Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1985

An Analysis of Principals' Centers in the United States: Their Organization and Operation

Barbara W. Unikel
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

AN ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPALS' CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES:

THEIR ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

by

Barbara W. Unikel

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

May

1985

AN ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPALS' CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES:
THEIR ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

This study investigated the concept of the principals'
center as a resource for the professional growth of school
leaders and was accomplished through an analysis of the
organization and operation of thirty-four principals' centers
located in the United States in terms of the following re-
search questions: 1) For what purposes are principals'
centers organized? 2) How are principals' centers organized
for governance? 3) How are principals' centers funded?
4) How are the funds utilized? 5) What staffing patterns
are principals' centers utilizing? 6) Who are the participants
in the principals' centers? 7) What programs do the principals'
centers offer? 8) How are principals' centers evaluated for
effectiveness?

A questionnaire was sent to the directors of the
principals' centers identified for the study. To tabulate
the responses the items were categorized to answer the
research questions. Tables were formulated to summarize
the data and a narrative description of the findings was
written. The results of the data were analyzed by dis-
cussing the generalizations and patterns of the responses
and the implications of the results. Findings were also
discussed through a comparison of study results with re-
lated literature.

The results of the study indicated that there was no
standard model of a principals' center. There is only one
characteristic that appeared in all of the centers studied--
a stated purpose for organization. In all other areas examined
by the research questions each principals' center was defined
by its own unique characteristics.

A model of a principals' center was developed for
possible implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Max A. Bailey, director of her dissertation committee, for his continuous support and encouragement, not only throughout the preparation of this study, but also during her studies at Loyola University. In addition, the author wishes to express gratitude to Dr. Philip Carlin and to Dr. Elizabeth Hebert for their assistance as members of the dissertation committee.

For his interest, support and cooperation in this study, the author wishes to thank Dr. Roland Barth of the Harvard University Principals' Center.

For their patience, understanding and encouragement, the author is especially grateful to her husband, Alan, her daughter, Jodi and her son, Robert.

VITA

Barbara W. Unikel was born in Chicago, Illinois, November 5,
1942.

She received her elementary and secondary education in the public
schools of Chicago, Illinois, where she graduated from Senn High
School in June, 1960. She received the Bachelor of Education degree
from National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois in June, 1964,
and the Master of Education degree from National College of Education
in June, 1979.

She began her teaching career at the Rock Creek Palisades School
in Wheaton, Maryland in 1965. After raising a family and running a
family-owned manufacturing business, she resumed teaching in 1976 at
Willowbrook School in Northbrook, Illinois for three years. In
September, 1979, she became administrative assistant to the
Superintendent of Schools in Glenview School District 34, Glenview,
Illinois. In 1981 she became assistant principal at Springman Junior
High School, Glenview, Illinois, and the following year became
principal at South School in Glencoe, Illinois, the position she holds
currently.

The author is married to Alan L. Unikel and has two children, a
daughter, Jodi and a son, Robert.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Current studies (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) repeatedly emphasize that the principal is the critical person in school improvement, that building level leadership is the single most important variable in determining the success and effectiveness of the instructional program. It is the principal who sets the tone, implements a program, opens or closes a possibility (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). There seems to be agreement that with strong leadership by the principal, the school is likely to be effective; without capable leadership it is not (Mangers, 1978; Goldhammer, 1971).

Increasingly attention is shifting away from the central administration, the federal government and the states as the agencies most able to improve the local schools. The focus now is on the school site administrator, the principal, as the key to sustained, effective educational services.

Despite all of the agreement about the importance of school principals little help or support is available to assist principals to grow professionally. Principals, like other professionals, are capable of change, growth, and redirection.

> They welcome nurturance, attention, instruction, support and rewards. If most principals are ill-prepared for their roles when they begin principaling, they are even less equipped to assume leadership once they have learned to get by as good managers (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, p. 79).

1

There is increased awareness that the preservice and inservice training of principals has been inadequate. The universities and colleges have had a monopoly on the preservice training of principals. There are varying opinions as to the effectiveness of these programs. (Several recent studies will be examined in the next chapter.) Inservice education for principals has also, for the most part, been unresponsive to the needs of school leaders. Programs provided by state departments of education, universities and colleges, professional organizations and local school districts have fallen short of addressing the realities of the principalship and the needs and concerns of school leaders.

The teachers' center model offers a promising precedent for the professional growth of principals. It is a model in which practicing teachers take an active role in determining their professional training needs as well as providing a significant portion of that training (Bell & Peightel, 1976). The "grassroots" teachers' center and the humanistic psychology movement provide the philosophical premises that have influenced the establishment of principals' centers. There have been a number of studies relating to both of these topics. While these studies will be dealt with more specifically in the following chapter some general comments can be made regarding them. "Grassroots" teachers' centers operate under the assumptions that participants in professional growth programs must be actively involved in decision-making to solve their own problems. Their basic needs must be met before they will respond to higher order challenges. Participants benefit most from self-initiated,

self-directed programs which start from personal strengths and are sustained, recognized and supported by others.

This humanistic perspective on teacher development leads inevitably to a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" concept of inservice. It implies that significant growth starts from within the individual teacher who is at the bottom of the educational hierarchy rather than in the heads of curriculum developers, administrators or educational planners at the top. Another assumption is that the most effective inservice programming is based on voluntary participation and on joint collaboration rather than on mandated attendance.

Modeled after successful teachers' centers in England and the United States, the first principals' center was begun at Harvard University in 1981. The Centers' goals were based on the rationale that professional learning and the growth of principals should begin by having principals identify the areas in which they need help and support. In addition, it was strongly believed that principals themselves were invaluable resources for one another. The Harvard Principals' Center chose to use a developmental/humanistic model, which capitalizes on strengths, rather than a remedial model which emphasizes weaknesses to be addressed. Other goals of the Center included: personal and professional recognition for the work that school practitioners do; expanding the membership of groups to maximize diversity and to broaden the repetoire of possible solutions and approaches to common problems; provision of a protected setting so that administrators can leave their day-to-day workplace; emphasis on voluntary participation, and; programs that vary in format and setting

to address differing learning styles, interests and needs.

Since 1981 the Harvard Principals' Center has continued to grow and develop. It has inspired the creation of other centers, adaptations of the principals' center concept and the principal-centered philosophy, throughout the United States. The present study provides an analysis of the organization and operation of these centers.

Purpose

The general purpose of this study is to investigate the concept of the principals' center as a resource for the professional growth of school leaders. The specific purposes are as follows:

1. To analyze the organization and operation of principals' centers located throughout the United States utilizing the following research questions:

a) For what purposes are principals' centers organized?

b) How are principals' centers organized for governance?

c) How are principals' centers funded?

d) How are the funds utilized?

e) What staffing patterns are principals' centers utilizing?

f) Who are the participants in the principals' centers?

g) What programs do the principals' centers offer?

h) How are principals' centers evaluated for effectiveness?

2. To develop a model of a principals' center for possible implementation.

Procedure

The procedure utilized in this study is not highly complex, therefore, a separate chapter is not devoted to procedure. A discussion of the entire procedure is included in this initial chapter.

Identification of principals' centers located throughout the United States was the first step in the study. A preliminary listing of centers was obtained from the Harvard University Principals' Center. Additions to that list were obtained from a survey of the literature related to professional growth programs currently operating for school leaders. Forty-one principals' centers were identified.

