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Chapter 1

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The writer became interested in the subject of differentiated staffing upon hearing a lecture in 1970 given by Bruce C. Newlin, then the new Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum for the Lancaster School District, Lancaster, California. (Dr. Newlin is now Superintendent of the Lancaster School District.)

Among other things, he made a statement somewhat to the effect that differentiated staffing would be a reality in the seventies. Certainly the concepts behind such a program were unfamiliar to the writer and many other teachers in Lancaster when the term itself had not been heard previously. Therefore, when the writer decided to write a graduate project in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Master of Arts Degree in Education, it appeared that a study about differentiated staffing would be appropriate and worthwhile.

At the date of this writing, the amount of literature on the subject was quite limited, and relatively few persons had reported on their districts' experience with differentiated staffing.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to learn about differentiated staffing in five widely separated areas in the United States by obtaining information from each of these areas on the following: (1) reasons for deciding to initiate such a program; (2) amount of preparation to implement the program; (3) funds needed and how they would be obtained; (4) faculty, student, and community acceptance; (5) actual working plans; (6) future possibilities.
Importance of the Study

In this document, pertinent information is given which could be useful to schools considering implementation of some form of differentiated staffing. Several different plans are presented, and some pitfalls to be avoided are delineated; other school districts may profit by the mistakes made by the pioneering groups.

Few reports of surveys on differentiated staffing are available in the literature; therefore, this study should prove of value.

School Districts Used in the Survey

School districts in five widely separated areas in the United States which were using differentiated staffing were chosen for this survey: Temple City Unified School District, Temple City, California; Beaverton School District No. 48, Beaverton, Oregon; Cherry Creek Schools, Englewood, Colorado; Williamsville Central School District, Williamsville, New York; Florida State Department of Education (Sarasota County, Dade County, Leon County), Florida.

Temple City, California, is a suburban bedroom community of houses and apartments located thirteen miles east of Los Angeles with a population of approximately 33,000 in 1973. About 5,000 are children of school age who are served by four elementary schools, one junior high school, and one senior high school. The school district became unified in 1954 and now encompasses approximately three square miles and crosses the boundaries of three municipalities: Arcadia, San Gabriel, and Temple City. Economically, it tends toward being a district primarily of middle- and lower-middle-class residents. Its population is composed of 89 percent white, 7 percent Mexican-Americans, and 4 percent Asians.

The Beaverton, Oregon, district is composed of fifty-seven square miles and had a population of approximately 65,000 in 1969-1970. It is one of the fastest growing areas in Oregon. In 1960 there were 10,000 children of school age; by
1971 that figure had grown to over 19,000 for which there are thirty schools. It is the fourth largest school district in Oregon. Beaverton is just west of Portland and therefore many residents work in Portland and commute. There is a wide variety of socioeconomic backgrounds represented throughout the district with less than 1 percent of the residents being of an ethnic minority.

The Cherry Creek School District is somewhat unusual in its composition. It is located in the southeast suburban area of Denver, Colorado. It has within its boundary incorporated cities as well as some unincorporated areas. It has thirteen elementary schools, two junior high schools, and two senior high schools. About 98 percent of the population is white, with less than 1 percent Negroes and less than 1 percent Mexican, and with a sprinkling of orientals. The residents generally are middle- or upper-middle class economically.

Williamsville Central School District is a suburb of Buffalo, New York. It is located in the northwest corner of the state between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. The population of Williamsville is about 60,000 people in an area of forty-four square miles. Williamsville has twelve schools, seven of which house students from kindergarten through the fifth grade; three are called middle schools with students from the sixth grade through the eighth grade; and two are high schools.

About 90 percent of the population is white with minorities of Indians, orientals, and blacks. This is predominantly a middle-class area with some upper-middle-class families. Fruit growing is a specialty in this area known as "The Erie-Ontario Lowland." Truck gardening, dairy farms, and greenhouses flourish in this region. Abundant water power and excellent transportation have made it possible for large industrial cities like Buffalo to develop.

In Florida, it was decided to use county units for differentiated staffing possibilities. The State Department of Education began the study of differentiated staffing and asked the legislature for enabling laws to implement the plans. The three sites selected are all city areas, but are widely separated in terms of distance and are very different in terms of size.
Sarasota County has an approximate population of 100,000. The city of Sarasota, which is located on Sarasota Bay, has about 50,000 people of whom about 10 percent are from minority ethnic groups. Sarasota is on the west coast south of Tampa, a little below 27½ degrees latitude and about 82½ degrees longitude. It is located in the part of Florida that is known as the southern section of the East Gulf Coastal Plain, which is an important agricultural area. The populace tends toward being middle class economically and is served by twenty-six schools. The high school seniors have the distinction of usually having the highest scores in Florida on their Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) examinations.

One recognizes the heartland of Dade County immediately because it is Miami. However, Miami is not in the center of the county, but rather it is on the Atlantic coast at the northern edge of the county. Miami and Miami Beach areas together represent over one million people. Its school district is the seventh largest in the United States and it is subdivided into six districts. Dade County School District operates on a multimillion-dollar budget and has its own television station. Much of this area's income is based on tourism, but Dade County is famous, too, for its truck gardens. Although many wealthy people live here, there are all the varied economic groups of any other large metropolitan area in the United States. The population is predominantly white with small minorities of blacks and Cubans.

The other area chosen in Florida was Leon County. Tallahassee is the center of its activity and is credited with being the fastest growing area in the eastern part of the United States, and as of July 1974, the economy was booming. Tallahassee is a middle-class community composed of about 70 to 75 percent whites with the other 25 to 30 percent being Negro.

The basic industry of Leon County is state government with agriculture in second place. Leon County has three high schools, three middle schools (seventh, eighth, and ninth grades), and more than twenty elementary schools (reported by Dr. Marshall Frinks in a telephone conversation on July 15, 1974).

The remainder of this paper includes: a review of the literature on differentiated staffing; procedures used and presentation of data obtained; and a summary followed by conclusions and recommendations.
A Brief History of Differentiation

A review of the literature on differentiated staffing indicates that the concept of differentiated staffing is not new, just the term is. The Williamsville Planning Committee made this statement: "Staff differentiation is a new term for a process which has historical precedence in public education. . . . The teacher of a hundred and fifty years ago performed tasks of our present-day custodian, teacher, and administrator." (61:13)

Gradually other trends developed: more children began attending school for longer periods of time, knowledge in content areas expanded, schools increased in size and complexity, coordination between schools became desirable, thus making impossible a self-contained unit of one teacher fulfilling all roles.

Differentiation began, in many instances, with the development of a position for a person known as a teaching principal who gradually left the classroom altogether. Then came the positions of assistant principals, superintendents, and others in administrative roles. A parallel strand to the differentiation into teaching and administrative roles was the development of the part-time custodian, then the full-time custodian, until today there are many differentiated roles within the custodial services coordinated from a central office by a superintendent of maintenance and grounds.

Classroom teacher differentiation began by dividing the children into age-level groups and assigning them a grade-level numeral. Further differentiation came about by assigning specific teachers to be responsible for certain areas of the curriculum such as art, music, foreign language, or physical education. In the high schools, differentiation was along content lines, so that now the teacher need be competent in only one or two disciplines.
In the last fifty years, departmentalization and team teaching have come to the forefront. Since the 1950's, team teaching has been more in vogue in an attempt to relate the parts to the whole, rather than divide the child's learning into neat little packages — each a separate entity with little attempt made to synthesize the learning. These kinds of differentiation (age-level, grade-level, departmentalization and/or team teaching) are all relatively easy to administer, but it has become apparent that, "Traditionally oriented school systems have bred classroom atmosphere of conformity, passivity, and joylessness in this country." (2:vii)

Change Is Indicated

Rollins asserted, "The present problem revolves not about the journey through the content, but about the fact that ALL pupils must make the journey in the same way and at the same time and under the same circumstances." (14:7) Later, he stated, "The problem that has developed over the years is that learning the content of particular subjects has become vastly more important than what the learner eventually does with his knowledge." (14:178) If the premise is accepted that no pupil can learn for another pupil, but that each must learn for himself and in his own way and then only if he chooses to do so, and if he accepts that learning of the content is important, then changes are indicated.

