

BERT HOHOL,  
*Assistant Superintendent of  
 Pupil Personnel Services,  
 Edmonton Public School Board,  
 Edmonton, Alberta.*

## PROBLEMS IN THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SPECIALISTS IN PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

This paper assumes general agreement on the part of educators that pupil personnel services are altogether necessary in today's education. Such services can be offered only by specialists, for no one can know everything about everything. The Industrial Revolution brought with it the complexities of modern society including the need for specialization, a characteristic of western civilization that some regret but that is here to stay. Rosecrance and Hayden are most realistic when they state, "Instead of arguing the ultimate worth of specialization, it might be more useful to make sure that specialization has a firm, broad foundation (1960, p. 235)."

There is general agreement on the need for pupil personnel services. The Council for Chief State School Offices, Washington State, stresses their importance in the following statement on responsibilities of state departments of education.

To meet successfully the challenges that face us today—changing industrial needs and technology, growing urbanization, changing social patterns, the complexities of the international situation—education must advance, more rapidly than in the past, toward identifying and fully developing the capabilities of all people. Pupil personnel services can and do contribute to such development by helping each individual gain the insight needed for understanding himself, understanding and adjusting to society, and wisely choosing among educational, occupational, and avocational opportunities. By helping to develop our human resources, school personnel services help to strengthen the nation (Lowe, 1962, p. 9).

As society continues to increase the role of the school in helping children to grow socially and personally, pupil personnel services will expand their function of helping the home and the school to see that the child has the best possible opportunity to obtain the best education the school system can provide.

Holt speaks of the need to stimulate growth of pupil services because of factors both within and without the school. In-school factors may include:

1. The diversity and comprehensiveness of our school programs to meet the needs of all children.
2. Bringing together more children for better opportunities in education.
3. The increasing body of knowledge to be included in programs of instruction.
4. Recent gains in the holding power of our schools.
5. The widening range of pupil characteristics brought about by the enrollment of all children in our schools.

Factors in our society which affect the need for personnel services include:

1. Development in technology and automation in industry.
2. Increased mobility of population.
3. Growth of population.
4. Expanding urbanization, unemployed youth.
5. Juvenile delinquency.
6. Pressures for maximum utilization of our human resources.
7. Expanded knowledge in the social sciences which provides us with better resources to study and understand the human individual and how he functions (1964, p. 2).

Holt concludes that an organized program of pupil services is an absolute necessity in our schools.

In general, the services provided by pupil personnel specialists are the following:

1. The school health department, including school physicians, dentists, nurses, and dental hygienists.
2. Attendance and visiting teachers trained in social work.
3. Child study and psychological clinic, including psychologists, psychometrists, and psychiatrists.
4. Guidance and placement departments, including counselors and placement workers (Rosecrance & Hayden, 1960, p. 195).

Lowe, defining pupil personnel services as “. . . those professional services, other than classroom instruction, which are offered by the school to help pupils attain their maximum personal development, and further, to facilitate the efforts of parents and teachers in the guiding and teaching-learning process (1962, p. 13),” goes well beyond the four services suggested by Rosecrance and Hayden. Lowe provides for comprehensive pupil help through the following: pupil accounting service, health service, remedial education service, speech and hearing correction service, home-school social service, counseling service, parent education service, and research service.

This writer feels that the Lowe recommendation is courageous, realistic, and consistent with today's objectives for education. In fact, I include one area of instruction in pupil personnel and that is special education. The instruction of exceptional children, particularly the physically handicapped and the mentally retarded, is instruction outside of the regular classroom and thus is a “special service.” Secondly, it is assumed here that teachers of special education classes require specialized preparation for their work as do school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers, and remedial specialists.

The chief weakness of the services in most schools and/or school systems is the absence of coordination of the several services in pupil personnel. In too many school systems pupil personnel specialists are more or less independent, having no place in the organizational structure, except to report periodically to a senior official. Depending on the size of the school system, this official could hold any rank from that of supervisor to that of superintendent. The over-riding, if not the sole reason for an organizational unit for pupil personnel services in contrast to separate, independent services

such as school social work services, and school psychological services, is its coordinative function. It is this concept that Lowe stresses time and again, and upon which he develops his structure and models for the organization and administration of pupil personnel services. He writes:

The administrative unit, pupil personnel services, is unique in one regard: it seeks to coordinate the efforts of the several service specialists in bringing about more meaningful learning experiences for children. The assumption is that, because of the interrelated nature of the several services, to preclude unnecessary duplication and to increase efficiency, their coordination is essential. Both the parents and the teachers are of primary importance in implementing coordinated preventive, remedial, and corrective programs (1962, p. 11).

