE AND PROCESS

As an introduction to the purpose(s) and process(es) of intern training, it seems appropriate to begin with general definitions of terms. According to Webster's Dictionary, purpose is "something set up as an object or end to be attained," and process is "a series of actions or operations conducing to an end." It is suggested that a synonymous term for purpose is goal, as defined by Boles and Davenport (1975, p. 424), and that a substitute term for process is method.

A search for synonyms and substitutes for the term "intern" is unnecessary if we accept the basic definition given by Webster. According to that authority, an intern is "an advanced student or graduate . . . gaining supervised practical experience." Combining these terms and definitions as they related to this chapter yields this: The chapter's content deals primarily with goals established for the interns, the methods used to attain these goals, and the relationship between the intern's supervised practical experiences and Western Michigan University's Community School Development Center.

Unless one possesses a basic understanding of the Center's operations and purposes, it is difficult to fully appreciate and understand the various aspects of the training and experience of the Center's interns. Brief mention of the Center's purposes was made in the previous chapter. Seay (1976), writing in the preliminary

draft of the external evaluation report, states that:

the major purposes of the Center are realized through the establishment of the following goals as guidelines for the center operation: (a) provide implementation consultant services and assistance for local communities and/or school districts, (b) provide preservice educational opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, (c) provide in-service education opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, (d) promote research, evaluation, and information dissemination in community education, (e) promote the community education concept at Western Michigan University, (f) promote the development of regional coordination/cooperation in the Center's greater service area, and (g) assist in the expansion of the community education concept at state and national levels.

Because of the space required, the more than 60 objectives which have been established for these seven goal areas are not listed here. Objectives which seem most directly related to intern training are, however, discussed more fully in both Chapters III and IV. It seems appropriate at this point to identify only the goals which have been established for the interns.

The proposal which the Center submitted to the Mott Foundation in February, 1976, requesting assistance in funding doctoral internships, lists these four internship goals: (a) to learn to provide consultant help for schools and communities interested in community education, (b) to learn to provide preservice opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, (c) to learn to provide in-service training opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, and (d) to learn to promote the community school concept within a university setting.

These goals are predicated on the assumption that doctoral fellows who are chosen will receive training to prepare them for

leadership positions in university centers, state departments of education, other state organizations, and national and state associations.

Further, it is stated that the fellows will be included in all phases of Center operations as members of the Center team. From the above statements, one might conclude that the interns would become involved in all seven of the Center's goal areas, and not be limited to the four goals specifically identified for intern training.

Be that as it may, it matters little (for the Center's purposes), whether interns are chosen with four, or seven, goals in mind. What do matter a great deal are factors such as the intern's qualifications, experience, and potential.

As suggested in Chapter I, persons awarded internships at a regional center such as Western's (up to and including the 1974-75 school year), had been provided the opportunity for a year's experience and training in Flint. To Center personnel, this meant a number of things, including: (a) a relatively large number of candidates from which to choose, (b) persons selected had been exposed to the concept of community education both in theory and practice, (c) it was presumed that applicants were pretty well committed to the community education movement, and (d) most of the formal course requirements for interns had been completed. These factors, when combined, provided the Center with interns prepared to take part almost immediately in Center operations, and to personally assume major responsibilities for and initiative in gaining learning experiences.

Given the set of circumstances as described, the intern training seemed to be accommodated by the Center Director's philosophy. In a somewhat simplified form, his philosophy might best be summarized in this manner: The opportunities for learning are provided both from within and from without the Center as its operations move through the daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly cycles. It should not be necessary to "lead interns by the hand" to these opportunities and "spoon-feed" the learning experiences to the interns. Rather, it is expected that they will assume the initiative and major responsibility for the needed training, with the Director playing a major role in making interns aware of the various opportunities available to them.

To insure that appropriate (in both content and number) learning experiences are available, a wide variety of such opportunities is provided through the Center. A few examples of situations with which interns might become involved are: (a) visitations to local school districts for consultant purposes, (b) supervision of student teachers in community school programs, (c) participation in teaching a formal community education class, (d) planning and conducting a Center in-service seminar or workshop, (e) attending advisory council meetings, and (f) assisting in research and evaluation projects in the University.

The value of these kinds of training experiences would probably remain indeterminate unless an attempt were made to evaluate them. This may be done in any number of ways during the course of a year. One method of evaluation employed on a quarterly basis uses an instrument almost identical to the one found in Appendix D.

The interns are asked to rate the first six items in accordance with the extent to which the opportunities identified were present during the internship experience. This type of evaluation, along with reports to the Mott Foundation which are compiled quarterly, is representative of the methods used in a regular and consistent manner.

It should be noted that regular and consistent use is made of the term opportunity in the Center Objectives Evaluation. Such usage is of deliberate and intentional design, and relates to the Director's philosophy as described earlier. It probably is true, though some would question this, that the presence of learning opportunities for interns is adequately measured by the above mentioned evaluation instruments. At the same time, it could be pointed out that the instruments ignore a number of significant variables.

Questions such as the following might be posed to illustrate this point. For example, what is the overall impact of the training program upon the interns? Is an index of an intern's "needs reduction" established and measured? Or an index of objectives achievement? Is an index of an intern's needs for learning opportunities established and measured? Does the intern training program yield side effects? If so, are they positive or negative in nature? Or both? Does the program produce graduates who achieve job success?

With a different type of intern (i.e., one with non-Flint background) receiving Center training since the 1974-75 academic year, the kinds of questions asked above need to be answered. It is not within the province of this paper to do this. The final chapter does, however, address itself in some detail to a related

issue; that of identifying training program components which may be in need of change.

Before that final stage is reached, information regarding methodology should be presented. By so doing, it is hoped that the reader will understand how the writer's conclusions were reached and why the recommendations are being made. It is intended that the next chapter will serve as a bridge from Chapters I and II (what "was" and "is") to Chapter IV (what "ought to be").

CHAPTER III

ACTIVITIES AND METHODS UTILIZED TO ATTAIN THIS INTERN'S OBJECTIVES

As stated in the present writer's internship prospectus (Appendix A), the major focus of experience was to be a research analysis of the Community School Development Center operations, with particular emphasis on the selecting and training of interns. To accomplish this, it was proposed that the process (method) to be used would consist of the following seven steps:

1. Studying and analyzing the seven major goal areas of the Center.
2. Identifying the objectives within each of the goal areas which seem to be most closely related to intern training and experience.
3. Locating and using various sources of information.
4. Obtaining relevant historical data of internships as previously and presently structured.
5. Determining the direction(s), or philosophical approaches, to intern training.
6. Indicating problem areas as determined by the previous steps.
7. Recommending changes.

The nature of the writer's internship experience suggests that it can be separated into two distinct parts, or phases. The first phase was that portion of the experience concluded in April and May, which served primarily to allow experiencing the kinds of things done by doctoral interns in their training program.