Concerning change, Rollins wrote, "There is nothing precious or infallible about change. Change itself is neither good nor bad. What is relevant about change is its degree and kind." (14:172) The latter statement is probably indisputable; however, Rollins may have overlooked a very important unspoken message that the word "change" carries with it. Dempsey has expressed this connotation very well:

The word "change" often produces rather strong emotional reactions, primarily because, to many people, change is threatening. Not a neutral word, "change" often conjures up visions of a
manipulator, a dissatisfied idealist, a troublemaker, a revolutionary, a malcontent. Nicer and safer words referring to the process of changing people are “education,” “training,” “orientation,” “guidance,” or “therapy.” We are usually more ready, for example, to have others “educate” or “train” us than we are to have them “change” us. We feel less guilty in “training” others than in “changing” them. But why do we have conflicting emotional responses about words somewhat similar in definition? The safer words carry the implicit guarantee that only the changes acceptable within the framework of a commonly held value system will be produced. Cold, unmodified “change” promises little respect for values, and might be perceived as altering those values. It might, then, foster straight thinking to use the word “change” and force ourselves to struggle directly with the implied problems of values that are involved. Words such as education, training, or guidance, because they are not quite so disturbing, may close our eyes to the fact that they also involve values. (4:49)

Having given the above ideas some thought, the writer will proceed using the word “change” to indicate something not just new, superimposed on the old, but a “change” in the sense of a different concept for all and with regard to value systems. Many factors determine the tempo, the rhythm, and the lyrics of human lives. Life does not stand still. It is ever changing and so must be education. However, some eras seem to demand more and faster changes than other eras.

The forces for change are variously defined, but essentially they are technology and population. (26:50) Technology and population interact with each other and bring about more changes so that in essence there is a continuing circle with varying sizes of bumps on its circumference that indicate the diversity and/or severity of change at any one given time in history. “Not to recognize these forces of technology and population, . . . is like not recognizing the tides. The force of change will rise and overwhelm those who ignore them. Recognizing these forces, on the other hand, is the important first step toward growth. Recognize the inevitability of change; plan for its use, and it will become a positive power for growth, the real purpose of change.” (26:51)
Today’s children need preparation for a lifetime of learning and must nurture and develop the desire to learn and the skills to follow through on it.” (28:23) The key phrase here is a “lifetime of learning.” Because the concept of education is changing from that of a highly structured program during the years of one’s youth to that of education throughout life, the training of teachers must necessarily change, too.

Educators need not be the victims of change but should become the vehicles of change. Allen and Krasno stated, “The training of teachers today should not be even remotely similar to that of a century ago. Instead of training all candidates alike, we should begin training individuals for specific responsibilities of professional staffs. The position a candidate is trained for should depend upon both his career goals and his abilities. By abandoning the concept of all teachers as interchangeable parts, we can bring about better and more specialized training by focusing on specific roles.” (19:42)

Man, having a limited perspective of the future, must recognize that the knowledge and kinds of skills that will be needed in the future are not possible to define now. However, a program of training for flexibility and innovation is not only possible but absolutely essential. “Prospective teachers must develop a commitment to exploration, experimentation, and research that will become a way of life. Much closer ties will be established between teacher preparation institutions and public schools so that teachers come to view schools as laboratories for learning rather than rigid, highly structured institutions.” (14:190)

Therefore, “By training teachers for differentiated roles, we will produce people who will become innovators and change agents in the organizational systems of the public schools.” (19:42)
Differentiated Staffing Proposed as One Possibility for Change

One December afternoon in 1965, Dwight W. Allen (formerly of Stanford University but now at the University of Massachusetts) was meeting with M. John Rand, then Superintendent of Schools, Temple City, California, and some of his colleagues in the Blackwatch Steakhouse. As they discussed ideas about educational changes, Dr. Allen began sketching ideas on the back of a napkin. He returned to Stanford with the napkin and began working to develop an hierarchical model that would encompass some of the ideas they discussed. The preliminary model was presented to the California State Board of Education in April 1966, with the Temple City Unified School District used as the example of how staff differentiation might take place. (See Model 1 on following page.)

The term “differentiated staffing” was probably coined in Dr. Allen’s original position paper released from Stanford University in 1966. In 1972, Allen and Kline, in their article “From Habit to Heresy and Home Again,” stated: (1:12)

Although many educators have not heard of it, the time has probably come to say there is no such thing as differentiated staffing. Certain unions and professional associations have fought it; others have embraced it. School districts have won or lost grants in attempting to implement it. Detractors and disciples have both traced its counterparts and forerunners back in history and across to professions other than education. Some educators have faced it head-on and have decided that there is less there than meets the eye; to others it looms as a threat to emotional health and professional heartland. It is variously considered an accomplished fact and an impossible dream; a hope and a hazard; a backroom plot and a vanguard plan. Simply saying that there is no such thing might allow us breathing space in which to clear the air, to refocus and assess what we see in the name of differentiated staffing, and then to try for a fresh approach to the concept for all concerned.
Model I
Temple City Differentiated Staffing Plan
1965-66

IV
Contracted Positions
CURRICULUM ASSOCIATE
(12 positions)
twelve-month contract
$14,000 - $18,000
4 steps

III
Contracted Positions
SENIOR TEACHER
(32 positions)
twelve-month contract
$12,000 - $14,000
4 steps

II
Probationary and Tenured Positions
STAFF TEACHER
(51 positions)
ten-month contract
$8,000 - $10,000
5 steps

I
Probationary and Tenured Positions
ASSOCIATE TEACHER
(80 positions)
ten-month contract
$6,000 - $8,000
10 steps

One-fourth of the Staff
Doctorate or Equivalent Typical
M.A. Typical
5th Year Typical
A.B. Typical
Noncertificated Staff

PARAPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL (3 to 6 positions)

Notes on Model I
This first model did not show the importance of classroom teaching as the basic responsibility of teachers functioning under such a plan, according to the Teachers Job Analysis Task Force under the leadership of Allan Shuey. During the summer of 1967, the TJATF redesigned the model.
Evidently they do not have an alternative suggestion for a name, because at the end of the article the authors wrote, "Maybe we in education are responsible, maybe others are, but someone has succeeded rather well in educating a mass of people known as the American Public. We should now want to grow with our clients. They are ready to seek alternatives and it is no longer so easy to fool some of the people all the time. To meet the crisis of staffing our schools in our contemporary complexities, we need to offer something other than "more of the same." Differentiation of staff can be one such offering. (1:29)

**Concepts and Definitions of Differentiated Staffing**

Differentiated staffing means different things to different people so that it is difficult to give a precise, concise, adequate definition in a sentence or two.

"Differentiated staffing is a concept which challenges a whole host of notions about how American education should be organized and operated. At the moment it may be heresy; in a decade it may be practice." (33:268) Accepting the truth of this statement by Ryan at this point is important. He stated: "A cornerstone of the differentiated staff concept is the recognition that there are many different roles and responsibilities hidden under the definition of teacher." (15:78)

The concept of differentiated staffing may be said to be based on the following three premises: "... first, there are differences among teachers in intelligence, teaching skill, and level of commitment; second, there are many different roles and activities lumped under the general label "teacher"; third, different qualities of professional contribution should receive different levels of remuneration, and, further, some teachers should receive as much or more payment for services than some administrators." (9:2 of Forward) Marshall Frinks noted that, "The crux of the differentiation of forward staffing concept, regardless of the elements in any proposed staff pattern, is a fundamental change in the way we perceive the professional teacher, his designated responsibilities, his image, and his status within the educational structure." (46:5)
"Some form of open scheduling has to precede any form of flexible staff organization of differentiation. The scheduling might be modular, blocked, flexible, rotating or nongraded, but it must provide, despite its nomenclature, for maximum flexibility for both teachers and student." (16:59-60) Along with flexible scheduling, there must be some kind of cooperative teaching using written goals and objectives. To complete this generalization of attributes, it must be accepted that the faculty shall participate in the decision making.