Lowe is here speaking of the team approach, the sole vehicle through which the best available knowledge of the various specialists can be brought to bear on the child's behalf. This does not just happen; it must be developed through coordination and the coordinator's major function is to maintain an effective balance between the concerns of the specialists and the over-all concerns of the school system. An important and related function is to develop and maintain an atmosphere in which each specialty feels equal to all other specialties in the eyes of the administration. The latter is at least as difficult a challenge, and infinitely a more sensitive problem for the coordinator than is the first one.

The functions of administration with respect to the services of specialists are still largely confused, with the result that far too many pupil personnel programs are spotty, semi-independent, leaderless, and often directionless operations. As in any other area of the school system's enterprises, there is a direct positive relationship between the extent and effectiveness of a pupil personnel program and the amount and quality of leadership it receives (Rosecrance & Hayden, 1960, p. 234).

Let us now briefly examine the role of the specialist, of the administrator of specialists, and the problems peculiar to the administrator of specialists.

Rosecrance and Hayden (p. 235) summarize the three general roles in which specialists in pupil personnel services perform: (1) educating teachers, (2) acting as consultants, and (3) handling cases directly. Studies have shown that after specialists have undertaken a program of education for teachers, the latter become more sensitive to problems and sometimes can prevent them from actually developing.

The role of consultant is exemplified by his helping a teacher who requests assistance with a boy who cannot read. The specialist may outline alternative plans for dealing with the problem; but, as Rosecrance points out, the initiative for action is in the hands of the teacher (1960, p. 236). Griffiths emphasizes the consulting role of the specialist when he states that there should always be someone in the organization to whom the teacher can turn with problems and who is not an evaluator.

In the third role, the specialist finds it necessary to take over the case himself because the problem is a deep-seated one and may need the combined efforts of several services.

In working with specialists, the school administrator has two kinds of problems (Griffiths, 1962, p. 193). First of all, the increase in services in-

matter here is the fact that the line officer is usually a generalist who carries out administrative acts.

Staff officers do not stand in direct line of upward and downward flow of authority. Griffiths divides them into three types on the basis of the functions which they perform: service, coordinative, or advisory (1962, p. 196). The service specialist, a staff officer, performs a function necessary to, but not a part of, the line operation. The school business administrator is an example. It is important to remember that he is a staff officer in relation to staff in other departments of the organization, but is a line officer in his own department. This relationship becomes important when it comes to departmental initiative in such responsibilities as personnel, programs, funds, and facilities. Also, it is not uncommon to look upon a staff function in the system as being a staff function in one's own department. When this happens, officials of one department might assign work and in other ways attempt to direct the work of staff members in another department. Pupil personnel services are particularly vulnerable to this error in procedure. For example, a supervisor of elementary instruction might require a pupil personnel worker to administer tests in a particular situation, instead of referring the request to the administrator of the pupil personnel services department.

Coordinative staff officers perform at what is generally referred to as the administrative cabinet level. Their function is to relieve the superintendent of many of the details of the school system operation. This position would call for a generalist strong in human relations and skilled at coordinating the many facets of the school system. Such a position might be that of the administrative assistant or assistant to the superintendent of schools. While he might do much work with the school principals in his coordinative role, he would have no line authority over them. This is a particularly viable position in a school system but one which is for the most part over-looked; we are far too committed to authority positions in the school superintendency team.

Advisory staff officers are specialists who provide expert assistance upon request. They have no power in the organizational structure; their authority lies in their expertise. Too often the real potential of expertise is subverted and thereby lessened when its consultative role is superseded by one which is more like a line role. This happens when, for example, remedial reading specialists are required to, or wish and attempt to, organize and supervise a remedial reading program for some portion of the school system.