The second phase was that portion of the experience concluded in June and July. This latter stage was spent primarily in studying the program for intern training, although some activities more closely allied to the first phase were included.⁵

Not long after the second phase had begun, it became obvious that a limit would have to be placed on the number of sources to be used. This meant, of course, that a limit on the number of things the writer could reasonably expect to accomplish would also be imposed. With the time available for study serving as the major constraint, it is suggested that a complete and thorough study would be an appropriate dissertation topic.

A large number of resource persons were available for input, and a wide variety of source materials also was available. It was decided to utilize the following sources, and if appropriate, to summarize briefly the information received. A more extensive report is included in the final chapter.

1. Nine persons most closely associated with the Center at the present time were interviewed and orally questioned. Included in this category were the Director, Associate Director, and the seven 1975-76 interns. Subsequent to a statement from this intern guaranteeing anonymity, all of these formal interviews were recorded on tape.

2. Numerous informal "rap" sessions, or discussions, were held with all the above. These sessions were not taped, but written

⁵A log, the keeping of which was an integral part of this total experience, is found in Appendix B. It illustrates rather clearly the two phases described.

notations and summaries were frequently made.

3. Four persons closely associated with the Center in times past were orally questioned and interviewed. Included in this category were two former associate or assistant directors, a person with the Mott Foundation, and the External Evaluation Committee's chairperson. Most of these interviews were also recorded on tape.

4. A great deal of time was spent locating and reading material stored in the Center's files.

5. The preliminary report developed by the External Evaluation Committee and its chairperson was studied carefully. It is perhaps well to emphasize three things at this point. First, the report is preliminary (emphasis added). As of this writing, committee members are reviewing the report and suggesting changes. Second, the contents of the report came from many human sources, most of whom have more than just a passing knowledge of the Center's intern training program. These persons include some members of the Department of Educational Leadership, its Chairperson, the Associate Dean of the College of Education, the Associate Dean of the Graduate College, interns from the Center, and a number of committee members themselves. Third, it was the present writer's privilege to serve as one of the committee members. Because of this, many comments made during committee work sessions, but not necessarily included in the written report, also served as input for this paper.

6. A brief written evaluation survey form was developed and mailed to 12 of the persons who have received Center training.⁶

⁶See Appendices D and F.

Seventy five percent of the questionnaires, or nine, were completed and returned. Of the three persons not responding, one is out of the country, one on vacation, and one has left his university position and his present location is unknown to this writer.

7. A wide range of other kinds of printed material and sources, located both within and without the Center's confines, was used. The Internal Revenue Service is one example of other sources.

Having followed the procedure outlined above, the next logical step seemed to be that of posing the question: Have the objectives outlined in the prospectus been achieved? An affirmative answer is given, with the remainder of this chapter providing the supporting rationale for that answer.

1. It was determined by study and analysis of the Center's seven major goal areas that four of them are closely related to intern training. The four goal areas so identified are: (a) to learn to provide consultant help for schools and communities interested in community education, (b) to learn to provide preservice opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, (c) to learn to provide in-service training opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, and (d) to learn to promote the community school concept within a university setting.

2. Further study and analysis of the four goals relating specifically to internships resulted in the identification of 17 objections.

Goal A (Consultant Help) objectives state that the intern will: (a) be able to verbalize an understanding of the community education

concept and relate the concept to specific settings, (b) demonstrate the ability to plan and initiate a community education program, (c) participate in a program of planned staff visitations to area school districts for consultant purposes, (d) demonstrate budgeting and financing knowledge and skills, (e) demonstrate an understanding of state and federal funding and agency procedures, and (f) become knowledgeable about the consultant philosophy and procedures as practiced by the Western Michigan University Community School Development Center.

Goal B (Preservice Training) objectives state that the intern will: (a) demonstrate an understanding of the six-week preparation (training) program of the Western Michigan University Center, (b) participate in the supervision of student teachers in community school programs, (c) participate in the teaching of a formal community education class, and (d) demonstrate the ability to conceptualize and explain a program for training community school directors.

Goal C (In-Service Training) objectives state that the intern will: (a) participate in seminars and workshops for community school directors, (b) attend community education workshops and conventions, and (c) assume the responsibility for planning and conducting a Center in-service seminar or workshop.

Goal D (University Setting) objectives state that the intern will: (a) regularly attend and participate in university center advisory council meetings, (b) assist in the involvement of a maximum number of university students and personnel in the programs, seminars, and other operations of the Center, (c) assist in making community

education presentations in classes and at faculty and student meetings, and (d) assist in research and evaluation projects in the university and in the area.

3. Various sources of information, as indicated in pp. 14-16, were located and used.

4. Historical data and information were presented in Chapter I.

5. The direction(s), or philosophical approaches to intern training, were discussed in Chapters II and III.

6. Problem areas which have been found are discussed in Chapter IV.

7. Recommended changes are also presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final paragraph in Chapter II indicated that Chapter IV will present this writer's perceptions of what "ought to be." This statement may create within the reader's mind a vision of a person returning from a mountain top, carrying a stone tablet with all the "ought to be's" carved upon it! If such a vision has been created, it should be treated as a mirage.

From the outset, it should be understood that even the present writer does not consider this chapter the sole repository of truth. To paraphrase a saint and a sinner,⁷ it is hoped this final chapter will make this perfectly clear for the readers, rather than having them see things through a glass darkly.

Some portions of this chapter may appear to be critical of the Center and its operations. If the reader finds negative connotations, it should be remembered that such interpretations are "in the eyes of the beholder," and not from the pen of the person doing the writing.

The writer has no wish to be labeled a nattering nabob of negativism. If some deem it necessary to attach labels, the one preferred is that of the shepherd who has not worried about the "ninety and nine," but was concerned with the one gone astray.

⁷The reader may decide for himself/herself which is which!

When outlining methodology at an earlier point in this paper, the statement was made that persons being interviewed were guaranteed anonymity. To keep that promise, no attempt is made to provide names, or to identify individuals in any other manner. Conclusions reached, and recommendations made, are based upon information secured by the writer from the many sources discussed on pp. 14-16 of this paper.

In many instances, data supporting the following conclusions are not included in this paper. It was not feasible to make transcripts of the extensive mass of data collected and recorded on tape. Except where indicated, quantitative kinds of things have not been considered. The conclusions reached are general in nature, and may be viewed as subjective judgments derived from the general tenor of responses received by the writer.

Conclusions

1. Historically, Western Michigan University's Community School Development Center has gained the reputation of "producing" trained persons capable of assuming various kinds of leadership positions. Data extracted from the evaluation survey form⁸ returned by persons who have received Center training tend to support that reputation.