Once the population of the study was determined, research questions were developed to provide the focus for an analysis of the organization and operation of the principals' centers. A questionnaire was developed as the means of data-gathering. As Van Dalen (1973) points out, in contrast to the interview technique, a questionnaire is able to assure objectivity because it is a structured instrument. In addition, a questionnaire prevents the respondent from being influenced by the opinions and attitudes of the interviewer. Isaac (1971) stated that,

> Eagerness of the respondent to please the interviewer, a vague antagonism that sometimes arises between the interviewer and the respondent, and the tendency of the interviewer to seek out answers that support his preconceived notions all complicate this method (p. 96).

A questionnaire eliminates the possibility of subjectivity and personal bias.

In addition to the eight research questions the questionnaire

included questions that would provide data relevant to the development of a model of a principals' center. Both forced and narrative response items were included in the questionnaire format.

In order to establish validity the completed survey instrument was field-tested. Directors of two principals' centers were asked to determine if the survey items were clearly written and easily understood and if the survey items were valid indicators of information sought. In addition, suggestions for improvement were solicited.

After reviewing the completed field-tested questionnaires, revisions were made in the survey instrument. The questionnaires, accompanying cover letters and preaddressed post-paid envelopes were then mailed to the directors of the principals' centers identified as the population of the study. (The questionnaire appears in the appendix of this study.) A follow-up letter was sent to those directors not responding within the given time frame.

As the completed questionnaires were received they were coded by number. To tabulate the responses to the questionnaires the items were categorized to answer the research questions. Tables were formulated to summarize both the research questions and additional relevant data. A narrative description of the findings was written to accompany each of the tables.

The results of the data were analyzed by discussing the generalizations found in the responses and the implications of the results. Patterns of responses were sought, as well as any trends which were evident in the data. Findings were also discussed through

a comparison of study results with the related literature.

Limitations

A study of this nature had some limitations. There were areas of inquiry related to this study, such as the role that students and faculty should play in a principals' center or evaluating the success of a principals' center in relation to school effectiveness which were not pursued. The significant area of limitation, however, was in the method of obtaining the data. Utilizing a questionnaire as the means of data-gathering imposes limitations for a number of reasons. Van Dalen (1973) and Best (1970) both indicated that many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing. Good (1963) cited several unique values of an interview as compared with a questionnaire. Among them, were that the interviewer could follow up leads and clues in a manner not possible by a questionnaire and that the interviewer could form an impression of the truth of the answers and the things that were left unsaid. Isaac (1971) listed the following advantages of an interview over a questionnaire: 1) Permits greater depth; 2) Permits probing for more complete data; 3) Makes rapport possible with the respondent, and; 4) Provides a means of checking the effectiveness of communication. In addition, a questionnaire may not ask the right questions or phrase the questions so that they elicit the appropriate responses.

Definition of Terms

Teachers' Center: A program for the continuing professional growth and renewal of practicing teachers which allows teachers to take an active role in determining their own professional training

needs and providing a significant portion of that training (Bell &
Peightel, 1976).

Principals' Center: A program for practicing school leaders in
which principals play a major role in determining their professional
training goals based on their own concerns, needs and aspirations. It
is a program that relies on the resources principals have to offer one
another (Barth, 1981).

This chapter sought to provide an introduction to the study and
clarify its purposes, procedures and limitations. Chapter II contains
a review of related literature and research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze Principals'
Centers as a resource for professional growth of school leaders. In
reviewing the current literature and research on effective schools the
importance of the building principal was consistently emphasized.
Time and again the literature and research state that the building
principal is the most important and influential factor in determining
the success and effectiveness of a school. Thus, the focus was
limited to a study of the professional growth practices of school
principals.

Reviewing the literature and research on preservice and inservice
training for principals provided an important perspective on current
practices and strategies.

In this study, the teacher center concept served as a prototype
for professional growth for principals. Consequently, the literature
on the teachers' center movement and its approach to professional
growth is reviewed in this chapter.

The fourth section of this chapter delineates the Principals'
Center as a viable way to address the need for responsive professional
assistance to practicing principals. The final section addresses the
research questions which grew out of a search of the literature on
organizational theory.

Consistent with the purposes of this study, this chapter is organized into five sections: Effective Schools and the Role of the Principal; Training of Principals; Teachers' Centers as an Approach to Professional Growth; Principals' Centers as a Resource for Professional Growth for School Leaders; and, Organizational Theory.

Effective Schools and the Role of the Principal

Recent studies of effective schools consistently emphasized the importance of the building principal (Brookover and Lezotte, 1977; Edmonds, 1981). There seemed to be agreement that with strong leadership by the principal, the school is likely to be effective; without capable leadership, it is not (Mangers, 1978; Goldhammer, et al., 1971).

This viewpoint, however, was slow in evolving. In the 1950's the supporters, researchers and reformers of public education focused on the central administration of local school systems. During that decade local school boards and superintendents were considered the most effective change agents. The 1960's brought a shift of attention to the federal government, then to the states, as the agencies most able to improve the local schools. The assumption was that central agencies could effectively influence the work of individual schools (Barth, 1981).

Increasingly, however, experience and research pointed to the individual school rather than the central agency as the critical force for change and improvement. Barth (1981) stated,

> Once again, educators and researchers have turned their attention to the influences on student performance at the local school site: particularly leadership at the school

level, the expectations of teachers and administrators,
community participation, and the ´ethos´ and social climate
of schools (p. 54).

In 1974, the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of

the United States Senate issued a report on the role of the school

principal. The leadership impact of the principal in the school and

the community was clearly stated: In many ways the school principal

is the most important and influential individual in any school. He or

she is the person responsible for all activities that occur in and

around the school building. It is the principal´s leadership that

sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of

professionalism and morale of teachers, and the degree of concern for

what students may or may not become. The principal is the main link

between the community and school and the way he or she performs in the

capacity largely determines the attitudes of parents and students

about the school. If a school is a vibrant, innovative,

child-centered place, if it has a reputation for excellence in

teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one

can almost point to the principal´s leadership as the key to success

(Abt, 1979, p. 15).

A growing body of research has indicated that in schools where

student achievement is higher than might be expected, principals

provide strong leadership and support. Teachers at these schools

report that their principals support new ideas and practices, and go

out of their way to acquire needed materials (Mangers, 1978; Edmonds,

1979).

Furthermore, of all the educators who influence the success of

the instructional program, the principal has been singled out as among the most important. Sarason (cited in Barth, 1981) stated, "Any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the schools depends primarily on the principal" (p. 55). Berman and McLaughlin (cited in Mangers, 1978) made the case even more strongly by asserting that, "The principal is the gatekeeper of change. If you have to pick one figure in the school system who really matters in terms of whether you get change or not, it is the principal" (p. 1).

A recent article stated that it is the principal who is called upon to bring teachers, students, parents and all other participants in a school together. In addition, the principal is the link between the local school and the school district, and regional, state and national offices and agencies. "Managing each school site is not enough: The principal must have a wider vision of the mission of education" (LoPresti, 1982, p. 3).

James Olivero (1980) of the Association of California School Administrators has defined this aspect of the principal's role in the following terms:

> Without leaders, any dream is likely to fade in and out of
> focus. For today's education, the principal – more than
> any other person – is the keeper of the dream. The
> principal realizes upward mobility for students in the
> school is possible when individuals possess the skills,
> attitudes and knowledge that accrue from a quality
> education (p. 1).

Under this view the school site administrator is not a mere manager but the educational leader of the school.

Unquestionably, the key educational issue of the future is sure to be the same as the key educational issue of the past: how to

improve the experience and performance of students who attend schools. More educational theorists have discovered that what teachers teach and children learn, for better or worse, is heavily influenced by the school principal. Just as many researchers have recognized that the individual school is a promising unit for educational analysis and change, many are also looking to the principal to become the influential agent of change within that unit (Barth, 1981).