From the vantage point of the educator, differentiated staffing means the opportunity to use one's talents in particular areas of one's competencies; it means helping to design the curriculum to fit the needs of the students; it means salary commensurate with duties performed; it means the use of paraprofessionals for nonprofessional tasks. Edward C. Pino, former Superintendent of the Cherry Creek Schools, defined differentiated staffing as, "A personnel design and system of organization that seeks to make more effective and efficient use of human and nonhuman resources through a better definition of job tasks and functions and a differentiation of role, status, competencies and reward." (55:1)

Michael Stover, former Information Officer of the Temple City District, stated: "The process of how this has developed may prove as valuable as the product, a revolutionary multilevel teacher hierarchy encompassing the competencies of the neophyte teacher as well as the Ph.D. research specialist." (58:1)

Beaverton District No. 48 (Oregon) has used a slogan to explain their concept of differentiated staffing from the educator's viewpoint. It is: "Better Use on a Professional Career-Ladder." In written descriptive materials developed in that district appeared the following: "For the Student, the New Staffing Pattern Means Many Things . . .

It means that he comes into contact with different kinds of teachers and adults having particular knowledge and experience to share.

It means that certificated teachers are more available for individual instruction and guidance, because they are not robbed
of valuable time to attend to chores which can be ably performed by auxiliary personnel on a more economical basis.

It means that he has professionally minded teachers who are constantly striving — with specialized guidance — to improve themselves as teachers.

It means that the walls of the “classroom” are ever opening into the community . . . widening the scope of relevant learning . . . and welcoming into the classroom more of the “real” world outside. (59)

In the material received from the Florida State Department of Education, differentiated staffing is defined as “. . . providing children with the best possible education by using the talents, interests, and professional ambitions of each member of a school staff in an effective, productive and satisfying manner.” (39:3)

A staffing plan is like all other concepts; in order to maintain relevancy it must always be in the act of becoming. Differentiated staffing is trying on “seven-league boots.” It is not going out and buying up something prefabricated on the market. It is, rather, the concrete manifestation of developing a systematic yet spontaneous method of releasing the intellectual and creative potential of a teaching staff. In a way, it is a form of self-actualization from the school system’s point of view. It is tapping and discovering new vistas of human dynamics within a school district. As such, each new district must go through the process. The “boots” must be custom-made. The boldness of a model is not so much of an external environmental constraint, but in the dreams of the eyes of the proposers. (14:119)

In 1972, Allen and Kline had some interesting comments to make about differentiated staffing — interesting because the idea was Allen’s in the beginning:

There is no such thing as differentiated staffing. That is, there is no single, tangible, recordable model that encompasses and exhausts what is potential within the concept, just as there is no
single act, at once exclusive and comprehensive, that exhaustively represents "love." The notion of differentiated staffing offers a frame of reference, a habit of mind, a nontraditional perspective, a rationale, perhaps even a process, by which a great number of specific patterns or models or practices may be devised, justified and evaluated. It is a broad notion, abstract and fundamental, and upsetting, the acceptance and extensive application of which make a number of role descriptions, behaviors and staffing patterns liable to change from the traditional — often drastically. It aims most directly at optimum release of discriminate human and professional potential toward the long-accepted educational ideal of providing as many steps toward high-quality individualized learning for as many students in our schools as possible. (1:15)

Perhaps Peter B. Mann has defined differentiated staffing the best in layman's terms. He says, "Differentiated staffing, then, is a division of teacher labor to fit student requirements; a restructuring of school ties, space and staffing patterns so that the focus is no longer on teaching but on learning, no longer on the teacher but on the student, no longer on the group but on the individual." (51:5)

**Important Considerations Before Embracing Differentiated Staffing**

Clark has pointed out that "any attempt simply to differentiate teaching roles without involving a differentiation among administrative roles will be doomed to failure from the beginning. This failure is inevitable because of the need within differentiated staffing to eliminate the prevailing worker-manager mentality which often separates teachers from administrators. The successful differentiation of staffing patterns within education will, of necessity, involve all the instructional, administrative and service roles within a school system." (3:100)

Allen and Kline further emphasized that, "Trying to differentiate the assignment and remuneration of school staff members without systematic concurrent changes in scheduling and curriculum on a wide scale is an experience in frustration." (1:14)
Rand and English wrote, “The board and staff should be thought of as members of the same team rather than opposite forces with the administration in the middle.” (13:109) Eve and Peck stated, “Perhaps leadership positions within a differentiated staffing pattern should be filled by educational statesmen who view themselves as amateur administrators.” (6:95) “The concern of the leadership team should be on where it is going, not on where it is now.” (13:109) The various members of the team — superintendent, principals, teachers, and auxiliary staff — all must have certain qualities in common, but each has individual responsibilities, personalities, and abilities that must be taken into consideration as they decide where they are going.

Very important is the concept the superintendent has of himself, since he is in the pivotal position when a change is being considered. “The superintendent must first be aware of himself, his strengths and weaknesses. He must measure his own desires for power, status and ego satisfaction.” (13:110) The principal in a differentiated staffing organization should be trained in systems design and group dynamics. He or she should be one who realizes how important leadership style is, as well as recognizing the demands of the situation. (13:110)

Rand and English acknowledged the importance of the teacher when they made the following statement:

If teachers are going to be receptive to the idea of differentiated staffing they... must be provided the opportunity to get out and see organizational and curriculum innovations. Visibility should go directly to the teacher, for the reward of recognition capitalizes upon powerful intrinsic motivators which exist in all of us. This kind of backup to the classroom teacher, available without having to buck the endless channels of red tape, reinforces the innovative teacher immediately. (13:110)

Rand and English made the observation that, “In the case of the public, it is almost inevitable that personalities become attached to issues, and issues rejected because certain personalities become associated with anxiety and change.
In that case, sometimes employing other personnel as advocates assuages citizens and issues regain a more normal perspective.” (13:112)

“Both the board and the community must anticipate the many manifestations of anxiety during transition periods or peak-load periods for the professional staff. Ambiguity will be a problem.” (13:112) Not hearing what the staff and the public are really saying can become troublesome for the administration and the board of education. Assessing “cold” data is relatively easy and may be satisfying, but listening to and hearing the “hot” data may be a better indication of success or failure of any venture; certainly, this is true with differentiated staffing.

Educators seeking new answers to perennial problems such as more effective utilization of staff should remember that their programs will seldom be reported to the consumer as they hope unless they take special pains to clarify goals to news media in understandable terms and assure a broad acceptability of the reported goals through participating management. (10:72)

English stated that, “The attitudinal feeling level, interpersonal and intergroup conflict, divided loyalties, communication distortion and other kinds of ‘people’ problems may be far more important to recognize and deal with than those rather easily discriminative marks between models.” (5:37)

The morale of staff members, especially those who had seniority and were not selected for a position they wanted or did not apply for any of the upper classifications and therefore lost their status, can be a very serious problem. This appears to be an inevitable byproduct of any hierarchy. However, if the advanced positions are regarded as ones of service rather than as supervisory ones, there will likely be a more ready acceptance of the position, as well as of the person filling the position.