Persons surveyed were asked to respond to six specific items. A rating scale, ranging from a low of 1 (not at all) to a high of 10 (to great extent) was used. An average for each item rated was determined by totaling the individual numerical responses in each

⁸Refer to item six (6) on p. 16 of this paper.

category and dividing by the appropriate number.

In all categories save one the average rating was above the mid-point of the scale. Following is a brief summary of this information.

<u>Learning Experience Rated</u>	<u>Group Average</u>
(1) Consultant concepts and skills	6.25
(2) Preservice concepts and skills	6.62
(3) In-service concepts and skills	7.62
(4) Promoting community education within a university setting	4.62
(5) Support of personal career interests and goals	9.37
(6) Interaction with Center staff for counseling and support	8.12

Several references have been made in this paper to the External Evaluation Committee's preliminary report. As committee chairperson, Seay (1976, p. 3) indicated that the evaluation procedures used were designed to determine the success of the Center in meeting its 7 (seven) goals. For purposes of this paper, particularly as they relate to the conclusions stated in this chapter, only the four internship training goal areas will be discussed.

Data which tend to support the above-stated "training reputation" conclusion are found throughout the evaluation report. Committee findings related to the goal areas are located in a 17-page section which begins on page 11 of the report.

In reference to Goal A (Consultant Help), and Goal B (Preservice Training), the committee concludes that both goals are being met at a

satisfactory level. Relative to Goal C (In-service Training), it is the committee's conclusion that the goal is being met at a quite acceptable level.

Goal D (University Setting) is being met with only moderate success, according to the committee's conclusion. It should be noted that this same goal area received a below average rating from persons surveyed who had received Center training. This does not necessarily imply that a correlation exists, but it may suggest that more than just a casual relationship is observable.

2. With the community education concept being increasingly accepted in many parts of the country, and with the resultant growth, additional demands have been placed upon the Center and its staff.

The Center was established less than a decade ago. During the period of time since, the size of the geographic service area for which the Center is responsible and expected to serve has expanded drastically.⁹ This expansion, however, has not been matched by increased numbers of staff members to meet the additional responsibilities. In the external evaluation report, Seay (1976, p. 11) reminded us that "the conclusions drawn from any evaluation study must take into consideration the human and material resources that can be used to realize the potential envisioned in the stated goals."

This kind of statement contains within it definite implications for the intern training program. Without an adequate number of

⁹See pp. 4-5 in Chapter I.

Center staff persons to perform all required job responsibilities (including supervision of interns), the training experience opportunities provided for interns may be lacking both in quantity and quality.

3. Some external factors, over which the Center has no control, affect the kinds of things which can (and cannot) be done. One such factor might broadly be characterized as "insufficient support of the Center by the University." Frequently, this type of statement translates into "insufficient financial support." In the Center's case, this translation is probably accurate, and relates to the "soft vs. hard" money argument.

At the present time, between two-thirds and three-fourths of the funds available to the Center for operating purposes come from the Mott Foundation. Salaries of the present Director and Associate Director are paid with "soft" money. If the salaries were paid with "hard" university money the potential for improving and expanding services would increase because of the availability for other purposes of the extra Foundation funds. Without added financial support, it is not possible to employ an additional professional staff member for the Center.

In addition to the aspect of financial support, questions relative to moral support by the university can be raised. For example, is the university really committed to the Center and its mission? Or, somewhat like Paine's "sunshine patriot," is the commitment there only because Mott Foundation dollars are? Are persons of university leadership positions (e.g., the President, the Deans of

the Graduate College and the College of Education, and Chairperson of the Department of Educational Leadership) knowledgeable about the Center's activities, procedures, and programs? Do these persons believe in community education? Is the university willing to provide the Center with adequate office and conference area space? Do the appropriate university officials recognize the problems created by a policy which forces each Associate Center Director, with a Western-awarded doctorate, to leave after only one year in that job?

In addition to the factors, external to the Center, listed above, are conditions placed upon the Center by the Mott Foundation's internship training grant and by certain Internal Revenue Service rules and interpretations relating to such grants.

Restrictions and conditions imposed by the Mott Foundation are specified in an eight-page letter sent to the university. The letter was addressed to Dr. James W. Miller [sic], was dated March 25, 1976, and came from William S. White, President of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Stipulations within the grant permit the Center Director to make appropriate budget adjustments but, at the same time, are highly restrictive in terms of permissible line item transfers.

A few of the many line item transfers prohibited are: (a) none between grants, (b) none for activities expressly prohibited in the commitment letter, (c) none which would carry the grant beyond the specified funding period, (d) none which would substitute for institutional commitment, and (e) none which would commit or imply any future grant or action by the Foundation.

Foundation stipulations for the grant also prohibit use of funds in any manner which would be construed as an attempt to influence legislation, to influence the outcome of any specific public election, and for an individual's travel and study unless the grant is within the meaning of Federal income tax laws (emphasis added).

This last point is, of course, still another example of external factors affecting Center operations. According to IRS Publication 520 (1976, pp. 1-4), certain conditions must be met if fellowship grants are to be excluded from income; i.e., considered non-taxable. The following information has been taken directly from this source. For ease of reading, relevant positions are numbered/lettered in outline form.

1. The primary purpose of the grant must be to further the education and training of the recipient in an individual capacity rather than to benefit the grantor.
2. The performance of part-time employment required of all candidates for a degree generally will not affect the status of a scholarship or fellowship grant that otherwise qualifies.
3. Amounts received under a grant will be assumed paid for the primary purpose of furthering the education and training of the recipient and will not be regarded as part-time employment if:
 - a. The taxpayer is a candidate for a degree at an educational institution; and
 - b. The candidate performs research, teaching, or other services for the institution that satisfies the existing specifically stated requirements for the degree; and
 - c. Equivalent services are required of all candidates for the degree.
4. It will not be assumed that the primary purpose test is satisfied to the extent that the taxpayer performs

services in excess of those necessary to satisfy degree requirements. Nor will it be assumed that the primary purpose test is satisfied if:

- a. The candidate performs teaching or other services for a party other than the educational institution; or
 - b. The grant is made because of past services or is conditioned on, or is subject to an understanding with respect to, future employment or other requirements [sic] including services in excess of those necessary to satisfy degree requirements; or
 - c. The degree requirements, or the nature and extent of the work that is approved as satisfying the degree requirements, are not reasonably appropriate to the particular degree.
5. The fellowship grant of a candidate for a degree is fully excluded from income [sic] for the following:
 - a. The basic scholarship or fellowship grant, which consists of the full amount of the grant and the value of any contributed services and accommodations (for example, room and board); plus
 - b. Any amount received incident to the grant that is specifically designated to cover expenses for travel (including meals and lodging while traveling and an allowance for travel of the individual's family), research, clerical help, and equipment. To be excluded from income these amounts must actually be spent for the purpose of the grant.
 6. Amounts received under the grant that represent payments for teaching, research, or other part-time employment required as a condition for receiving the grant are taxable, unless required of all candidates as a condition of receiving a degree.