Barth (1981) has also observed that:

> Attention has shifted to the school principal because effective principals make better schools. The able principal has the capacity to create conditions which elicit the best from students, teachers and parents most of the time. Principals, more than anyone else, can insulate teachers from distracting, debilitating, outside pressures so they may devote their precious energies to students. Principals can orchestrate the school's constellation of unique needs and resources so that everyone generally gets what is needed. And principals have the capacity to stimulate the growth of the school community, to lead by responding thoughtfully and purposefully to children, teachers, and parents (p. 55).

Despite all of the agreement about the importance of school principals little help or support is available to assist principals to grow professionally. The case for making a major investment in the continuing education of the principals is so strong that one can only wonder why we have responded to it in such a weak manner.

> The universities and professional organizations, with their overlapping memberships and institutional biases and constraints, have too long monopolized the field. Options must be found that are more flexible in their approach to learning, more responsive to the real needs of people, more interested in providing sensitive support over a sustained period of time, more capable of building a sense of community founded on common concerns and shared values regarding the human condition. Too much is at stake to do otherwise (Brown, 1974, p. 19).

"Good principals are not born that way, they learn how to be effective through an ongoing process of growth" (Strother, 1983, p. 293).

There seem to be, then, four educational themes to be aware of: First, there is recognition that the individual school site is where large influence over pupil achievement resides. Second, there is recognition that schools can't do it alone, but that in concert with others they may be better able to achieve their important work. Third, there is recognition of the importance of the school principal to students' success, to school climate, and to school effectiveness. And, finally, there is recognition of both the necessity and the payoff of sustaining the professional growth of principals.

Training of Principals

Research has indicated that we are entering a new era of staff development in public education. During the seventies, federal, state and private agencies sponsored many projects which focused on the improvement of education through staff development programs for teachers. These projects were designed to improve teacher's instructional skills by making them more aware of effective teaching practices and by providing training in instructional skills and strategies (Nur, 1981).

After a decade of examining these programs and what works and doesn't work, researchers have identified factors that contribute to effective school improvement efforts. "Mounting evidence suggests that effective schools are characterized by effective leadership" (Shoemaker and Fraser, 1981, p. 178). But little attention has been paid to preservice or inservice training for principals.

The preservice training of school principals has been a monopoly of the universities and colleges. There is general agreement in the literature that it is extremely difficult to measure the quality of a training program, but, that by all known criteria, some institutions are doing a much better job than others (McIntyre, 1979; UCEA Commission Report, 1973).

The content that should be included in a good program for training school principals is extremely difficult to identify. Different groups of planners come up with radically different contents, each group with convincing arguments. Attempts to standardize offerings by prescribing course titles seem to be futile. McIntyre (1979) found that a sound program should include such broad areas as organizational behavior and development, decision making, human relationships, leadership, instructional improvement, management science, and school law. He also asserted that, "The internship is by far the most highly recommended program feature, especially when practitioners are asked to do the recommending" (p. 31).

The argument persists, however, and is supported by a number of research studies, that the principal is poorly prepared for the job in the first place. In a recent article, studies by Gross, the University Council for Educational Administration, and Becker were examined. Each concluded that there is virtually no relationship between effectiveness on the job and formal preparation for the job. In fact, Gross found a negative correlation between quantity of formal preparation and leadership in the position (Brown, 1974).

Blumberg and Greenfield also found little to suggest that

university graduate training had much direct or observable influence
on any of the effective leaders they studied. Goldhammer and his
colleagues also concluded that principals who were effective could
not, on the basis of their formal preparation, be distinguished from
those who were not (Mazzarella, 1982).

Barth (1981) supported this tenet and stated that:

> Universities offer more courses addressed to aspiring school
> heads than to practicing principals. Despite efforts to
> certify thousands of aspiring principals, these programs alone
> will never be sufficient, because no one knows what the
> principals will face until the situation presents itself.
>
> To be sure, universities have expanded their curriculum....
> While these can offer needed ideas and materials, they tend
> to do little to help the principal translate theory into
> action in a highly idiosyncratic context - a school. Nor
> do they provide the opportunity for individuals to
> systematically reflect upon their practices, or to share
> concerns and insights with other practitioners (p. 60).

Preparation programs for school administrators have traditionally
emphasized theory over practice. The unhappy result has been that new
principals can talk about leadership concepts and management
processes, but are not always able to put these into practice.

Morris, Crowson, Hurwitz and Porter-Gehrie (1984)(a) conducted
intensive research into what the building principal's job is really
like. They suggested that a greater understanding of the daily life
of the principal is creating doubt about the adequacy of university
training programs for principals. Their research also pointed out
that the internship experience offered in most graduate programs is
inadequate. Morris, et al, advocate a more intensive program of
building-level observation and an apprentice-like introduction into
school management. In addition, their research findings indicated

that principals are instructional leaders "more through indirection, by creating an ´atmosphere´ in which teaching and learning can thrive, than through such methods as inservice training of teachers or classroom observation" (p. 692). Thus, the emphasis that the typical university curriculum places on teacher supervision and evaluation is not relevant to the realities of the position.

> If the work principals do is to be thoughtful, rigorous
> and effective, then the certification requirements and
> the formal academic course work preparing principals for
> the profession should also be thoughtful, rigorous, and
> effective (Barth, 1982, p. 8).

That surveys asking, "What contributed most to your effectiveness as a principal?" always seem to find academic preparation ranking at the bottom of the list suggests that continued attention to preservice programs for principals must remain a high priority (Pellico, Stevenson, Surratt, 1984).

A professor of educational administration stated in a recent article that preparation of a school site administrator does not take place only on the college or university campus. He pointed out that while a preservice training program is one of the important elements in a total context of administrator training it is geared to address only entry-level competencies. The gap between preservice preparation and inservice development is an "illogical separation, since the training of the individual should, theoretically, span the professional preparation received on campus and the experience gained in school district employment" (Lo Presti, 1982, p. 33).

Professional literature has pointed out several sources of inservice education for principals.

One important source of help is in the universities. They have resources that could be applied in important ways. For example, in several universities, programs for principals on the job are being developed by people such as Vito Perrone, John Goodlad and Simon Wittes. There are doubts, however, whether universities can make a significant contribution to the continuing education of principals. Charles Brown (1974) Director of the Leadership and Learning Cooperative for the Education Development Center in Massachusetts expressed these concerns:

> Too many things seem to get in the way: course requirements, degree programs, credits, a faculty reward system that emphasizes scholarly research rather than teaching and learning, ingrained attitudes and traditions, and the built-in inertia familiar to all institutions (p. 22).

State departments of education are another place to look for inservice education for principals. Though their record of service to principals is minimal they do have resources, not the least of which is access to state funds. Thus, they must be considered a potential ally in any effort to develop programs (Brown, 1974).

The best source for inservice education for principals is the school district itself. Unfortunately, however, school district staff development programs for administrators are virtually nonexistent. Historically, inservice programs for principals occur when someone in the central office decides that there is a need for principals to improve in an area. All too often there is little connection between the principal's needs and the training prescribed by others. Consequently, little personal or professional growth occurs (Barth, 1981).

It appears, then, that another solution must be found to address the need for professional growth for principals. One which can begin to address some of the new realities of the principalship unencumbered by the shortcomings of the state departments of education, the universities, local inservice programs or formal university training.

Teachers' Centers as an Approach to Professional Growth

The concept of the teachers' center offers a promising precedent for the professional growth of principals. It is a model in which practitioners have taken an active role in determining their professional training needs as well as providing a significant portion of that training (Bell and Peightel, 1976).

Studies by Lawrence (1974) and Berman and McLaughlin (1975, 1977, 1978) and Edelfelt and Lawrence's (1975) review of the literature on inservice education concluded that motivation and actual learning are improved when teachers have a major voice in determining their own professional development programs.