Differentiated staffing will likely be perceived as either “distributive” or “integrative” by the staff and perhaps by the community. A distributive dominant behavioral mode of organization is one in which “individual behavior is
aimed primarily at pursuing personal goals and where secrecy, manipulation and subgroup hostility appear as a result of 'win or lose' strategy governing day-to-day operations.” In this kind of organization, “differentiated staffing will be viewed as a vehicle to perpetuate existing problems.” (13:107-108)

In an organization in which the primary mode of behavior is integrative, “individual behavior is characterized by a high degree of collaboration in mutual problem-solving situations, and where trust and openness are prevalent,” the people will tend to view “differentiated staffing as a vehicle for improving the profession. It will be seen as encouraging greater teacher creativity and actually drawing into teaching certain persons whom we cannot either attract or retain very long.” (13:108)

Rand and English pointed out that not all the answers have to be known before something is tried, but in the case of differentiated staffing, English stated that, “Without the presence of clear and measurable objectives, differentiated staffing may be an irrelevant solution looking for a problem.” (5:38)

Many teachers have become disenchanted with inservice education programs, but all schools trying out differentiation have found that:

An inservice education program which is integrated into the instructional task of the school is essential to the success of any differentiated staffing, and the removal of the school administrator from his fountain-of-knowledge position as dispenser of inservice education is a vital prerequisite to the development of such a successful inservice education program. Considering the potential erosion of the administrative power base, it will then not be surprising if many administrators view an impending change in inservice control as a serious threat to their leadership position. (3:98)

One of the key ingredients of differentiated staffing is the part the certificated staff must take; that part has many aspects. One of these aspects is active participation as reported in the CTA Journal. “Advocates of staff differentiation
and those who view it dimly both agree: Teacher participation in studying the idea and putting a program into effect is ESSENTIAL for it to be workable.” (34:42)

Fiorino emphasized that “the need for adequate preparation prior to the adoption of differentiated staffing cannot be overemphasized. The fact that every facet of the educational process within a school district will be affected demands that diligent, comprehensive, and systematic planning must precede the implementation of any FIO (Flexible Instructional Organization) model.” (7:X1)

Another significant consideration is that of evaluation. If it is to be meaningful, evaluation must be based upon objectives which have been clearly defined.

Unless expectations from an innovation are specified in advance, the effectiveness of the program cannot be determined. The ultimate long-range objective is the improvement of learning for the individual student. It is unlikely that significant change in learning can be demonstrated and attributed to differentiated staffing in one or two years. However, long-range evaluation must be based upon a comparison with pre-innovation achievement. Thus, baseline data should be collected when the program is begun. (7:101-102)

Different kinds of evaluation may proceed simultaneously, but not necessarily at the same rate nor for the same length of time. “Whatever mechanism or instruments are used, they should uncover weaknesses of the program in time to make adjustments. Process evaluation is perhaps the most important part of a training project in differentiated staffing.” (16:62)

Evaluation of the program must continue all the time at each site because each program is different from another in many respects; and there is no data bank of empirical research yet, to which one can refer because of the newness of the concept of differentiated staffing. At the same time that the program is being evaluated, the staff and the students must be evaluated.

“Teachers will also have to assume regulation of the profession through evaluation of colleagues, a privilege highly prized and guarded by many other
professions.” (34:44) However, many certificated personnel fear evaluation by their peers. Lewis proposed that, “In a differentiated staffing structure, a team evaluation is made possible which avoids unilateral decisions and allows the teaching staff to review and make continuing appraisals of the strengths and weaknesses of its own members, according to the behavioral objectives.” (9:176)

Jerome Harris, a member of a board of education, wrote in the journal School Management: “As part of this differentiation of role and salary, a new set of quantitative and qualitative criteria must be used to evaluate how much each teacher, at each level, is really worth.” (25:6) The problem is essentially how much is to be paid for each position on the career ladder. Generally, the salary of the highest category is double the salary of the lowest category in the professional hierarchy.

In a differentiated-staffed school, the teachers would be permitted input in developing the criteria to be used in evaluating the staff. It is possible to extend the term “teacher” in differentiated staffing to include administrators because they are certificated and in some models do teach, so that they may come under the same evaluative process as the other certificated personnel.

Who evaluates what the pupils are accomplishing? Many advocates of differentiated staffing suggest that aides be given the task of checking papers. The Firesters have a comment to make about such a procedure:

The notion that teacher aides, for instance instead of teachers, should grade papers is inconsistent with the purposes of evaluation. No quantity of test scores can provide a teacher with the understanding of just what learning difficulties are being encountered by his students. Two pupils with identical grades may be having two very different learning problems, and only by performing this vital evaluation function himself can the teacher effectively fulfill his teaching responsibilities. (24:26)

However, it must be remembered that papers are only one means of evaluation. In fact, Fiorino has insisted that checking papers is measurement — not evaluation. He stated, “The process of evaluation begins when measurement ends.”
Evaluation utilizes the information derived from the measurement process as well as from such other sources as self-rating scales, questionnaires, direct observation, and interviews, to make a value judgment or decision.” (7:192)

Another serious consideration when planning differentiated staffing is that the model remain flexible. Each district has found it necessary to make modifications of their particular models each year so rigidity of the plan must be guarded against, and yet when the plan has become acceptable because of the compromises agreed upon, it automatically has considerable built-in rigidity.

One of the real dangers involved with differentiated staffing is that of over-specialization by the staff. However, this need not happen if careful planning of the program for professional growth is done and assignments are not repeated exactly year after year. Also, let no one think that less administrative decisions will need to be made; in fact, probably more will be made but with a difference — staff will be in on the decision making. Another aspect to consider is that too much time can be consumed for planning and coordination. Adequate study and planning before implementation can help alleviate that situation. Fiorino assures one that “time spent in planning and coordination should significantly contribute to quality of teaching.” (7:11)

There is also the problem of buildings. Are more needed? If so, what kind? Can the existing ones be adapted to fit the needs of the program under consideration? MONEY is another factor which must be considered. Lewis stated that, “Defraying the cost for differentiating the teaching staff can be a reality if the administrative staff and the Planning Committee make a concentrated effort to plan carefully, and to utilize all of the available resources which are at its disposal. However, there will be transitional costs for the implementation of differentiated staffing. These will come under the heading of planning, developing, and implementing the differentiated teaching pattern.” (9:212)

Funds may be secured from private grants, bond issues, private donation, and sometimes government agencies, but Dempsey has cautioned, “One thing is
clear: the changes advocated will have to be accomplished at little additional cost to the public.” (4:205)

Lewis suggested that: “Most important of all, perhaps, is the fact that a conscientious, careful, and knowledgeable Planning Committee can contribute much to defraying the costs of implementing the differentiated staffing structure by skillfully insuring that maximal benefits are obtained from each dollar invested in the program.” (9:212)

Another consideration that is very important is to recognize that “Inherent in any differentiated staff is the use of auxiliary personnel, sometimes called paraprofessionals since their work is alongside of, or parallel to, the work of the professionals.” (10:69)

A paraprofessional may be a person who is attending college classes to become a teacher; a person with some academic training, or a person in the community with particular skills that the “regular” teacher does not have. Other auxiliary personnel may be aides — mothers, fathers, or others in the community with no specialized training, but who are interested in helping. Each district must make some basic decisions about using these persons. It must be remembered, however, that:

To hold that auxiliary personnel are noninstructional is to make a distinction that cannot be maintained, for if we accept the broad definition of teaching as an interpersonal influence to alter student behavior, even the aide who puts the blocks away can alter the behavior of the child in the room. When an aide is used to distract a disruptive child, she may be more of a teacher-counselor than the professional cares to acknowledge. (10:70)

It is wise to remember that, “The paraprofessional’s voice will be the community’s voice, and it may or may not harmonize with professional judgment.” (10:71)

Consider the following statement: “A university can develop a well-educated person . . . yet it cannot provide the beginning teacher with careful, on-the-job
introduction into the many roles of the teacher.” (51:81) Great things surely would come about if the colleges, universities, and school districts developed mutually helpful programs.

Many potential problem areas have been discussed, including: differentiation of all personnel, not just teachers, with appropriate remuneration differentiation; team approach including the board of education, written goals and objectives; flexible scheduling; shared decision making; long-term planning and inservice training; model development and flexibility; staff morale; evaluations; perception by and involvement of community; use of paraprofessionals; overspecialization; adequacy of buildings; money; and possible cooperation between local schools and higher educational institutions. All of these potential problem areas are important and have been dealt with more or less by each staff involved. However, probably the chief barrier to successful implementation of staff differentiation is the one cited by the coordinator of The Division of Press, Radio, and Television Relations of the National Education Association: “The greatest barrier to staff differentiation is not physical or financial, according to many staff differentiation experimenters, but our own previous conditioning to the organizational structure which blocks our vision to perceiving problems and solutions.” (34:42)
Chapter 3

PROCEDURES AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

Procedures Used

In 1971, when the writer began collecting literature about differentiated staffing, a personal visit was made to Temple City, California, for the purposes of interviewing school personnel and observing operation of differentiated staffing in the Temple City school district.