A somewhat simplified explanation of much of the above has been received from a Mott Foundation Program Officer. Basically, it was stated that: (a) the purpose of fellowship grants to interns is to train them, not "use" them, and (b) things done by interns must be in the nature of learning experiences with academic credit awarded for successfully completing the experience. Given this clarification,

it seems quite clear that interns are restricted in the kinds of things they can do. Restrictions of the IRS have definite implications in the assigning of certain specified "learning experiences" to interns.

4. Persons who have received training in the Center, interns (both present and past), and other persons closely associated with the Center, perceive many positive things about the Center. Interns receiving training in the Center during the 1975-76 school year listed¹⁰ seven strengths which they (interns) believed the Center to have:

1. The human resources, including staff, faculty, directors, interns, and lay personnel, available to the Center are exceptional. The availability and willingness of these people to assist and contribute in their various areas of expertise is a major strength.
2. The in-service opportunities provided by the Center are substantial. Topics selected by area community education personnel reflect their needs and interests. Speakers are excellent, functioning under a format most conducive to learning by the participants. Attendance supports the value of this type of service.
3. The strong financial base of the Center reflects continued support of the Foundation. Funding for normal Center operations, expansion and seed monies, dollars for service to local communities and doctoral fellowships reflect such support. The consistency of this support allows for a continually solid operation.
4. The reputation of the Western Michigan Center as a successful training center for leaders in various community education settings is noteworthy. Graduates currently in positions of responsibility on a local, state, national, and international basis [sic] support this fact.

¹⁰In a presentation on May 10, 1976, by the interns to the External Evaluation Committee.

5. The number of visitations and the availability of consultant services to local communities is significant. Discussions with local directors and interest in their programs is an effective method of positive interaction between Center staff and local communities.
6. Progressive and innovative operations of the Center are encouraged and supported by the College of Education. This support includes areas [sic] of administration, travel, public relations, and extension of Center services on a local, state, and national level.
7. The potential of the Center to maintain its role as a national leader in community education is evident. With the past success of both the Center and its graduates, the rapid acceptance and expansion of the community education concept, the current Federal legislation and appropriations supporting community education and because of the ever-increasing demands for Center expertise, there is a limitless market for its services.

During the many interviews and informal discussions held with the interns during July, 1976, this writer determined that the interns believed the following additional items to be strengths: (a) the attendance at local, state, regional, and national workshops and conventions presents the opportunity to meet and "rap" with many community educators, (b) the potential exists in the placement of interns in a wide variety of learning experiences, (c) the willingness of Center personnel to allow individuals to develop their class schedules prior to scheduling Center-related activities for the interns, and (d) the "status" interns have enables them to gain information rather easily when they contact other universities and/or regional centers, identify themselves as interns, and asked for the needed information.

Persons receiving Center training (see item 6 on p. 16) were asked to respond to this question: Looking back, what do you believe

were the most beneficial aspect(s) of the intern training program at Western? Many of the responses were, in essence, similar to those given by this year's interns.

Statements made by former students which were not identical, or nearly so, to statements made by this year's students include: (a) "the opportunity to do things and be treated as an equal, not a student," (b) "the joint program with the State Department of Education," (c) "the willingness (of Center personnel) to share their thoughts and ideas and reasons for specific actions taken," (d) "the opportunity to explore/test theory with practical experiences," and (e) "the opportunity to observe and evaluate various leadership styles in relation to overall effectiveness."

Perceptions held by others closely associated with the Center are perhaps best summarized by the final statement in the External Evaluation Committee's report. It states that the Committee (1976) found the Center to be a vital part of Western Michigan University, and:

The Center provides a broad range of educational services and excellent educational leadership in the geographical area served by the University. It emphasizes service to communities--as does the University--and provides such service on a minimum budget. At the same time the Center exerts state and national leadership in community education, adding to the prestige of the University in a rapidly expanding professional field. Western Michigan University has much reason to be exceedingly proud of the Center and to place it among those programs receiving continuing and increasing University support. (p. 35)

5. There does not appear to be a clearly defined role of the Center in its relationship to (or with) the Department of Educational Leadership. In interviews with this year's interns, one intern made

the statement that a big void, or hiatus, existed between the Center and the Educational Leadership Department. That statement was immediately followed by a question suggesting that perhaps the Department's Chairperson held goals and expectations for the Center which were in conflict with those held by Center personnel.

One might properly argue that goal conflict is a problem that should be presented with the writer's final conclusion, which deals with communication. However, a number of concerns reported by the External Evaluation Committee indicates a "relationship" problem which goes beyond a communication problem. The committee (1976) reported these concerns:

Community education seems too often to be a separate segment of the institution rather than an integral part of a total program of training in educational leadership. . . . There seems to be a lack of moral support and understanding from the Department of Educational Leadership. . . . The lack of effective working relations between the Center and the Department of Educational Leadership was obvious to the Committee There is certainly a difference in understanding between faculty members in the Department of Educational Leadership and the staff in the Community School Development Center as to the place of the Center in the University setting. (p. 19, 24, 29)

6. Numerous examples of communication problems were found.

This is perhaps the most significant of the conclusions reached by the present writer. The conclusion certainly accounts for the largest number of recommendations made by this writer.

Much of the following discussion on "communications" is predicated on this assumption: A primary function of communication is to reduce uncertainty. If "speaker/listener" uncertainty has been eliminated, or significantly reduced, communication has occurred.

Speaking in general terms for a moment, little evidence could be found to indicate that interns were aware of how and why they were selected for the 1975-76 training program. The selection process, and criteria used in the process, appear to be rather vague and nebulous. In addition, policies designed to present expectations held for the interns appear to be inadequate.

In more specific terms, it was found that incoming interns:

- (a) did not receive an adequate orientation to the Center and its purposes, to the University, and to the community-at-large,
- (b) were not familiar with the conditions and restrictions placed upon them by their fellowship grants,
- (c) were not sure of the Center secretary's role as it related to the interns,
- (d) were not aware of any emphasis on them participating fully in the Center's "in-house" activities,
- (e) kept waiting for things to happen, resulting in a loss of valuable time,
- (f) perceived little sense of direction and structure of their potential learning opportunities,
- (g) found Center staff meetings inadequate for communication purposes,
- (h) found little in the way of definitive guidelines relating to office discipline, routine procedures, proper attire, etc.,
- (i) questioned the value of statements that "learning opportunities exist" when the realities of the situation prevent interns from taking advantage of such "opportunities," and
- (j) discovered that goals and expectations held by Center personnel for the interns (and vice versa), were not fully and mutually discussed.

As stated in the chapter's beginning, the conclusions were distilled from information gleaned from a wide variety of sources.