Most teachers' centers do claim to offer teachers just such a voice, as well as many voluntary options for participation (Devaney and Thorn, 1975). The "grassroots" type of teachers' center places particular emphasis on the issues of teacher control and voluntarism (Devaney and Thorn, 1975; Buxton, 1979; Martin, 1977; Devaney, 1977).

Teachers' centers are not an American innovation. They became popular in England, Japan, Germany, and other countries responding to the need for curriculum development and inservice education (DeVault, 1974). In the United States educators saw the idea as the answer to many different needs, both educational and political. In their paper

entitled, "Concepts of Teacher Centers," Joyce and Weil (1973) traced American interest in teachers' centers directly to the British experience following Sputnik in the late 1950's. Both the Plowden (1967) and, more specifically, the James Report (1972) authorized the creation of teachers' centers to assist teachers in understanding and interpreting Nuffield Foundation science and mathematics curriculum materials (Nicholson, et al., 1976; Thornbury, 1974).

In the United States educators were excited by the British Infant School and began to import British head-teachers to lead summer institutes where American teachers could begin to learn the complex strategies of "opening up" their classrooms (Yeomans, 1972). By 1968 teachers' centers began to appear. Early centers were closely modeled on the British assumptions that: Basic and effective innovation in the classroom comes about through the efforts of practicing teachers; there exists among teachers a vast reservoir of untapped expertise and experience; teachers' centers are a neutral place for teachers to reexamine and develop curriculum appropriate to their own students' needs (Burrell, 1976; Devaney, 1974; Rogers, 1976).

These teachers' centers were called "grassroots" centers (Joyce and Weil, 1973). Grassroots teachers' centers were generally started and run by classroom teachers. Participation was voluntary. Programs were informal, hands-on and involved making and sharing curriculum ideas. A major philosophical premise was that motivation for growth begins within the individual and change proceeds from the bottom-up rather than from the top-down (Watt, 1979).

During the 1950's and 1960's the "humanistic" psychology movement

also contributed new ideas about human learning and growth. During this time the theories of Arthur Combs, Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers provided educators with a vision of the way people learn. These theories have been applied by staff developers to inservice programs (Bunker, 1976; 1977; Hruska, 1977) and researchers have documented their usefulness in promoting professional growth (Lawrence, 1974; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978).

Rubin (1971, 1978) in particular has called for inservice programs based on the self-identified individual needs of teachers. He asserts that professional growth should be "regarded not as something the system does to the individual but rather as something the individual does to himself" (1972, p.273).

The gap between humanistic developmental theory and practice was bridged by Bunker (1978). With his associates Bunker built a conceptual framework for professional growth that has been directly translated into practice (Bunker and Hruska, 1978). The following concepts from "Beliefs Which Foster Human Growth" form the framework for the basic model of teachers' centers (Bunker, 1979).

1. Participants should be actively involved in solving real problems. Learning takes place when people have an opportunity to interact with data.

2. Participants needs must be met. In order to deal with higher order needs (cognitive, self-actualization), lower order needs (psychological, security) must be met.

3. Participants should be involved in decision-making about the design, implementation and evaluation of their own programs. Shared

decision-making increases involvement.

4. Skill acquisition is valued. Skills are the tools for solving real problems.

5. Participants respond positively to the opportunity to work from their strengths. People are more effective when they feel good about themselves. Success is built upon success.

6. Participants seem better able to apply new learnings, refine their skills and continue growing as they get feedback and support from others.

7. Growth takes time and tends to occur in stages.

8. Participants will benefit from self-initiated and self-directed learning. A major goal of staff development is to help others to become more self-directed.

If, as the research has pointed out, the humanistic-developmental ("grassroots") model of a teachers' center is the most effective approach to teacher professional growth then this model may also be used effectively for the professional growth of principals.

Principals' Centers as a Resource for Professional
Growth for School Leaders

As a result of the recent research on effective schools there has been a refocusing of attention on the role of the school principal. The universities, state departments of education, professional organizations and school districts are acknowledging that the quality of a school is related to the quality of its leadership.

Responses to this realization have included: A move to strengthen the preservice training and certification of aspiring

principals; renewed attention to the process of selecting principals; and an increased number of activities devoted to the professional development of practicing school leaders (Barth, 1984).

Clearly, today's administrator must be a learner (Morris, et al., 1984(b); Karius and Prince, 1980). The demands, expectations, and stress upon principals are increasing. "They too need replenishment and invigoration and an expanded repertoire of ideas and practices with which to respond to overwhelming demands" (Barth, 1981, p. 161).

Fortunately, the thrust of current attention given to the professional development of principals is changing. In the past, the range of effective options that school leaders could choose from in planning staff development programs was narrow in range. Most staff development for principals was prescribed from outside and done to principals. A principal of an elementary school recently wrote,

> Except in rare cases, most administrative training can be
> characterized as non-systematic, one-shot opportunities for
> an administrator to interact in a workshop setting with someone
> who is unfamiliar with the specific constraints under which
> an administrator operates (Zigarmi, 1981, p. 93).

Now, increasing numbers of school leaders are investing in their own development. The humanistic-developmental theory exemplified in the "grassroots" teachers' centers described in the preceding section of this chapter, is becoming the model for more principals to voluntarily exercise leadership and ownership for their own professional growth.

Throughout the United States, principals are coming together to take an active role in not only determining their professional development needs but also in providing a large part of the training.

Principals' centers are being organized to facilitate activities emanating from the concerns, needs, and aspirations of the principals themselves (Barth, 1981).

The essential idea of a principals' center is that it is initiated and directed by principals, for principals. Its total focus is on improving professional skills, attitudes, and expertise among principals (Carmichael, 1982).

The first principals' center was opened in 1981 at Harvard University. It was established to assist Boston area principals to become more effective leaders of their schools. At its inception the Center had three broad goals:

1. To help principals work with the changing realities of school administration and support them in their development as educational leaders.

2. To identify effective school practices and encourage visibility and exchange of these practices through communication among principals, Harvard faculty, students, and other educators.

3. To study the impact of declining enrollments and legislation such as Proposition 2 1/2, on the effectiveness of school principals (Barth and Levenson, 1981).

The director of the Principals' Center at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Roland Barth, has written extensively about the concept of the principals' center. In an article published in May, 1981, he provided a comprehensive listing of the purpose and objectives of a principals' center. He stated that:

The primary purpose of a principals' center is to provide

responsive professional assistance to practicing principals
and other school leaders which will enable them to become more
effective in their work. More specific objectives are:

1) To help principals better cope with the changing realities
of school administration, including increased time demands,
collective bargaining, declining enrollments and resources,
and new state and federal mandated programs and guidelines.

2) To bring together principals both within districts and
across districts to share new experiences, concerns,
problem-solving approaches, and successes.

3) To identify promising school practices and arrange for
principals who wish to engage in similar practices to
visit these sites.

4) To encourage formal and informal networks among
principals, district and university personnel that will
persist beyond the confines of the Center.

5) To provide a mechanism for practitioners to be
instrumental in promoting their own professional
training and growth.

6) To promote the professional development of principals
who have a particularly strong background in administrative
skills by encouraging them to share their expertise with
others.

7) To improve principals' understanding of the problems
they face by bringing together at the same time teachers,
parents, and principals.

8) To provide assistance to principals in building
coalitions among teachers, parents, students, and
principals.

9) To provide on-site consultation around the particular
problems facing a principal.

10) To link the university with local educational
practitioners.

11) To provide a national forum for discussion of school
leadership and professional training.

12) To emphasize the importance of the principal and school
site leadership and bring new attention to the problems and
concerns facing principals (pp. 62-63).