This discussion of line and staff functions provides the basis for this writer's position that using the pupil personnel administrator (and for that matter, the instructional administrator) as a line officer is not in the best interests of a school system—a view supported by most of the experts.

However, many school systems do use such administrators—the supervisor of guidance, or, in the instructional department, the elementary supervisor—as line officers. Griffiths examines the case for this organizational structure and finds several reasons for it (1962, p. 197).

The first reason seems to be that many principals, particularly elementary school principals, have not the requisite training or experience for their work and should be supervised by someone who does. While the argument

volves scheduling difficulties. Pupils will have to miss classes, provision for space for pupil personnel activities must be made, and records must be maintained.

However, the major difficulty the administrator experiences is the evaluation of a program in which he does not have competence. The administrator cannot be expected to be competent in such specialties as psychological services and school dental services, yet he holds responsibility for those programs to be effective.

The limitations of specialists with whom the administrator must work constitute a problem which is human rather than technical.

The most serious limitation of the specialist is his inability to see his own specialization in the proper perspective of several specialties and in the objectives of the whole school (system). Human factors are important, too, and Lowe cautioned:

Each team member must come to terms with his own personal uncertainties, misgivings, jealousies, and ambitions. Each has his own system of values, his own vested interests in maintaining and strengthening his position, and his own concept of how best a program of pupil personnel should function (1962, p. 13).

Another limitation is the tendency of many specialists to identify with other specialists and to be unable to recognize the non-specialist. Griffiths illustrates this by suggesting that a music director is much more likely to be influenced by the recommendations of his state association in teaching matters than by officials of his own school system. In pupil personnel, a comparable situation exists when, for example, a remedial specialist derives his professional impetus from his training program and his professional organization rather than from the total school system.

Another limitation, of which a specialist could be altogether unaware, is that of confusing the importance of his knowledge with the significance of what he recommends. This could motivate a speech clinician, for example, to feel that the superintendent is standing in his way when the recommendation he makes is not accepted.

The specialist may resist ideas from outside his group. Griffiths says the English teacher who has some ideas on teaching mathematics is not likely to receive a very sympathetic hearing from teachers of mathematics; the school counselor's ideas on home visits may be resisted by the school social workers.

There are, then, some real problems which are inherent in the increase of specialist services in the school systems. It is these difficulties that make it so important to organize an administrative structure that would best resolve these problems and make decision-making on behalf of children the best possible.

One concept is paramount in any discussion of an administrative structure for specialists—and while the present concern is with pupil personnel specialists, it should be mentioned that the same principles apply to all such positions—the concept of line and staff organization.

In brief, line organization involves a direct flow of authority upward and downward. A line officer has power and authority over subordinates, thus providing a system of accountability in the hierarchy. An important

itself stands up, this is a problem of selection, rather than one of organizational structure.

The second and most convincing argument for making specialist supervisors line officials is based on expertness itself. The proposition that he who knows the most should have the say has a kind of easy appeal to common sense, but it is an over-simplification. Knowledge of something and capacity to administer it are not of necessity related. However, if we are agreed that the major purpose of supervisory staff is to bring about behavioral changes in other staff, the consensus of writers in the field is that this is best done by persons in staff, not line, positions.

The last argument relates to a position between the principal and the superintendent, such as director or assistant superintendent, to whom principals are responsible. In large school systems both positions are sometimes found in line authority, thereby placing even more distance between the two key positions of principal and superintendent. The rationale here is that the latter cannot supervise the principals, who must therefore report to an intermediate official. This position is supported by Urwick who says that "no more than six subordinates whose work interlocks should report to a single superior (Griffiths, p. 197)." While the basic issue here is the idea of interlocking work rather than the matter of number of subordinates, Urwick's contention was generally reduced to mean that no more than six people should report to one individual. Griffiths rightly states that the work of principals does not interlock and the superintendent could in fact supervise a larger number of principals than is usual. However, this writer thinks that once a school system has about fifteen schools, the school system requires line officers other than the superintendent in the central office.

However, while most school systems use instructional personnel as line administrators, the literature on school administration is generally agreed that these should be staff positions. Griffiths cites Elsbree and McNally, Bartky, Reeder, and Founce to support his own position on this matter (1962, pp. 198-99).