From the interns' responses, the writer was able to identify more specific concerns. When such conclusions, or concerns, have been verbalized and placed in a paper of this nature, it is hoped that a certain degree of face validity can be ascribed to the process. In making recommendations, the final hope is that the recommendations will be considered and acted upon if feasible.

Recommendations

Some recommendations can be expressed in relatively few sentences; others are more complex, and are thus accompanied by explanation, detail, and/or rationale. Some recommendations may be relatively easy to act upon and implement in a short period of time; other recommendations may be relatively easy to act upon, but implementation will take a longer period of time.

Still other recommendations may be impractical, unrealistic, and difficult (if not impossible) to act upon. Factors or variables which might create a situation preventing implementation are: (a) lack of money and/or other resources, (b) IRS regulations and guidelines, (c) Mott Foundation grant requirements and conditions, and (d) lack of University support and commitment.

The area of communications seems to generate the most concern, and most of the following recommendations deal with the communications area. Brown and Keller (1973, p. 1) point out that two things are involved in communication between people: (a) relationship, and (b) information. The nature of the former determines the latter. In other words, if an open and accepting relationship does not exist,

the information "signals" between sender and receiver are subject to misinterpretation, misunderstanding, and misreading.

Thus, the writer believes that if the following recommendations are to be successfully acted upon, an open, honest, and accepting relationship must exist among all persons concerned. With no particular order or priority, it is recommended that:

1. The "hands off" philosophy of training new interns, and providing opportunities to learn, should be modified. Most of these interns come to the Center possessing little or no community education background. Not only do they not have the answers to questions, they are not even sure what their questions are.

2. A "game plan" ("how do we get there" type of thing) should be devised. Goals and objectives for interns and Center staff should be collectively discussed and developed by all who will be directly affected. This recommendation implies a democratic interaction with the Director, Associate Director, and interns.

3. The expectations held by the Center staff for interns relative to their anticipated behaviors, responsibilities, and contributions should be spelled out.

4. A well-planned orientation session for incoming interns should be held. It should not be a cursory one hour "Hi--my name is . . .--goodbye" type of thing. An outline detailing activities and procedures should be developed by the present interns and Center staff, along with a handbook containing appropriate information. A properly conducted orientation session, if successful, should shorten the time in which interns are unable to assume major responsibilities.

5. New interns should be informed immediately, and specifically, what each has been budgeted for travel, conventions, workshops, etc. Interns should also receive a schedule containing dates of all pertinent conferences and workshops, when known, and the estimated cost of attending each.

6. Certain kinds of common learning experiences should be mandated for all interns (unless competency can be demonstrated prior to those experiences). Interns should be held accountable for developing skills, for example, in proposal writing, budget development, legislation analysis and interpretation, etc.

7. The capabilities of each intern should be analyzed and evaluated periodically. When appropriate growth and competency have been demonstrated in an area, added responsibilities and involvement commensurate with the demonstrated capabilities should be given the intern.

8. When only selected Center staff or interns attend conferences or workshops, time should be made available in staff meetings for participants to provide a synopsis of "what happened."

9. A list should be drawn up which specifically states the basic competencies, knowledges, and skills a Center trained graduate is expected to have. An "individualized" learning program could be developed for each intern, centering upon his/her identified needs and career goals.

10. Staff meetings should be more than just a calendar sharing session. A general or specific discussion topic, or a learning activity (such as budgeting) could be included as part of the session,

or "mini-seminar." Information on the planned agenda should be made available in advance to all interns.

11. A schedule should be periodically developed and posted, listing forthcoming opportunities for learning, mini-seminars, etc.

12. The position of Associate Director of the Center should be given the rank of Associate Professor within the tenure system. Lack of leadership continuity at the associate director level does not lend itself to effective leadership and goal achievement of the Center. With two permanent positions in the Center, not only would continuity of leadership be provided, but two qualified persons would be able to advise doctoral degree students.

13. Cooperation from the Educational Leadership Department faculty should be sought in identifying and recommending able doctoral candidates who are at or near the second year level, and who may be interested in community education.

14. A determination should be made as to how intern training fits with specific requirements and expectations of the Educational Leadership Department, and with the general purpose of graduate education at the University.

15. An assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each intern should be made at the time of admission to the program. The strengths should be utilized and shared (not exploited), and each intern should follow a learning program developed to remedy his/her weaknesses.

16. It should be recognized that providing the interns with the opportunity to share their strengths and expertise could develop

a sense of "worth" and "belonging" which might tend to foster a feeling of loyalty to the Center and its goals.

17. Each prospective intern should be made aware of the selection process, criteria used in selecting interns, Center training program requirements and expectations, time deadlines for application and admission, and Graduate College requirements.

18. Interns should be selected on the basis of their abilities and potential. Thus, interns should be able to assume some responsibilities with a minimum of guidance, direction, and follow-up.

19. The present method of evaluating interns' learning experiences (using the 10-point rating scale as found in Appendix D) should be modified to more accurately measure goal achievement.

20. If an assigned field experience is proving to be non-beneficial in terms of the intern's needs, the experience should be terminated and another, more suitable, substituted. Before this can be done, expectations and criteria must first be developed, so that a "bad" situation or "poor" performance is easily recognizable.

21. The Center staff person who will have major responsibility for supervising interns should be involved with the selection process.

22. Each intern candidate should be personally interviewed (prior to selection and notification) by the selection committee.

23. An intern without prior community education experience at the building, program, or district level, should have some early experience of this kind.

24. The Center has need for another professional staff person, and a professional staff member should be added to the current

number of Center personnel.

The reader should be aware that many of the recommendations, if adopted, will result in more "structure" in the training program. One should also note that "structure" is not a four-letter word.

References

- Boles, H. W. & Davenport, J. A. Introduction to educational leadership. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1975.
- Brown, C. T. & Keller, P. W. Monologue to dialogue: An exploration of interpersonal communication. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Notification of grant (#76-040) awarded to Western Michigan University. March 26, 1976.
- Coats, W. E. Survey report of Mott leadership programs. Unpublished report, Western Michigan University, 1970.
- Minzey, J. D. & LeTarte, C. Community education: From program to process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1972.
- Seay, M. F. (Ed.). Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1974.
- Seay, M. F. Preliminary report of the external evaluation committee. Unpublished report, Western Michigan University, 1976.
- Tax information for American scholars in the United States and abroad. (1976 Edition, Internal Revenue Service Publication 520). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1976.

APPENDIX A

INTERNSHIP PROSPECTUS

INTERNSHIP PROSPECTUS

SPONSORING ORGANIZATION:

Community School Development Center, Western Michigan University

FIELD SUPERVISOR:

Dr. Gerald C. Martin, Director, Community School Development Center

UNIVERSITY ADVISOR:

Dr. Harold W. Boles, Department of Educational Leadership

MAJOR FOCUS OF EXPERIENCE:

Research analysis of the Community School Development Center operations, with particular emphasis on the selecting and training of interns.