Michael Stover, Administrative Officer for differentiated staffing at that time, was gracious and helpful. La Rosa Primary School was visited. The principal, Mr. Taylor, was liberal with his time and permitted the writer to visit any rooms she desired.

Each school district in this study was contacted by letter to secure information about differentiated staffing in their respective districts. Printed materials of many kinds were sent by each district or school area. In the spring of 1973, each area was contacted again by letter and asked for current materials and for their perception of the effectiveness or lack of the differentiated staffing in their districts and their future plans for their schools. In July 1974, the writer talked by telephone to an administrator in each district except Florida. In Florida, the conversation was with Marshall Frinks in the Curriculum Department of the Florida State Department of Education. As a result of studying the materials and of the visit to Temple City in 1971, it was decided to proceed with writing the project.

Data Obtained From Five Selected School Districts Which Have Used Differentiated Staffing

Late in 1965, Temple City Unified School District decided to embark on a study of the possibilities of differentiated staffing using the ideas Dwight Allen, John Rand, and Fenwick English had been discussing. It became the business manager's job to provide answers to such questions as:

1. Is the district financially able to plan and implement differentiated staffing or will outside funding be necessary?
2. If outside money is needed, how shall it be obtained?

3. Can the district, after a period of time, support regular operations from its own budget?

As in each of the other districts, it was determined that outside money would be necessary. Planning costs were underwritten primarily by a grant of $40,720 from the Kettering Foundation. The Education Professions Development Act of 1967 supplied $450,000. This was used for the major one-time expense of training staff, both professional and noncertificated. Changes of the physical plant, including the installation of a Library Instructional Media Center at each school and modifications at the high school, were provided by proceeds from a $4 million bond issue.

In 1971, it was believed that by the end of the five-year period (1972-1973) when the Education Professions Development Act federal grant would no longer be available, Temple City would be able to support differentiation from its own budget.

In the Beaverton (Oregon) schools, the project period began in 1968 and is to continue through 1974. Actual implementation began in the school year 1970-1971. Prior to that time, intensive planning was done by all levels of the educational hierarchy, and new buildings were constructed using new architectural designs for schools such as open classrooms, media centers, and library facilities at the school site. Beaverton was fortunate to be able to design some of their buildings with differentiated staffing in mind, because they had to build buildings to accommodate the rapid expansion of their population. Almost all of the other districts had to modify plants. Beaverton applied for federal monies from the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 to carry out the years of study and planning. A necessary commitment also was the compliance with Title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Cherry Creek School District, part of metropolitan Denver, did not exist until 1951. From then until 1965, it was similar to other school districts in an above-average socioeconomic suburb. In 1965 it embarked upon a program for bringing about educational change in a planned and orderly way under the able leadership of the new superintendent, Dr. Edward C. Pino.

Funds were granted to Cherry Creek schools by the Kettering Foundation of Dayton, Ohio, for study of the possibilities for change — differentiated staff included.
Some of the money was used for teachers to travel to observe other districts involved in various kinds of innovation, especially differentiated staffing. Study of their own district and its needs and interpreting those needs and possible changes to the community required some of the money. Inservice training for the teachers when a far-reaching, comprehensive change is proposed means considerable funds are needed. Later, money came from the Education Professions Development Act. Actual implementation began in September 1969.

The history of the differentiation program in Williamsville, New York, is shown quite concisely in the following outline found in that school district's literature:

1961  Beginning of the Team Concept
1966  Introduction of Unit-Allocation Flexibility
1967  E.P.D.A. program started
1968  Team Leader Plan initiated
1969  Williamsville Teachers Association Differentiated Staffing Committee formed
1970  Advisory Committee reorganized
1970  Director of Differentiated Staff position created
1970  Differentiated Staffing Planning Committee formed to develop a "model." (60:15)

Just ten years after the Williamsville schools began to utilize the team concept, differentiation in staff, roles, and compensation were a reality.

In Florida, the situation was somewhat different from the others. The teachers chose to emphasize a need for some changes by striking in 1968. The State Department of Education perceived that this was no localized phenomena, therefore the department "began a full-scale investigation and research into the area of differentiated staffing" . . . After much study over a lengthy period of time, the Florida legislature directed the State Department of Education to "develop and operate model projects of flexible staff organization." (53:10)

Florida established the first statewide study program in the United States. However, only three counties were involved in the project by 1972. One area chosen was
Sarasota County with seven of the twenty-six schools in the city of Sarasota being involved — some completely and some only partially using differentiated staffing.

Another county involved was Leon, in which the city of Tallahassee is located. One particular high school in Tallahassee was selected for the project because innovation had not been popular in it. Personnel of that high school have proceeded slowly and did much intensive planning before actually embarking on a differentiated staffing program.

The third pilot project was in Dade County, in which the city of Miami started with two schools using differentiated staffing plans. One was a newly built high school and the other was the Norwood Elementary School. In the Norwood School, when it was discovered that only half as many teachers would be needed, the teachers directed the principal to choose the teachers who would stay and the others would then be transferred. “This dedication has been a prime ingredient in the success of the Miami project.” (53:13)

Florida availed herself of federal financing through the Education Professions Development Act of 1967.

The implementation of differentiated staffing in each of the school districts chosen for this paper had several similarities:

1. The original plans (with Florida the exception) began to develop about midway into the 60’s.
2. All used federal funds and several of them also had Kettering Foundation grants.
3. All of the models were based on some kind of cooperative teaching and all used paraprofessionals or volunteer aides or both.
4. All of the schools had a division of the staff into several categories with many, if not all, the certificated personnel having some teaching assignments.
5. The salary paid was based primarily on the role a particular person had in the differentiated staff pattern. His teaching experience and his formal education were of secondary consideration.
6. Generally, it took about two years of planning and training of personnel before the actual change in staffing patterns became a reality.
Because Temple City was the first district to try this approach to education, many others have used Temple City’s plan (see page 27) as a starting point, but each has found that adaptations have been necessary. Today there is considerable variety in the different localities. Also, it has been discovered that flexibility must be built into the plans or change within cannot be accomplished smoothly, if at all. After much study and discussion by the staff and community committees, it became apparent to Temple City personnel that there needed to be some method of deriving valid criteria to measure both the products and processes of the problem-solving model. A Product and Process Model was created for this purpose. It had the following seven steps:

1.0 Make Needs Assessments
2.0 Identify District Educational Goals
3.0 Determine Learner Objectives
4.0 Determine Program Structure
5.0 Determine Support Systems
6.0 Establish Implementation Plan
7.0 Establish Evaluative Process

Interestingly, after the Temple City school personnel had developed the Product and Process Model, they discovered that there was one very important prestep they hadn’t taken. They realized they hadn’t arrived at a decision as to their basic philosophy about man and his education. In the words of Rand, “It is necessary for a philosophical reconciliation to be made before needs assessment is initiated. The reconciliation has three elements: the nature of man, the nature of knowledge, and the nature of the learner.”