Although this list was generated with the Harvard Principals'

Center in mind these objectives characterize the mission of most

principals' centers.

The activities and programs offered by a principals' center are

based on what principals want to know and do. A principals' center,

like a successful teachers' center, must be a place where school

practitioners play a major role in their own professional training.

Principals, like teachers, have the capacity and ability to encourage

professional growth and effective practice in their colleagues.

> Principals can help one another because they occupy the
> same rung on the bureaucratic ladder, deal with similar
> problems, face similar pressures, and evolve different
> solutions. Principals neither evaluate nor are evaluated
> by one another (Barth, 1981, p. 61).

Principals' centers as contexts for professional development are

becoming increasingly responsive to the conditions under which school

leaders learn. Recent literature has shown that factors associated

with the professional growth of school principals include:

1. Professional recognition - in response to the need of

educators for personal and professional recognition for the work they

do. With the involvement of principals as "producers as well as

receivers of ideas, services, skills, centers are finding that being

helpful to others is a powerful way to generate respect both for

oneself and others" (Barth and Van Der Bogart, 1984, p. 92).

2. Voluntary attendance - when participation is by choice there

is a willingness to learn.

3. Protected setting - many principals prefer to be in a neutral

setting away from the interruptions and responsibilities associated

with their school.

4. Maximum diversity – centers draw a heterogeneous group of people who bring with them a variety of experiences, ideas, and backgrounds thus expanding the approaches to solving problems.

5. Principal-centered programs – principals are extremely capable of planning and implementing their own professional development activities.

6. An array of formats – activities within a center vary to accommodate different learning styles, interests, and needs (Barth and Van Der Bogart, 1984).

The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory prepared the Establishing A School Executive Management Institute report (1984). The study was directed at state-level organizations that provided training for school district administrators and included principals' institutes; university-based administrators' professional organizations. In addition, interviews were conducted with directors or coordinators of institutes for inservice training of school administrators in twelve states.

The report cited seven characteristics of effective staff development programs:

1. Long-term commitment to a particular direction or program, enabling the learner to proceed in an orderly way from orientation through in-depth exposure to integrated practice.

2. Meaningful involvement of those who are to be "developed" in needs and assessment and planning.

3. Active participation as well as verbal commitment of key

central office administrators and principals to the staff development effort.

4. Development of an in-house cadre of knowledgeable leaders who can carry on the training once the expert has departed.

5. Sufficient numbers of staff members voluntarily involved in the learning to provide an adequate support system to maintain the change long enough for it to be institutionalized.

6. Inclusion of immediate application possibilities in the training program.

7. Adequate economic support -- particularly to provide time for the sustained effort needed.

La Plant and Doresh (1984) prepared a status report on inservice for school administrators. The report cites a number of generalizable propositions regarding the planning and implementation of effective inservice education for school leaders. The report states that:

1. Effective inservice is directed toward local school needs.

2. Inservice participants need to be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs.

3. Effective inservice is based on participant needs.

4. Active learning processes, rather than techniques such as lectures, are viewed as desirable and effective inservice instructional modes.

5. Inservice that is part of a long-term systematic staff development plan is more effective than a "one-shot", short-term program.

6. Local school inservice must be backed up by commitment of

resources from the central office.

7. Effective inservice provides evidence of quality control, and is delivered by competent presenters.

8. Programs which enable participants to share ideas and provide assistance to one another are viewed as successful.

9. Inservice programs are effective when they are designed so that individual participant needs, interests, and concerns are addressed.

10. Rewards and incentives, both intrinsic and extrinsic, must be evident to program participants.

Principals' centers are looking to the research on adult development as a resource for the design of activities and programs. We now know that adults continue to grow and change throughout their life. Growth is both a "normal" and a "natural" process (Perry, 1968). Thus it is important that this growth is actively promoted and supported within the context of a professional development organization (Levine, 1984).

Developmental psychologist and Associate Director of the Harvard Principals' Center, Sarah Levine, has delineated several developmental paradigms that specifically address the goals of a principals' center:

1. All people see, experience, or understand the world differently.

2. Throughout life, individuals carry with them diverse assumptions about how the world works.

3. Adults have specific "life tasks" to be confronted at different times. A significant part of adult development, then, is

tied to age (Levinson, 1978).

4. Individuals at different developmental stages have varied

capacities.

It is evident that all of these factors will directly impact on

the content, format and effectiveness of professional development

programs.

> Recognizing that individuals bring such different assumptions
> about learning and knowing to workshops and seminars helps to
> explain how no one style or single format can satisfy or be
> comfortable for everyone. As a result, we must continually
> approach teaching and learning from a variety of perspectives
> and offer a range of program options (Levine, 1984, p. 2).

The principals' center, though still in its fledgling stage, is a

concept being increasingly embraced by school leaders as a resource

for professional growth. Though principals' centers throughout the

United States may vary in form, format, even title, their purposes

demonstrate a dedication to the personal and professional development

of school principals.

Principals' centers are characterized as places where school

practitioners play a major role in their own development. They are

places which attempt to improve the quality of life and learning in

schools by encouraging the continued growth of that individual who is

now considered the most important factor in determining the success

and effectiveness of a school - the principal.

Organizational Theory

The purpose of this section is to explore the various

organizational factors of principals' centers that are highlighted by

the research questions.

Data have been gathered from research on teachers´ centers, group dynamics and management. The information clarifies individual, interpersonal and group behavior within organizations, as well as the interplay of the human and structural dimensions. The following areas will serve as the focus of this section: purpose, membership, evaluation, finance and governance.

Purpose

Defining the organization´s basic purpose is the critical starting point for any organization. All other planning and organizing should implement the organization´s basic purpose. The failure to define basic purposes "may lead to meandering and undistinguished organizational performance at best, and pointless exhaustion of resources at worst" (Hampton, Summer, Weber, 1982, p. 371). Management without purpose degenerates into expediency and opportunism, as distinguished from building enduring institutions (Selznick, 1957).

Clear statements of strategy and purpose can set the direction for an organization. If they are to be truly useful, however, purposes must be translated into "operational definitions". They must, in other words, be expressed as specific, concrete, measurable activities and desired results. These purposes become objectives (Hampton, et al., 1982).

Objectives have the following characteristics:

1. They are specific.

2. They are reality-oriented.

3. Their achievement can be verified.

4. They specify the time they will be achieved (Hampton, et al., 1982).

Assuming that each listed organizational objective is congruent with the organizational purpose it is meant to implement, the organization has defined, operationally, where it is headed. It has also established a framework that can help guide decision-making and other conduct within the organization toward the objective (Hampton, et al., 1982, p. 373).

Classic management theory assumed that objectives were to be set by managers and passed down the chain of command to the subordinates. The behavioral approach to management (McGregor, 1960; Likert, 1961) has held that a participative objective-setting procedure is necessary to improve motivation and performance. As McGregor (1960) stated,

> Genuine commitment is seldom achieved when objectives are externally imposed. Passive acceptance is the most that can be expected; indifference or resistance are the more likely consequences. Some degree of mutual involvement in the determination of objectives is a necessary aspect of managerial planning (p. 868).

In general, a successful group has a defined purpose and clear objectives and members of a group have personal goals and objectives that are identical or compatible with the group objectives.

> The more time a group spends developing agreement on clear objectives, the less time it needs in achieving them, and the more likely that the members' contributions will converge toward a common solution (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973, p. 116).

Membership

Membership is a central concept in groups. From the beginning, the group is perceived as the environment within which an individual

moves; it provides his primary source of reference (Thelen, 1954).

A fundamental question seems to be: Why do people join the groups they do?