DURATION:

A minimum of 240 hours shall be spent during a time period commencing Monday, April 26 and ending no later than Friday, July 30.

RATIONALE:

For nearly six years, I have served as Community School Coordinator for the Portage Public Schools. Our school district is located within the service area of Western Michigan University's Community School Development Center.

During the period of time mentioned, I have had hundreds of contacts with Center personnel. These persons include permanently assigned staff, i.e., director, assistant director, secretarial, etc., and temporarily assigned staff, i.e., individuals serving major internships of one or two year's duration. Contacts with Center personnel have ranged from quick phone calls to seminars lasting several hours to more structured and formalized meetings lasting a day or more.

These widely varied contacts and experiences have given me a good working knowledge of the Center's activities, particularly as they relate to local districts. At the same time, a fair degree of understanding of the Center's other roles, such as a regional center and training site for interns, has been picked up.

While serving as a member of an external evaluation team looking at the Center's operations, I had a unique opportunity to view the internal structure and workings at the Center. The experience suggested additional areas of the intern training program which needed study and analysis. As I perceive them, these areas could be broadly classified into three categories: (a) intern training and experience, (b) the role of the Center's interns and their relationship with local district Community Education programs, and (c) future directions. I would propose working primarily with the first two categories; by so doing, it would seem that the third area would, as a consequence, receive some attention. The process used would consist of seven steps, which are outlined below.

1. Studying and analyzing the seven major goal areas of the Center which are: (a) provide implementation consultant services and assistance for local communities and/or school districts, (b) provide preservice educational opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, (c) provide inservice education opportunities for community educators, lay personnel, and students, (d) promote research, evaluation, and information dissemination in community education, (e) promote the community education concept at Western Michigan University, (f) promote the development of regional

coordination/cooperation in the Center's greater service area, and (g) assist in the expansion of the community education concept at state and national levels.

2. Identifying the objectives within each of the goal areas which seem to be most closely related to intern training and experience.

3. Locating and using various information sources, including: (a) center evaluation field questionnaire, (b) internship evaluation format, (c) quarterly narrative reports, (d) annual assessment documentation, (e) advisory council evaluation, (f) workshop and seminar evaluation, and (g) personnel interviews.

4. Obtaining relevant historical data of internships as previously and presently structured.

5. Determining the direction(s), or philosophical approaches, to intern training.

6. Indicating problem areas as determined by the previous steps: (a) What are they? (b) Why are they?

7. Recommending changes.

APPENDIX B

LOG OF THE EXPERIENCE

LOG OF THE EXPERIENCE

April 26, 1976

This time was spent with Dr. Martin and Bill Carmody. We met with the Board of Education in Sparta, Michigan, and served in an advisory and consulting capacity. The district is investigating the feasibility of expanding its Community School program, and employing its director on a full-time basis.

I identified three problem areas with which the Board is concerned: (1) the effects of "competition" from their giant neighbor to the south, (2) the effects of the proposed expansion on the North Kent consortium's working relationships, and (3) the role and influence an advisory council would play, i.e., would it become involved with making policy for the Board?

That I did not adequately prepare myself for this meeting was a major problem with which I had to deal. Because I had not done my "homework," I knew very little about the community, about the program and half-time director, funding patterns and cooperative arrangements, and the Board's general educational philosophy.

April 29, 1976

This time was spent with Bill Carmody in Lansing. We met with State Department of Education personnel Mary Rogers, Gary Sullenger, and Mike Hunter. These persons were to discuss with Community School Directors evaluation techniques for 1975-76 programs, salary reimbursement forms, and proposal writing for 1976-77.

As frequently happens, this meeting with State Department personnel quickly forced the adversary relationship between the Department and directors to surface.

Dr. Rogers began by introducing the concept of intermediate school districts being "interposed" between local district high school completion programs and the State Department, beginning with the 1977-78 school year. This started a hassle and argument, with Dr. Rogers either being extremely naive (not perceiving the levels of distrust many directors have of ISDs and the State Department), or deliberately wishing to mislead directors into a false sense of security ("nothing is going to change"). Because of the hostility generated by this confrontation, directors seemed in a mood to turn off the rest of the day's program. Not helping the situation was the fact that the State Department indicated needed forms had been mailed to all Intermediate School Districts on April 15. These forms had not been received by the Kalamazoo ISD, nor many others throughout the state, as of April 29.

May 7, 1976

Met with Pat Long, a doctoral intern in the Community School Development Center, to help in the planning of the June Interdisciplinary Seminar for approximately 30 graduate students enrolled in EDLD 662 on a credit basis.

Arrangements for the meeting place and evening meal had been made by me. In addition to discussing the physical set-up, we talked about the written evaluation which would be required of the

students, along with their oral reactions to the year's learning experiences.

May 10, 1976

This date marked the first in an intensive three-day external evaluation of the Community School Development Center. Dr. Maurice Seay, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Educational Leadership, served as committee chairperson. A copy of a letter dated March 26, 1976, lists the committee members and is found in Appendix C.

The committee's major responsibility, as contained in the charge given by Dr. Seay, was to identify areas of strengths and concerns in the Community School Development Center's operations. Primary sources of information were to include personal interviews with: (a) selected staff from the Center, Educational Leadership Department, College of Education, and the Graduate College, (b) members of the Center Advisory Council, (c) directors at local district community school programs, and (d) doctoral interns working in the Center.

During the evening hours, the interns made a formal presentation to the committee. The perceptions of the interns were of great interest to me, particularly as the comments listed strengths and areas of concern as related to the doctoral training program.

May 11, 1976

The day's schedule called for listening to comments from members of the Advisory Council and from the Department of Educational Leadership. The perceptions of this latter group, as had been true with the interns, were of great interest to me.

May 12, 1976

The day's session served primarily as a "wrap-up" for the committee's work. On an individual basis, each committee member related his findings to the entire group. As chairperson, it remains the task of Dr. Seay to summarize and compile the many pages of information into preliminary report form. Where appropriate, it is my intention to use relevant portions of the report in my specialist project.

May 19, 1976

The major portion of this day was spent in writing my portion of the evaluation report. A number of questions relating to intern training were posed. These included: (a) What is the selection procedure used for awarding internships? (b) Are the best possible candidates selected? (c) Who is responsible for structuring and supervising intern experiences? and (d) To avoid approving dissertations which are repetitive or not directly related to community education, what methods are used to identify topics which need researching?

Again, it is my intention to address these, and other questions, as my specialist project takes form.

June 14, 1976

Spent time today, including an extended lunch period, with Dr. Martin. We discussed various approaches which I might use in developing the project. It was suggested that some research related to historical perspectives of the internship training program would

be desirable.