Obviously, it is necessary to determine what one perceives as needs before one can decide what knowledge to impart and how to do it. Rand further stated, “Knowledge can be perceived as either ends and thereby fixed or as means and thereby ever changing. Curriculum is written once and never changed or curriculum is constantly revised and replaced. Educators must reconcile which school they are in, the fixed knowledge or changing knowledge camp. . . . It would appear that differentiated staffing would not flourish in the former or fixed knowledge concept, but rather that: “Collaboration, not control, is the operative factor in this philosophy.”
### Educational Planning Model

**Temple City, California**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Identify District Educational Goals</td>
<td>Determine Learner Objectives</td>
<td>Determine Program Structure</td>
<td>Determine Support Systems</td>
<td>Establish Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Establish Evaluative Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Societal Needs</td>
<td>Reconcile Immediate and Future Needs</td>
<td>Establish Student Target Population Objectives</td>
<td>Determine Program Areas</td>
<td>Determine Media Needs</td>
<td>Identify Constraints</td>
<td>Design Annual Educational Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Learner Needs</td>
<td>Reconcile Local Variables</td>
<td>Establish School-Community Indices of Accomplishment</td>
<td>Match/Mismatch With Existing Programs</td>
<td>Determine Instr. Adm. Needs</td>
<td>Design Management Control System</td>
<td>Develop Measurement Design and Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>const</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Staff Needs</td>
<td>Establish School-Community Priorities</td>
<td>Relate Outcomes to Specific Areas</td>
<td>Determine Area Offerings</td>
<td>Determine Pupil Service Needs</td>
<td>Train Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate Offerings With Learner Objectives</td>
<td>Determine General Support Needs</td>
<td>Design Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Community Service Needs</td>
<td>Implement Facilities Equipment and Staffing Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Temple City School District has changed its model several times. In 1965-1966, Model I had four categories for certificated personnel and one for paraprofessionals. In 1967-1968, the teachers changed the model to provide for five categories of certificated personnel and one for paraprofessionals. Model III was established for 1969-1971 in which there were four categories for certificated teachers (not including principals) and three support levels. In 1971-1972, they reverted to a five-level teacher hierarchy. (See model on page 30.)

By the use of the preceding examples, the writer is emphasizing that the model can be flexible and also pointing out that there is a need for changes. Mr. Schmidt, a principal in Temple City, reported that at present (1974) Temple City does not have the position of Master Teacher filled because of the lack of funds. However, all six schools still are involved with differentiated staffing. The high school, the junior high school, and the school with grades four to six use modular scheduling. In the two schools which house grades kindergarten through six, the children move at specified intervals from one area to another, not necessarily as a group. Instructors usually remain in the same location for a longer period of time. La Rose Primary School (kindergarten through third grade) is in the California Early Childhood Program.

The Temple City Unified School District has been able to continue with differentiated staffing with all these various kinds of structure, primarily because it has worked for them and their paraprofessional help have made it possible. At the end of the school year 1973-1974, the school district had seventeen cooperative teachers called “interns” from State Polytechnic University, Pomona, who worked in the schools five hours a day. Three hours a day were counted as student teaching for credit from the University, and for the other two hours a day the “interns” were paid at the rate of 2/5 of a beginning teacher’s salary.

Distinctive features of the Temple City Unified School District’s plans include: flexible use of time and space; collegial evaluation processes; diffused decision making; curriculum renewal; teacher involvement in selection of personnel; evaluation committees; utilization of paraprofessionals; performance criteria for teacher evaluation; behavioralizing the curriculum; systematic approach to change; clinical laboratory for preservice training; inservice training programs; leadership development
Temple City Unified School District
A Model of Differentiated Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONE-YEAR APPOINTMENT</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>NONTENURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teacher</td>
<td>Staff Teacher</td>
<td>Master Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B. and California</td>
<td>B.A. Degree and</td>
<td>Doctorate or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>California Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 100% Teaching Responsibilities
- 10 months
- $7,365 - 10,177

- 100% Teaching Responsibilities
- 10 months
- $8,590 - 14,882

- 3/5 Staff Teaching Responsibilities
- 10 months
- $8,590 - 14,882 + $1,300 stipend*
- 12 months
- $19,000 - 25,000

- 2/5 Staff Teaching Responsibilities

Instructional Aides: $4,650 - 5,650
Clerks: $4,650 - 5,650

*Original model included 11 months' employment and salary range of 11/12 of principal's salary. Budget conditions as a result of rate of teacher turnover and state income prohibit adoption of full schedule at the present time.
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program; summer curriculum development; career ladder; and redefinition of administrative roles.

In Beaverton, Oregon, during the school year 1970-1971, differentiated staffing was implemented in three of the district's schools: Cooper Mountain Grade School, Mountain View Junior High School, and Aloha High School.

Cooper Mountain School had a certificated staff of twenty-two teachers and twelve assistant teachers (not certificated). This provided a ratio of one adult to 14.4 students. Mountain View's ratio of adults to students was 1:13.9 with thirty-six certificated personnel and fifteen assistants. In Aloha High School, there were 51.3 full-time certificated persons and seven half-time assistants. The ratio of adults to students was 1:18.1.

The faculty of each school developed a set of recommended job descriptions for the staff of that particular school. Each job description detailed: name of position, tenured or nontenured, duties, skill and training required, salary range, and period of employment. The recommendations were processed according to the diagram shown below: (54:1)
The process through which an idea goes before it is accepted or rejected is shown on the flow chart on page 33. It is interesting to note that any member of the educational group may present an idea to the team or area group, at which time it may be accepted, rejected, or modified. If it is rejected or modified, it is returned to the originator. If it is accepted, it is sent to the total faculty for consideration. At each level, it may be accepted, rejected, or modified. When the principal receives it, he has a choice of returning the idea to either the total faculty or to the team if he wishes to reject or modify it. However, the district office personnel involved with the idea can return it only to the principal. For an idea to be acceptable and passed on, it must pass with a two-thirds majority or have 90-percent consensus before it goes to the next group for consideration.

On the next page (34) is a copy of the Responsibility and Accountability Chart of Mountain View Junior High School. It shows shared decision-making responsibility, reflecting the fact that the accountability is shared. There are relatively few people directly responsible to the principal — three, to be exact. The instructional coordinator appears to have much responsibility, and there are many other positions of lesser responsibility with everyone being accountable to someone.

The staff of Mountain View School did not consider its recommendations to be the final answer, but rather they recognized that “experience and periodic evaluation will lead us to possible alteration and change.” (54:1) In Beaverton’s Mountain View School, the plan is for the principal to participate in the instructional program approximately ten hours a week and all other certificated personnel to be intimately involved with students, generally in an instructional capacity. The elementary school and the high school faculties developed similar charts with the necessary deviations because of the differences in the kinds of curriculum needs and the ages of the students involved. Mountain View Junior High School has gained state, national, and international attention because it has been able to maintain its differentiated staffing program for one year beyond the time governmental funding stopped. In 1974, five junior high schools and ten or more elementary schools were still participating in differentiated staffing to varying degrees. The high school dropped out of the formal program after two years.
FLOW CHART FOR IDEAS

Mountain View School
Beaverton, Oregon

Policy: 90% consensus
Procedure: 2/3 majority
Each principal is allocated money for the program at his school; therefore, each school tends to operate differently. The master teacher position presents a problem economically and professionally. Some schools use many assistants, some not very many. Beaverton is one of those fortunate areas that has access to many people attending colleges who serve as assistants in the classroom. Also, they have many other kinds of professional people: craftsmen, artisans, and people with other special skills from which to draw.

The Cherry Creek Schools in Englewood, Colorado, have refined and changed their models of differentiated staffing several times. Before embarking on a program of such magnitude, a committee spent five months in 1968-1969 reading about differentiated staffing, visiting other sites, and assessing the value of such a program for Cherry Creek. The thrust of the committee's report was that, "Total involvement of all segments of the education community — staff, administration, the Board of Education and patrons — is not merely desirable, but essential." (57:2) Pino, Superintendent of the Cherry Creek Schools, gave the staff the "go-ahead" sign for developing differentiation. He imposed only two constraints: "Any model to be approved must be endorsed in writing by all building staff members affected and any model adopted could cost no more money." (57:2)

In September 1968, a unique program was implemented that had been developed over a two-year period with the University of Colorado. This program consisted of a work-training period of five years which the student entered after his second year of college. At the end of his five years, it was possible for him to have his M.A. from the University and to also be tenured by a joint Cherry Creek/University of Colorado Tenure Board. During his five years, he would have proceeded through the following positions: Instructional Assistant, Intern, Junior Resident, and Senior Resident. He would also have been paid about $20,000.