An understanding of why people join certain groups is complicated (Quey, 1971). There appears to be three major reasons:

1. They like the activity of the group.

2. They like the people in the group.

3. Being in the group can satisfy needs lying outside the group. Thus, the group itself does not satisfy a person's needs directly, but is a means to satisfying these needs (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973).

The question of membership becomes more complex when it is noted that an individual may belong to a number of groups.

> Some he may join for task reasons, some because of the people, some to meet needs beyond the group; in some he is an involuntary member - and to each he brings his unique self and behavior to meet his needs in that situation (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973, p. 52).

In addition, membership in a group may not engage the entire person; it may have relevance to only certain parts of his life. Thus, groups also vary in the amount of the person invested in membership. "The particular parts of a person that are engaged by membership will affect both the functioning of the group and its significance for members" (Cartwright and Zander, 1968, p. 50).

Research points out that the attractiveness of a group can be increased if a member (or potential member) believes that his needs can be fulfilled by belonging to that group. Changing a members' needs is difficult, thus, it is more feasible to emphasize the properties that meet the needs of a member or the advantages to be

gained from belonging (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973). Some of the
properties that increase attractiveness are:

1. Prestige - The more prestige a person has within a group, or
the more obtainable it seems to be, the greater will be the attraction
to the group (Kelley, 1951; Aronson and Linder, 1965). People who are
placed in a position of authority over others are more attracted to
the group than those low in authority. However, those in a position
of high authority who may be placed in a position of low authority are
less attracted to a group. Those who are already in positions of low
authority and who expect to remain at that level are not attracted to
the group. Those that are most attracted are members of high prestige
who envision themselves remaining in that position or those of low
prestige who see themselves rising in the group. In addition, those
who are valued members are more likely to be attracted to a group than
those who do not have much social worth (Jackson, 1959; Snoek, 1959;
Lott and Lott, 1969).

2. Milieu - A cooperative relationship is more attractive than
one which is competitive (Deutsch, 1959). If a group works as a team
toward a goal and if it will be rated on the basis of team effort the
members will be friendlier than if it is a competitive situation. If,
on the other hand, members are judged on the basis of individual
performance, it is to be expected that there is "less interpersonal
relationship, more withholding of information or not volunteering
information, fewer influence attempts" (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973,
p. 60).

3. Degree of Interaction Among Members - Heightened interaction

among members may increase the attractiveness of the group (Homans, 1950). Participating, or enjoying other members, or developing friendships as a by-product of belonging to the group increases the attractiveness to its members - it offers additional opportunities to continue these positive relationships. Research also points out that if the interaction among members is unpleasant (if members ignore one another, bore each other, or there are members who are considered "repulsive"), attraction to being a member will decrease (Festinger, 1957; Aronson, 1970; Amir, 1969).

4. Size - The size of a group greatly influences a members' attraction to it (Seashore, 1954). Smaller groups are likely to be more attractive than large ones (Wicker, 1969).

> In a small group, it is easier to get to know the other members, to discover similar interests, to have dedication to the cause, to have a sense of being a significant participant in the group. As the group increases in membership there is a corresponding heterogeneity of interests. Feelings toward each other become less personal, concern with the 'cause' is often less intense, and there is a reduction in the degree of individual participation, intimacy, and involvement (Tsouderos, 1955, p. 208).

Relationships with other groups are also a factor. Groups are more attractive if their position is improved with respect to other groups (Deutsch, 1959; Stotland, 1959).

5. Success - Members are attracted to join groups or continue in groups that have been successful (Jackson, 1959; Shelley, 1954). Task success is an important determinant in members' reactions to the leader and the group (Ninane and Fielder, 1970). Napier and Gershenfeld (1973) described several factors that decrease the attractiveness of membership in a group. They asserted that a member

will:

> ...consider leaving when the forces of attraction are decreased
> or negative, when his own needs for satisfaction are reduced,
> when the group becomes less suitable as a means for satisfying
> existing needs, or when the group acquires unpleasant
> properties. He will actually leave when the forces for
> remaining in the group are less than the forces for leaving
> (there are also forces against making a change and, instead,
> just letting the existing conditions continue) (p. 61).

Evaluation

In the research on group dynamics it has become standard to
describe the adequacy of group performance in terms of two concepts:
1) Effectiveness - the extent to which a group is successful in
attaining its task related objectives; and 2) Efficiency - the extent
to which a group satisifed the needs of its members (Barnard, 1938).
Though each factor can certainly be viewed independently of the other
a group expends energy on both and each impacts greatly on the other.

> High task involvement may mean high productivity but possible
> future difficulties in unresolved personal issues. High
> personal involvement may mean high morale, but little effort
> on task activity, and consequently low productivity (Napier
> and Gershenfeld, 1973, p. 119).

There is evidence (Berkowitz, 1954; Thelen, 1954) that if,
initially, a group encourages members to get to know one another and
share personal goals, there will be a common frame of reference, a
"set toward problem solving." Very often, "more cohesive groups are
more productive than less cohesive groups. There seems to be a
general circular relationship between group solidarity and
effectiveness" (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973, p. 119).

It is also believed that the quality of a group's performance
affects members feelings of self-worth. "Members of highly successful

groups evaluate their individual contributions favorably and those in unsuccessful groups rate them poorly" (Cartwright and Zander, 1968, p. 426).

Evaluation is part of a process. When groups utilize evaluation as a means for modifying or changing goals, activities, or roles they continue to grow. As a result of an ongoing evaluation process groups may change because of the following factors:

1. Groups have increased knowledge of their resources.

2. There is increased experience in working as a group.

3. There may be an emergence of new standards.

4. The emotional level of the group changes (Napier and Gershenfeld, 1973).

Lippett (1961) has suggested a number of steps to help a group be productive:

1. The group must have a clear understanding of its purposes.

2. The group should become conscious of its own process.

3. The group should become aware of the skills, talents, and other resources within its membership.

4. The group should develop methods of evaluation so that it can have methods of improving its process.

5. The group should create new jobs and committees as needed and end others as they become obsolete or incompatible with the goals.

The literature on teachers' centers offers an organizational perspective on the questions relating to finance and governance.

Finance

Bell and Peightel (1976) point out that teachers' centers are

financed in a variety of ways:

1. In West Virginia the <u>state legislature</u> appropriated funds that made possible eight regional teacher education centers.

2. In Minneapolis, a teacher center is receiving financial backing from the <u>Minneapolis Public Schools and the University of Minnesota.</u>

3. Financing of the Scarsdale Teacher Institute is negotiated with the board of education and is <u>part of the contract arrangement of teachers with the school district.</u>

4. <u>School district funds</u> are used to operate the San Francisco Teacher Learning Center.

5. Several teachers' centers have received financial support from <u>private foundations.</u> For example, the Workshop Center for Open Education in New York City is funded by grants from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Federal Title III funds from the U.S. Office of Education.

6. The Creative Teaching Workshop depends on <u>donations, membership, and workshop fees</u> for its support.

Thus, the teachers' center model offers evidence that no predictable or standard source of income exists. Funding comes from a wide variety of sources and ranges from minimal to substantial amounts.

Governance

Teachers' center governance also varies - from informal agreements to legally binding contracts between two or more partners.

Bell and Peightel (1976) found that many teachers' centers are

organized around some type of advisory or policy-making council while others have attempted to operate their organization without any formal structure. Their research indicates that the most common arrangement is a formal written agreement.

Important factors in determining the structure of governance of a teachers' center appear to be the size of the organization and the amount of financial support it receives. Those centers that are a single controlling unit often have loosely knit governing structures – if they have a board or council at all.