June 30, 1976

As a follow-up to the time previously spent with my advisor and supervisor, I again discussed with Dr. Martin a number of alternatives to be considered in the project development. In addition to historical perspectives, it was decided that the topic of future directions should be fully explored. Personnel from the Mott Foundation in Flint were suggested as possible resources, as well as Bill Carmody and Gloria Gregg.

July 7, 1976

In preparation for a meeting tomorrow with Bill Carmody, time was spent in the Educational Resource Center researching the general topic of internship goals and objectives.

July 8, 1976

Time was spent with Bill Carmody, primarily to review with him personal observations I have made thus far, whether any of these observations might be considered inappropriate to the project, and to receive additional suggestions for research analysis.

July 9, 1976

Continued research work which had been initiated Wednesday in the Educational Resource Center.

July 10, 1976

Spent most of the time re-reading, studying, and analyzing the preliminary findings located in the external evaluation materials. Special note was made of the portions dealing with intern training and experiences.

July 11, 1976

A continuation of work begun yesterday. A written summarization and outline were developed based upon the evaluation materials.

July 12, 1976

The entire day was spent in the Community School Development Center. I had informal discussions with Dr. Martin and Bill Carmody concerning Center activities. Discussions with these two were continued during lunch, and I conducted a formal taped interview with Dr. Martin.

July 13, 1976

The files located in the Center contain a wide variety of material. Some time was spent in determining which of the files would be most appropriate for me to use. I then began to locate and identify portions of the files which relate directly to intern training and experiences.

July 14, 1976

Informal discussions today with Bill Carmody, Dr. Martin and Dr. Maurice Seay. I had lunch with the latter two, plus the opportunity

to conduct a formal taped interview with Dr. Seay. In addition, I attended a meeting involving the Center's Director, Associate Director, and interns.

All of the participants shared information regarding forthcoming Center-related activities, times, duties, locations, and purposes of such. The prime objective of this sharing had the implied purpose of making interns aware of educational and training experiences available to them.

July 15, 1976

Spent time in the Center with Bill Carmody. He provided help and suggestions for developing a questionnaire to be sent to a number of former interns. I hope to gather information from them relating to their perceptions of the training they received while interns.

July 16, 1976

The questionnaire was completed and mailed. In the absence of Dr. Martin and Bill Carmody, I attended a meeting of area Community School Directors. The Center has established communications and a working relationship with several such formal groups of directors. In addition to the organization in the immediate Kalamazoo area, groups are located in the Berrien, Kent, and Muskegon county areas.

July 17, 1976

Time spent in the Center gathering additional research materials, with files being a primary source. Had informal discussions with

Pat Long and Bill Carmody.

July 18, 1976

In the Center again, with a continuation of Saturday's research activities. Had the opportunity to again informally discuss Center activities with Pat Long.

July 19, 1976

The entire day was spent in the Center. I spent some time setting up interview schedules with present interns, and conducting a formal taped interview with Carolyn O'Donnell. Informal discussions again with Dr. Martin and Bill Carmody, plus a letter written at Dr. Martin's request to area directors who have not yet returned Mott-sponsored questionnaires to Research Triangle Institute.

July 20, 1976

Taped a formal interview today with Bill Carmody, newly-appointed Associate Director for the Community School Development Center. Dr. Martin assigned me the task of setting up a seminar for directors, superintendents, and/or business managers.

The seminar is sponsored by the Center, working cooperatively with the Michigan Community School Education Association and the Michigan Association for Public Adult and Continuing Education. Representatives from the State Department of Education will be in attendance to explain and interpret portions of the new State Aid Bill that deal with adult education.

July 21, 1976

Taped interviews today with: (a) Dr. Gloria Gregg, who served as the Center's Associate Director during 1975-76, (b) Dr. Frank Manley, Jr., who served as Assistant to the Director during 1975-76, and (c) Pat Long, currently an intern.

In addition, I spent time organizing the previously mentioned seminar. It will be held Wednesday, July 28, in Portage Central High School.

July 22, 1976

The entire day was again spent in the Center, with time set aside for a conference with my advisor and lunch with Bill Carmody. During these lunch "meetings" with various Center personnel, I find the informal discussions productive, informative, and rewarding.

July 24, 1976

The major portion of this day was spent in putting Chapter I research into some semblance of order.

July 25, 1976

The entire day was spent in the Center. Additional source materials for Chapter I data were located in the files. Completed the writing of the first chapter's rough draft.

July 26, 1976

The initial typing of Chapter I was completed today. Discussed the contents with Dr. Martin, and his suggested changes and additions for the chapter were incorporated. A number of minor grammatical changes were made prior to tomorrow's scheduled conference with my advisor.

July 27, 1976

Met with Dr. Martin and Dr. Seay today to discuss the working draft of the External Evaluation Committee's preliminary report. Dr. Martin's role in this particular discussion was to check the report for possible errors in terms of factual content. I also met with my advisor to discuss Chapter I of my project. A number of errors were discovered, and a number of suggested changes in terms of style and content were made. Following this conference, I again met with Dr. Martin, primarily to share with him the results of the conference with my advisor.

July 28, 1976

The seminar, scheduled for superintendents, business managers, and directors located within the Center's service area, was held today at Portage Central High School. Dr. Mary Rogers and Dr. Joseph Hudson represented the State Department of Education. Al McPherson, President of the Michigan Association for Public Adult and Community Education, and Jerry Wing, President of the Michigan Community School Education Association, were in attendance as representatives of these

two professional organizations.

Approximately 60 persons were in attendance to hear Dr. Rogers state the Department's interpretations of the portions of S.B. 1473 related to state funding of adult education. Several changes significantly different from the state's funding practices of previous years were noted and discussed. The major financial impact upon school districts operating high school completion programs can be summarized briefly: Districts will receive less money than in previous years.

July 29, 1976

Most of the time today in the Center was devoted to the re-writing of Chapter I and developing outlines for Chapters II and III. I also completed an assignment Dr. Martin had given me; that of developing a T/O chart which would show the Center's organizational relationship to the Department of Educational Leadership, the College of Education, and the Graduate College.

July 30, 1976

This morning, Dr. Martin and I met with directors from districts located within the greater Kalamazoo area. The three major topics for discussion were: (a) possible methods to be utilized by school districts in order to comply with the requirements of S.B. 1473, (b) possible responses to the State Department of Education's position that G.E.D. certificates are the same as high school diplomas (thus excluding persons who have the former, but not the latter, from the

fourth Friday membership count for state aid purposes), and (c) a television advertising campaign aimed at adults living in the greater Kalamazoo area who are non-high school graduates.

In the afternoon, the chapter outlines on which I had worked yesterday, were completed, and the writing of Chapter II was started.

July 31, 1976

The day was spent in the Center. The writing of the second chapter's rough draft was completed and the writing of Chapter III was begun.

August 1, 1976

The day was spent in the Center. The writing of Chapter III was completed. The initial typing of Chapters II and III was completed.