Cherry Creek emphasizes the systems approach to staffing, and requires that all aspects of a program must be differentiated.
For a program to be differentiated, the following must be present:

Same
dollar resources must be differentiated.
Roles to be performed must be differentiated.
Trainer and trainee roles must be differentiated.
Professional and nonprofessional roles must be differentiated.
Subject matter and methodological competencies must be differentiated. (57:5)

As with the other districts, preservice and inservice training are essential in Cherry Creek. Team teaching is the basis of the cooperative teaching style in Cherry Creek schools. Assignment to a team organized for differentiated staffing is based on the following five criteria:

Willingness to be assigned (unanimous written commitment is required for all teacher teams desiring to organize on a differentiated basis)

Divergent yet complementary subject matter competencies

Compatibility with other team members

Team balance in matters of sex, age training, and experience. (57:7)

In the Williamsville (New York) school district, there are several kinds of teaching positions with specific requirements for each. The teaching staff is divided into three categories: apprentice teacher (has a B.A. and is certificated or has formalized plans for certification, but has never taught); new teacher (has a B.A. and is certificated or has formalized plans for certification, has had teaching experience, but is new to Williamsville); and teacher (has B.A., is certificated, and has had experience in Williamsville). Each of these teachers serves in four roles in relation to students: diagnostician, prescriber, presenter, coordinator. This is shown in the following diagram. (60:17)
Should five teachers decide to serve as a team with three of them having student teachers and one student being assigned to the entire group, it could be diagrammed as follows:
Teachers Cofunctioning Within a Group

Teacher A

Teacher B

Teacher C

Teacher D

Teacher E

ST = Student Teacher

TA = Teacher Aid or Assistant

(60:28)
In the diagram, each tricircle figure represents an individual teacher who has joined a group; however, the three circles representing each individual teacher are not equal in diameter because a teacher might be stronger in one role (shown as circle) than another. Thus, "Teacher A" is shown with one circle that is larger than the other two circles, representing in this case the fact that "Teacher A" is not only strongest in the presenting role, but also probably that he functions as presenter a greater percentage of the time than he might when not a member of the group.

"Teacher E" serves in the capacity as coordinator because that is his area of greatest strength. This is shown by the center area being larger than it is in the tricircles representing the four other teachers in his group. "The broken lines leading from one tricircle to another represent the working relationships not only between the teacher with a major coordinating role but also among all five teachers in the group." (60:21)

The coordinator has a dual role. He serves in the capacity of Personnel Teacher who initiates and facilitates professional growth of the people in his group individually and as a whole. Over a period of time, the coordinator has come to be called the team leader. It has worked out that the team leaders are second only to the building principal in importance in the differentiated plan. Of the 658.6 teaching units in Williamsville in 1972-1973, 55 percent of these units were team units. Of the seventy team leaders in 1972-1973, 85.7 percent of them had been team leaders two years and 71.4 percent had been team leaders three years or more.

Differentiation has met with a high degree of acceptance and cooperation on the part of the teachers and the community. All of the schools have differentiated staffing to varying degrees. They also have certain aspects in common: Each building has a senate composed of no more than 20 to 25 percent of the staff in that building. The building principal serves as chairman of the senate and has veto power. Each group must be represented in the senate. Released time during the school day usually is provided for the senate meetings at least once every two weeks. The building senate allocates building resources: staff, space, supplies, and budget.
The building administrator has no teaching assignment. He coordinates all the programs as established by the senate, develops the budget cooperatively with the staff, and is responsible for its administration. Only those teachers who wish to work in a team of differentiated staff do so and with no extra financial reimbursement nor lightening of the teaching load. The writer specifically asked about the use of paraprofessionals in Williamsville, because New York State is unionized and unions tend to disapprove of the use of paraprofessionals. In Williamsville, use of paraprofessionals is a "non-negotiable item."

As previously indicated, differentiated staffing in Florida was initiated by the State Department of Education and presentations were made by State Board of Education personnel to selected counties. (County lines in Florida are also the school district boundaries.) Sarasota and Dade counties were more receptive to the idea of differentiated staffing than was Leon County. During the inservice training, teachers discovered they didn't know how to write a curriculum for an individualized program, nor how to make it work after they had the tools. Sarasota was fortunate to secure the services of Fenwick English, who had been at Temple City prior to and during its schools' implementation of differentiated staffing. (Dr. Frinks gave Dr. English credit for making the program operative in Sarasota with less problems than existed in the other two areas.)

The implementation of differentiated staffing in Florida was not much different from the processes followed in the other localities in this report. These processes were: study; writing goals and objectives; informing the community of the possibilities and asking for their input; determining fund resources available and amount needed; considering necessary structure changes; devising career ladder with appropriate job descriptions — including the use of paraprofessionals and volunteers; and finally, actual implementation.

In the process of implementation, the staff was selected according to the applicant's ability to fulfill the requirements as stated in the job description, as well as the desire of the teacher. (Only those teachers participated who wished to do so.) The length of service and amount of education were secondary in the
establishment of salary in a career ladder arrangement. The amount of responsibility and work determined the position on the ladder and that, in turn, determined the salary one was paid.

Sarasota County's plan may be used as representative of what has and is (in 1974) taking place in Florida with differentiated staffing. Sarasota uses a plan designated as a "Systems Model" because it applies to each school in the district certain minimal specifications, salaries, and educational program. Beyond that, each school designs its own model to be applicable to the unique goals, needs, and philosophy of the individual school. Change is expected to be necessary and desirable, so flexibility is built into the model.

Staff members have different role names in nearly every school community, but they are always in a vertical hierarchy with the highest or greatest position, except the principal or principal-teacher, at the top. The hierarchy in the Sarasota schools is shown in the diagram on the following page.

Today (1974), several Sarasota schools are differentiated in a successful and sophisticated program.

Dade County started with two schools differentiated in September 1971. They were North Miami Beach Junior High School and Norwood Elementary School. Each of these schools is organized into "little schools." At Norwood, the "little schools" are preprimary (four-, five-, and six-year-olds); primary (six-, seven-, and eight-year-olds); junior (eight-, nine-, and ten-year-olds); senior (ten-, eleven-, and twelve-year-olds). The junior high school has approximately 2400 students organized into "little schools" with about 600 in each. Dade County had good press coverage and did two years of study before they tried implementation. Unfortunately, the success of the project depended too much on the personalities of people who have moved on to other areas. In 1974, Norwood Elementary still operates a differentiated model using team teaching as their basis of cooperative teaching. The junior high school is no longer in the program.

Leon County, Tallahassee particularly, tried differentiated staffing for only one year, after one year of less than whole-hearted study except by a few individuals.
The Total Vertical Hierarchy and Concomitant Positions in the Sarasota County School District's "System Model"
The community overreacted, according to Dr. Frinks (per telephone conversation with the writer). The University and the State Department were in agreement as to differentiated staffing's feasibility, but communication was inadequate with the board of education of the district and the community. The preliminary planning was not too well done, Dr. Frinks indicated.

What is the future of differentiated staffing? It is always risky to predict what will happen in the future. However, each administrator the writer talked with considered differentiation a practical way to help provide individualized instruction with the use of paraprofessionals and aides. Mr. Schmidt of Temple City expressed his belief that differentiation will remain a part of the Temple City Schools' program. It must be remembered, though, that no one works in the program unless he desires to do so, so there is a choice for both the parent (student) and staff to be in a structured, self-contained unit if that is their wish. Funds are somewhat of a problem, at present, and will probably continue to be so.

In Beaverton, Oregon, the question of continuing a differentiated program for the future appears to depend in some degree on the acceptance by the organized teacher groups. At the moment, there is some opposition to the use of paraprofessionals. The monetary demands are presenting a problem, too. When the district uses over 70 percent of its income for staff salaries, there are some problems that differentiated staffing has not solved.

Milton Schmidt, Director of Program Development and Instructional Services for the Cherry Creek Schools, reports that differentiated staffing is no longer a project for them, but an accepted way of going about the business of educating the children there. All of the Cherry Creek Schools are involved to some degree in differentiated staffing, and all the signs of the future point to "GO."