On the other hand, centers that involve the cooperation of two or more institutions or organizations are more likely to have policy-making councils. By their very nature this type of center is generally larger than a single unit organization and will usually have greater financial support.

Typically a policy board sets priorities, designs activities and allocates resources. These roles increase the likelihood that the services provided will be timely, appropriate, and useful. A director is responsible for the implementation of policy decisions and the operation of the center, accountable to the policy board (Barth, 1981).

Research in the area of management also supports the concept of a formally structured coordination system. This form of governance is considered particularly suitable for organizations with relatively stable goals and relatively homogeneous parts. Structured is defined as

rationally worked out job descriptions for operating positions
and people, policies and procedures for coordinating diverse
jobs, and managerial positions and people specializing in
effectuating the coordination itself (Hampton, Summer, Webber,
p. 504).

This current study sought to investigate the concept of the

principals' center as a resource for the professional growth of school

leaders. Chapter III provides an analysis of the organization and

operation of principals' centers currently existing throughout the

United States.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate the concept of the principals' center as a resource for the professional growth of school leaders. Principals' centers currently existing throughout the United States were the population of the study. Forty-one principals' centers were identified, and a survey instrument was sent to the director of each center.

The data presented reflect responses from 34 respondents to the survey instrument. The following research questions provided the focus for an analysis of the organization and operation of these principals' centers:

1) For what purposes are principals' centers organized?

2) How are principals' centers organized for governance?

3) How are principals' centers funded?

4) How are the funds utilized?

5) What staffing patterns are principals' centers utilizing?

6) Who are the participants in the principals' centers?

7) What programs do the principals' centers offer?

8) How are principals' centers evaluated for effectiveness?

The presentation of the data is organized by each research question. Additional relevant data, not specifically addressed by the research questions, are presented at the end of this chapter.

41

For What Purposes are Principals' Centers Organized?

The responses to this question indicated that all of the principals' centers surveyed have a defined purpose. This finding is consistent with the literature that asserted that defining the organizations' basic purpose is the critical starting point for any organization (Hampton, Summer, Webber, 1982). As indicated in Table 1 many of the principals' centers have multiple purposes. Clear statements of purpose set the direction for an organization. All programming, planning, and organizing should implement the basic purpose(s). The literature also pointed out that, in general, a successful group has a defined purpose and clear objectives and members of that group have personal goals and objectives that are identical or compatible with the group objectives (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973).

The stated purposes of the principals' centers surveyed fell into nine different categories: 1) To provide opportunities for personal and professional development; 2) To promote improvement of educational leadership; 3) To provide opportunities for sharing ideas with colleagues; 4) To develop a network of mutual support; 5) To provide opportunities to put research into practice; 6) To improve schools; 7) To identify the needs of the principals; 8) To provide school administrators with services which will be helpful in implementing their duties and responsibilities, and; 9) To help principals gain insight into their work.

Of these nine categories, the following four were identified most frequently as a major purpose of the organization: 1) To provide

Table 1

For What Purposes are Principals' Centers Organized?

	1 Prof. Dev.	2 Leadership	3 Sharing	4 Network	5 Research	6 School Improvement	7 Identify Needs	8 Provide Services	9* Gain Insight
#1	X								
#2	X	X			X	X			
#3					X	X	X		
#4	X								
#5	X								
#6	X						X	X	
#7	X			X	X				
#8	X		X						
#9				X					X
#10	X								
#11	X								
#12	X								
#13	X							X	
#14	X								
#15	X								
#16	X								
#17	X		X	X			X		
#18			X		X		X		
#19	X		X				X		
#20	X								
#21	X								
#22								X	
#23	X						X		
#24	X								
#25	X								
#26	X								

Table 1 (continued)

	1 Prof. Dev.	2 Leadership	3 Sharing	4 Network	5 Research	6 School Improvement	7 Identify Needs	8 Provide Services	9* Gain Insight
#27	X		X	X	X		X		
#28	X		X	X			X		
#29	X								X
#30	X								
#31	X								
#32	X	X	X	X					
#33	X		X	X					
#34	X								
Totals	30	2	8	7	5	2	8	3	2

* 1 - To provide opportunities for personal and professional develoment.
  2 - To promote improvement of educational leadership.
  3 - To provide opportunities for sharing ideas with colleagues.
  4 - To develop a network of mutual support.
  5 - To provide opportunities to put research into practice.
  6 - To improve schools.
  7 - To identify the expressed needs of the principals.
  8 - To provide school administrators with services which will be
     helpf ul in implementing their duties and responsibilities.
  9 - To help principals gain insight into their work.

opportunities for personal and professional development; 2) To provide

opportunities for sharing ideas with colleagues; 3) To develop a

network of mutual support, and; 4) To identify the needs of the

principals. Clearly, the most frequently stated purpose (88% of the

respondents listed this as one of their organizations' major purposes)

was to provide opportunities for personal and professional

development.

It is not surprising that this was the most commonly stated

purpose of principals' centers. Experience and research are now

looking to the individual school site and particularly to the

principal as the critical forces for educational change and

improvement. Recent studies of effective schools clearly emphasized

the role of the building principal as central in determining the

quality of a school (Brookover & Lezotte, 1977; Edmonds, 1981;

Mangers, 1978; Goldhammer, 1971). It is increasingly apparent that

the role of the principal and the very nature of the position are

changing and becoming more complex.

Despite the mounting pressures and increasing visibility facing

the building principal there are few professional growth opportunities

within school districts or from universities and colleges or

professional organizations. Principals need opportunities to learn

and to grow. Options are being sought that are responsive to the

needs of the individual, flexible in their approaches to learning and

sensitive to the realities of the profession (Brown, 1974).

Recognition of the necessity of providing and sustaining the

professional growth of principals is resulting in increased support

and help for educational leaders. The purposes of principals' centers
in the survey population are designed to meet this need.

The number of respondents, therefore, indicating that a major purpose
of their organization is to provide opportunities for personal and
professional development is evidence that this need persists and that
attempts to address this need are being made.

It is interesting to note that eight of the respondents indicated
that a major purpose of their organization was to identify the
expressed needs of principals and to provide inservice activities
geared to meet these needs. This is also consistent with the
literature indicating that inservice programs and activities based on
the self-identified individual needs of the learner are the most
effective (Rubin, 1971, 1978).

As evidenced by the responses to this research question, all of
the principals' centers have a defined purpose. Although there is no
standard and the purposes vary in number and intent, the findings
remain consistent with current literature.

How Are Principals' Centers Organized for Governance?

Responses to this question indicated that the governing
structures of principals' centers vary - from no governing structure
and informal agreements to State Departments of Education and
structured by-laws.

The governing structures of the principals' centers surveyed
encompass seven different categories: 1) Council of school districts
(2%); 2) State Department of Education (8%); 3) Ad Hoc Committee (5%);
4) University faculty (5%); 5) Advisory board (61%); 6) Private

foundation (2%); 7) No governing structure (8%), and; 8) Combination (32%). These findings are consistent with the literature on teachers' centers which also found a wide variety of governing structures - from informal agreements to legally binding contracts between two or more partners (Bell & Peightel, 1976).

Important factors in determining the structure of governance of a teachers' center are the size of the organization and the amount of financial support it receives (Bell & Peightel, 1976). These same factors appear to be consistent with the data on principals' centers. Those centers that bring principals together on an informal basis, that are single controlling units with minimal resources, generally have loosely knit governing structures or none at all. In contrast, principals' centers that involve the cooperation of two or more institutions or organizations, generally have policy-making boards. These types of centers are generally larger than a single unit organization and will have greater financial resources.