August 2, 1976

The day was spent in the Center. A copy of Chapters II and III was provided Dr. Martin. His suggestions and reactions to the chapters are being sought. In preparation for a scheduled conference with my advisor, some time was spent working needed changes in the chapters to be discussed. An intern, Pat Long, and I met with a student who wishes to investigate community education graduate studies.

The day's activities ended with an informal discussion with Bill Carmody. I provided him with a synopsis of the "counseling" session involving the potential graduate student, Pat Long, and myself.

August 3, 1976

The outline of Chapter IV was completed, and the writing of that chapter begun. Chapters II and III were discussed in a conference with my advisor. Writing errors were noted, along with recommended style changes. Dr. Martin's comments on contents were also received and noted.

During the remainder of the day (and evening) time was spent in the re-writing of the second and third chapters, and a continuation of the writing of Chapter IV.

August 4, 1976

The entire day was again spent in the Center, with most of the time devoted to the writing of the last chapter. I had an informal luncheon meeting with two interns, Phil Knight and Mike Dixon. They, along with other Center interns, have displayed an active interest in my project.

August 5, 1976

The writing and initial typing of Chapter IV were completed today. The chapter's contents were discussed with Bill Carmody during lunch. Some items in need of revision were noted. This was done in preparation for the scheduled conference with my advisor.

August 6, 1976

I met with my advisor to discuss the final chapter. As in prior conferences, writing errors were noted, along with some possible

style changes.

Although my internship at the Western Michigan University Community School Development Center has "officially concluded" (in terms of time requirements), much work remains to be done before my project is complete.

APPENDIX C

DR. MAURICE SEAY LETTER

COPY OF ORIGINAL LETTER

March 26, 1976

Dear Colleague;

The following committee has been appointed to make an external evaluation of the Western Michigan Community School Development Center:

Dr. Douglas Procunier, Mott Foundation
Dr. Tom Fish, College of St. Thomas
Dr. Loren Bonneau, University of Nebraska
Mr. Henry Houseman, Portage Public Schools
Mr. Patrick Shafer, Orchard View Public Schools
Mr. Lynn Smith, W.M.U. Doctoral Intern
Mr. John Garber, Northern Michigan University
Mr. Gary Sullenger, Michigan Department of Education
Dr. A. L. Sebaly, W.M.U.
Dr. Norval Bovee, Paw Paw Public Schools

In the conduct of this evaluative study we are requesting some of our colleagues in community education to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. Because this is the first evaluative study of this type to be made of the Center, we hope that you can give to us the time necessary to complete the questionnaire (approximately 15 minutes).

And may I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this important effort.

Sincerely and with Best Wishes,

Maurice F. Seay
Professor Emeritus
Department of Educational Leadership

MFS:te

APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTER

NAME _____

(for follow-up purposes only)

PRESENT INSTRUMENT USED BY INTERNS
TO EVALUATE SELECTED CENTER OBJECTIVES

1. The Center provided opportunity for internship learning experiences which helped develop consultant concepts and skills.
(Not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (To great extent)

2. The Center provided opportunity for internship learning experience which helped develop pre-service concepts and skills.
(Not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (To great extent)

3. The Center provided opportunity for internship learning experiences which helped develop in-service concepts and skills.
(Not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (To great extent)

4. The Center provided opportunity for internship learning experiences which helped develop concepts and skills related to promoting Community Education within the university setting.
(Not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (To great extent)

5. The Center provided opportunity for internship learning experiences which supported personal career interests and goals.
(Not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (To great extent)

6. The Center provided opportunity for interaction of interns with Center staff for counseling, support, and general learning experiences.
(Not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (To great extent)

7. Looking back, what do you believe was the most beneficial aspect(s) of the intern training program at Western?
8. Please use the back of this sheet to make suggestions as to how you believe the intern training program might be improved or changed.

PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

311 South Washington
PORTAGE, MICHIGAN 49881

62

COMMUNITY EDUCATION
"It Makes a Difference"

AREA 616
PHONE 337 3041

July 16, 1976

Do you have a few minutes to help a struggling student complete his specialist project and graduate next month? You do? Fine! Let me explain what I am doing, and what I am looking for.

I am doing my 720 Ed.S. internship this summer in a former "home" of yours; Western's Community School Development Center. With Harold Boles as advisor, I am studying the intern training program conducted by the Center. Three perspectives of the intern training program being studied are: past, present, and future (?)

You can be of tremendous help to me doing the following:

- (1) Sharing your perceptions and reactions to the training you received; and
- (2) Sharing your ideas and suggestions as to how the training might be improved and/or changed.

Because of the time factor and deadline with which I am faced, may I suggest this procedure:

If the enclosed evaluation instrument can be returned within a week (on or before Friday, July 23), this would be fantastic! If not, then I will attempt to reach you by phone in your office on Monday, July 26, and pose the questions orally.

With many, many thanks to you in advance, I am

Sincerely yours,

Henry Houseman
Community School Coordinator

Enc.

APPENDIX E

LIST OF COOPERATING CENTERS

LIST OF COOPERATING CENTERS

Listed below are the names of states (in the Upper Midwest Region) and institutions which have cooperating centers serviced by the Western Michigan University Community School Development Center:

<u>STATE</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>
1. Iowa	Drake University
2. Minnesota	College of St. Thomas Mankato State University
3. Nebraska	University of Nebraska
4. North Dakota	North Dakota State University
5. South Dakota	University of South Dakota
6. Wisconsin	None at present time

APPENDIX F

NAMES OF PERSONS HAVING SECURED LEADERSHIP POSITIONS
SUBSEQUENT TO TRAINING AT WESTERN'S
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

These individuals are currently serving, or have served, in various kinds of leadership roles. They hold, or have held, positions such as Center Directors, Assistant and/or Associate Directors, State Departments of Education Consultants, and other kinds of Community Education Consultants:

1. Bonneau, Loren University of Nebraska
2. Carmody, William Western Michigan University
3. Clark, Philip University of Florida
4. Fish, Thomas College of St. Thomas
5. Gregg, Gloria Western Michigan University
6. Huber, Joseph University of South Dakota
7. Johnson, Wilber Oklahoma State University
8. Manley, Frank (Jr.) Western Michigan University
9. McNeil, David Maryland State Department of Education
10. Miller, Brian Drake University
11. Miller, Sidney University of Missouri
12. Nance, Everett University of Missouri
13. O'Donnell, Carolyn New Mexico State University
14. Parson, Steven Virginia PolyTechnical University
15. Porter, Chuck Colorado State University
16. Robbins, Wayne California State Department of Education
17. Rogan, William Boyd University of Alabama
18. Schmitt, Donna Eastern Michigan University
19. Smith, Eric Mankato State University
20. Ticknor, George California State University
21. Wood, George Ball State University
22. Woods, William North Dakota State University