Williamsville (New York) considers its program good with community acceptance and involvement at a high level. All of the Williamsville schools are involved with differentiation to varying degrees and each has its own model subject to change from year to year. (Tom Link, with whom the writer conversed, is now a principal [in 1974], but was formerly the project director.) When the program is no longer
in the project stage, it appears that each school can go it alone because enough experience has been gained at the school site to carry on. Could it also be that there is not money for a project director's salary when the government funding stops?

Florida has an unusual opportunity to implement differentiated staffing by whatever name they choose to call it. Until the legislature passed a bill that became law in the school year 1973-1974, funding by the state was about 80 percent with many strings attached. However, the new law permits much more local autonomy and at the same time provides a new formula whereby the funds will be allocated. The law called the “Full-Time Equivalent Teacher Program” means that instead of using “average daily attendance” as a base for figuring funds, the position of the teacher will be of primary focus. It works like this: Every teaching position is allocated points; for example, a physical education teacher’s point value is 0.9, whereas a counselor’s point value is 1.5. The state funding will still be about the same, but the distribution may be considerably different. It remains for each district to decide what its staffing pattern will be.

Summary

Differentiated staffing has been presented as it has been used in Temple City School District, Temple City, California; Beaverton School District No. 48, Beaverton, Oregon; Cherry Creek School District, Englewood, Colorado; Williamsville Central School District, Williamsville, New York; and three county school systems in Florida: Dade, Sarasota, and Leon.

Temple City, as the first district which studied, planned for, and implemented differentiated staffing under that name, became the model for others to follow, with perhaps the exception of Williamsville, New York. (That district neither claimed nor disclaimed knowledge of Temple City's efforts.)

Each district discovered that although its ideas of differentiated staffing might be generally the same as others' ideas, each district still had to develop its own plans
and models suitable for its unique situation. However, all have found certain basic requirements are essential: for example, community knowledge and support are imperative; all parts of the total program must be differentiated (teachers, administrators, scheduling, curriculum); only those staff members who wish to participate need do so; written goals and objectives are required; and paraprofessionals and/or aides are a necessity.

Each district found it was nearly impossible, if not impossible, to implement differentiated staffing with all that implies without additional money above the usual budget. Those districts who could, built new buildings and others made modifications of existing plants to expedite individualization of instruction with cooperative teaching.

As of mid-1974, Temple City (California) plans to continue with differentiated staffing to the extent that its budget permits. Beaverton (Oregon) is optimistic about continuing its differentiated staffing program. Cherry Creek (Colorado) is continuing with differentiation to some degree in all of its schools. Williamsville (New York) plans to proceed with its plans and indicated no particular problems. In Florida, at present (mid-1974), Sarasota schools are the only ones involved to any great extent. Dade County has only one school participating at this time in a differentiated program. However, with the new law in Florida which gives the local district more autonomy in determining its own kind of staffing organization, it is hoped by officials in the State Department of Education that other counties will try differentiated staffing, although it will likely be called by some other name.
Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Melton, in his 1972-1973 report, stated, "The federal funding of differentiated staffing created a controversial and important innovative thrust in education. For four years, this concept has left its mark as a viable alternative in the pursuit of excellence in the teaching-learning process. Through the funding and impetus provided by the United States Office of Education, differentiated staffing has enjoyed a glamorous but stormy life." (52:1)

Originally thirty-five projects were funded. In May of 1971, only seventeen projects were funded, but the Florida project was divided into three parts so that actually nineteen populations were included. Each year a lesser number of schools received federal funding for several reasons. One reason was that the government cut back on funds for special kinds of programs in education; another reason was that some of the schools which had been funded previously did not wish to continue, so those schools did not write the necessary proposals; a third reason for this lack of funding is attributable to the fact that some of those who wrote proposals did not have their proposals accepted.

The amount of interest shown by other districts throughout the United States seems to be out of proportion to the number of schools involved in the funding by the United States Office of Education. Perhaps this indicates that society is ready for a change in education, and that differentiation might be a significant "means" for accomplishing some relevancy for today and the future. The tendency in the past has been to impose or superimpose some kind of special program on top of the existing program — that of one teacher to one class of thirty or more children in a specified room for five or six hours a day.

None of the proposed "change programs" heretofore has demanded so many changes as rapid and as comprehensive as has differentiated staffing. In fact, the
promise of advocates of differentiated staffing is that failure will be the reward if
the district does not accomplish the proposed changes simultaneously and include
all aspects of education. It must be remembered, however, that thorough advance
preparation is absolutely essential and that continuous internal evaluation must be
going on at all times, and periodic impartial external evaluations need to be done.

Any district considering implementation of differentiated staffing should be
cognizant of the following statement made by Melton, “Differentiated staffing has
offered one alternative for educational renewal. It is not, nor does it contend to
be, the panacea for all the ills of education.” (53:23) If a district is contemplat­
ing the development of a differentiated program, it should consider some of the
informal research which has been done. Williamsville Central School District (New
York) had several in-house research papers done by persons working on their doc­
toral dissertations. Some of the findings concerning team teaching versus self­
contained classrooms from the students' viewpoints are listed below:

- They liked it.
- They had more friends.
- They did more work.
- Their academic work showed improvement, but grades did not.
- Parents were better informed about their work.
- Students were able to identify with one teacher.

(47:25-26)

Also in Williamsville, evaluators made some interesting discoveries about
teachers in team versus nonteam situations. They were:

- Teachers demonstrated an increased and more efficient use of a
  variety of teaching materials and mechanical aids in teams. (47:28)
- Team teachers exhibited a more favorable attitude to varying
differences in pupils. (47:28)
- More time and emphasis can be spent working directly with
  students in a team-teaching situation. (47:28)
Another study done in Williamsville showed that at the primary level there was no significant difference in achievement scores between children in team-teaching situations and those in a self-contained classroom.

Petrie, a member of the Teacher Education Research Center of State University College of Fredonia, New York, conducted a study on student and teacher interaction in differentiated staffing teams and nonteaed classrooms. "Petrie concluded that children in nonteamed classes were involved in more information processing with adults, whereas children in differentiated classes were more adept at making choices." (47:31) Melton continued with the statement: "Concerning teacher behavior, Petrie concluded that although there was no significant difference between teamed and nonteamed classes concerning teacher diagnosing, teamed teachers engaged in more prescribing activity while nonteamed teachers engaged in more presenting activity." (47:31-32)

Before definitely deciding on differentiated staffing, school district personnel should consider other available findings. One such study was done in 1972-1973 by Melton. He surveyed all the districts which were government funded for differentiated staffing. A partial listing of his findings is:

- Ranking from 1 to 10 with number 1 being the severest on a scale of sixteen problems that would have not occurred or would have occurred to a lesser degree without D/S, the greatest problem was that of teacher fatigue with a rating of 2; staff rivalries, community misunderstanding, and fear fell between 2 and 3, turnover and transfer were 0. (52:16)

- Seventy-nine percent of the districts reporting indicated that goals and objectives were established for the learners. (52:22)

- Ninety-five of the districts developed goals and objectives for differentiated staffing. (52:25)

- Subjective judgment of the teachers was used in setting the objectives 63 percent of the time. (52:26)
Subjective judgment of the teachers or administrators was used in determining staffing assignments 52 percent of the time. (52:31)

Fifty-two percent of the placement assignments were made by the teachers. (52:34)

In 74 percent of the schools reporting, the models were designed by school site personnel. (52:41)

Fifty-eight percent of the schools found the most beneficial result to be increased teaching skills. (52:49)

In 63 percent of the cases, the most influential environmental factor that affected D/S was curriculum individualization, then came flexible scheduling with 58 percent. (52:52)

Differentiated staffing should be continued in districts that have found it, in their judgment, to advance education of the whole child. As soon as is practical for a particular district, within five years at the most, some kinds of research should be started that will establish empirical evidence as to the value or lack of value of differentiated staffing for today’s and tomorrow’s youth.

For those districts in which the school personnel believe that change is the answer to their educational problems, differentiated staffing is one possibility, but it should be undertaken only after much thorough study by all the people who are going to be involved in any way. The process cannot be rushed, and the success of the product will depend upon the commitment of a vast majority of the persons involved.
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