While the case for either line or staff is well made, I do not feel it is equally made. This paper therefore takes the clear position that if a major responsibility of instructional supervisors is to improve instruction, and that of pupil personnel services is to improve the children's capacity to use instruction to best advantage, both can be best carried out by staff and not line positions.

Griffiths drives home his point with a terse statement on the nature of the specialist's authority. "The staff officer derives his authority from his technical knowledge. His role is not to coerce, but to educate (1962, p. 199)." Operationally, this principle would recognize the line position of the school principal with whom the supervisor would work in a horizontal, that is, staff, relationship. It would also enable a consultative relationship with the teacher in which the teacher would not hesitate to turn to the supervisor for assistance.

In closing this discussion it is important to remind ourselves in the strongest terms that to define the specialist as a staff position is not to place the department of specialist services in a junior relationship to other depart-

ments in the organization. E. E. Holt, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Columbus, Ohio, makes a discerning case for placing the pupil personnel administrator at the level of other major advisors to the superintendent.

The pupil services administrator should be a member of the administrative staff on the same level with other major assistants of the superintendent of schools. Such an organizational structure promotes maximum coordination and communication with administration and instructional supervision at all levels. It facilitates the development of a functional and balanced program that integrates pupil services in a manner that is acceptable, effective, and in close harmony with the goals of the total school program (1964, p. 4).

It seems incontrovertible that unless these services are represented by an official who sits in joint deliberation with officials in instruction and administration, they will not develop on a "common front" with the others. To expect pupil personnel to provide an effective program of services to children, parents, and teachers—as well as to instruction and administration—without an equal voice in the affairs of the institution involved, seems to me to be somewhat less than efficacious administration.

#### REFERENCES

- Davis, F. G. *Pupil personnel services*. Scranton: International Texbook, 1948.  
 De Young, H. *American education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.  
 Griffiths, D. (Ed.) *Organizing schools for effective education*. Danville: Interstate Printers, 1962.  
 Holt, E. E. *The organization of pupil personnel services*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1964.  
 Lowe, R. *A rationale and models for organizing and administering programs of pupil personnel services*. Eugene: Bureau of Educational Research, 1962.  
 Rosecrance, F. C., & Hayden, V. D. *School guidance and personnel services*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1960.  
 Safford, G. *The organizational status of pupil personnel offered by Oregon's public schools*. Eugene: School Study Council, 1962.

#### L'ORGANISATION ET L'ADMINISTRATION DE SPECIALISTES EN "PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES"

BERT HOHOL

Ce document suppose de l'accord général des éducateurs que le "Pupil Personnel Services" rend des services entièrement nécessaires dans l'éducation d'aujourd'hui. L'intérêt principal est de présenter des méthodes pour l'organisation et l'administration des spécialistes dans ces services.

La structure et les modèles proposés sont développés suivant l'idée générale que la fonction co-ordonnatrice est la raison essentielle, sinon la seule raison d'une unité d'organisation pour le "Pupil Personnel Services" au lieu de services indépendants et séparés tels que les services sociaux et de psychologie de l'école. C'est à ce sujet que les services du "Pupil Personnel Services" sont uniques: ils visent à co-ordonner les efforts de nombreux

spécialistes rendant ainsi une instruction plus significative pour les enfants, en supposant que ces services sont en corrélation.

Ce document examine les relations et la hiérarchie concernant les spécialistes du "Pupil Personnel Services" et conclut que les services accomplis (service, co-ordination et conseil) sont ceux d'un officier administratif. Cela ne signifie pas, cependant, que les services des spécialistes se classent dans une situation inférieure aux autres services de l'organisation.

Il paraît incontestable que ces services ne se développeront pas de la même manière que l'instruction et l'administration à moins qu'ils soient représentés par un officier qui délibérerait avec les autres sur un pied d'égalité. Espérer que le "Pupil Personnel Services" fournisse un programme effectif de services aux enfants, parents, et professeurs . . . aussi bien qu'à l'instruction et à l'administration . . . sans avoir droit à une voix égale dans les affaires de l'institution évoquée, semblerait inefficace.