Responses from the survey indicated that 61% of the principals' centers are governed by an advisory board or policy-making council. The membership of these boards varies in number, composition, and leadership from center to center. Members are elected, appointed or volunteer their services. Responsibilities of the advisory boards vary and include such activities as establishing priorities, designing and implementing programs and activities, allocating resources and setting dues structures to policy making, conducting needs assessments, setting meeting dates and times and evaluating prgrams.

As indicated in Table 2, 23% of the centers have formalized

Table 2

Does Your Organization Have By-Laws?

	Yes	No
#1		X
#2		X
#3	X	
#4		X
#5		X
#6	X	
#7		X
#8		X
#9	X	
#10	X	
#11	X	
#12		X
#13	X	
#14		X
#15		X
#16		X
#17		X
#18		X
#19		X
#20		X
#21		X
#22		X
#23		X
#24		X
#25	no answer	
#26		X
#27		X
#28		X
#29		X
#30	no answer	
#31	no answer	
#32		X
#33	X	
#34	X	
Totals	8	23

by-laws as part of their structure of governance. Three respondents stated that future plans of their organizations included the development of by-laws. As was the case with the governing structures of the principals' centers, the size of the organization and the amount of financial support appear to determine the need for a formalized set of by-laws.

The responses to this research question indicated that 92% of the principals' centers surveyed are organized by some form of governing structure. These findings are consistent with the literature emphasizing the importance of a form of governance to effectuate the coordination of the resources of an organization (Hampton, Summer, Webber, 1982).

How Are Principals' Centers Funded?

Funding of principals' centers comes from a wide variety of sources. As indicated in Table 3, financing can be derived from: 1) Business; 2) University; 3) Private foundation; 4) State Department of Education; 5) School District; 6) Federal funds; 7) Membership fees; 8) State Associations; 9) Workshop fees, and; 10) Other sources as: course fees, interest grants, individual contributions, in-kind services, store receipts, private grants, and individual fees.

The most frequently cited sources of funding were: 1) State Departments of Education; 2) School Districts; 3) Workshop fees; 4) Universities, and; 5) Membership fees. Responses to the survey indicated that 56% of the principals' centers received funding from more than one source. There doesn't appear to be a consistent pattern to the combination of sources or the amount of funds from each.

Survey results indicated that none of the principals' centers are supported by federal funds. This is consistent with the shifting of focus since the 1960's, from the federal government as the agency considered most able to influence local schools to the states and individual districts and schools as the critical forces for change and improvement (Barth, 1981).

Forty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they derive some funding from their State Department of Education. Of all the categories listed this one was cited most frequently as a source of income. Six of the principals' centers receive 100% of their funding from their State Department of Education. Table 3 also points out that 8% of the centers surveyed receive funding from business, 26% from universities, 8% from private foundations, 32% from school districts, 5% from state associations, 26% from workshop fees, and 32% from other sources.

As shown in Table 3a, 29% of the respondents indicated that participants in their center pay a membership fee. The amount of the fees vary and range from $185.00 to $25.00. Two of the principals' centers hold summer institutes and require participants to pay a fee which, in both cases, includes the cost for room and board. Membership, in one of the principals' centers surveyed, is limited to school districts. The districts are charged a fee ranging from $500.00 to $1500.00 depending on their size.

Eleven (32%) of the principals' centers receive all of their funding from only one source. Six, from their State Department of Education, three from a local university, one from a school district,

Table 3

How Are Principals' Centers Funded?

	Business Percentage	University Percentage	Private Foundation Percentage	State Dept of Educ Percentage	School District Percentage	Federal Funds Percentage	Membership Fees Percentage	State Assoc Percentage	Workshop Fees Percentage	Other	Percentage
#1				X 100							
#2									X 90	Course Fees	10
#3				X 30	X 70						
#4		X 50			X 50						
#5		X 60							X 40		
#6							X 70		X 20	Interest grants	10
#7	X 30	X 30			X 5		X 10		X 10	Individ Contributions	15
#8				— NONE —							
#9		X 12		X 30			X 38	X 20			
#10										In Kind Services	100
#11				X 50	X 50						
#12			X 87				X 05		X 6	Store Receipts	6.5
#13							X 80		X 15	Private Grants	5
#14				X 100							
#15		X 20			X 10		X 70				
#16				X 90	X 5				X 5		
#17				X 100							
#18				— NONE —							
#19					X 100						
#20	X 5		X 30	X 5						Individ. Fees	60
#21				X 100							
#22				X 95						Grants	5
#23		X 100									
#24				X 85						Wilmington Dev Cncl	15
#25				X 100							
#26				X 100							
#27	X 10			X 20	X 40				X 30		

Table 3 (continued)

	Business Percentage	University Percentage	Private Foundation Percentage	State Dept of Educ Percentage	School District Percentage	Federal Funds Percentage	Membership Fees Percentage	State Assoc Percentage	Workshop Fees Percentage	Other	Percentage
#28		X 100									
#29		X 14	X 10	X 20	X 50	NO ANSWER	X 10	X 15		X	35
#30				X 50					X 50	X	06
#31					X 40	NONE –					
#32											
#33											
#34		X 100								X	

52

Table 3a

Do Your Members Pay a Fee to Belong?

	Yes	No	Amount
#1		X	
#2		X	
#3		X	
#4	X		varies from $500 to $1500 per year depending on size of school district
#5		X	
#6	X		$185.00
#7	X		not yet determined
#8		X	
#9	X		$300.00 includes two weeks of room & board
#10	X		$25.00
#11		X	
#12	X		$30.00
#13	X		$175.00
#14		X	
#15	X		$125.00
#16		X	
#17		X	
#18		X	
#19		X	
#20	X		$850.00 - Summer Institute Cost
#21		X	
#22		X	
#23		X	
#24		X	
#25		X	
#26		X	
#27		X	
#28		X	
#29		X	
#30	no answer		
#31		X	
#32		X	
#33	X		$100.00
#34		X	
Totals	10	23	

and one by providing in-kind services.

Only three (8%) of the respondents stated that their center receives no funding at all. These centers are organized informally with no governing structure or formalized system of evaluation. They have no established leadership or meeting site.

The findings from this research question are consistent with the literature on teachers' centers that shows that no predictable or standard source of income exists (Bell & Peightel, 1976). As with teachers' centers, principals' centers receive funding from a wide variety of sources with amounts of revenue ranging from minimal to substantial amounts.

How are the Funds Utilized?

As indicated in Table 4 principals' centers utilize their funds in a variety of ways. Responses to the survey show that funds are expended in the following categories: 1) Professional staff; 2) Clerical staff; 3) Programs; 4) Communication; 5) Facilities, and; 6) Other expenses as: refreshments, participation expenses, travel and lodging.

The most frequently cited category for the utilization of funds was programs. Sixty-four percent of the principals' centers indicated that monies were expended for this purpose. The percentage of funds utilized for programs ranged from 100% to 5%. It appears that those centers allocating the lowest percentage of funds to programs utilized a large percentage of their funds for professional staffing purposes. This may reflect the stated purpose(s) of the organization or the functions of the professional staff. It is not surprising to observe

Table 4

How Are The Funds Utilized?

	Staffing: Professional		Clerical		Programs		Communic		Facilities		Other	
		%		%		%		%		%		%
#1	X	40	X	10	X	40	X	2	X	8		
#2					X	100						
#3	X	25	X	10	X	35	X	20	X	10		
#4					X	65	X	35				
#5	X	75	X	10	X	5	X	5	X	5		
#6	X	48			X	52						
#7	X	70	X	10	X	5	X	10	X	5		
#8					--N O N E--							
#9	X	20			X	45	X	5	X	30		
#10					X	75	X	25				
#11					X	100						
#12	X	45	X	20	X	10	X	3	X	22		
#13	X	30	X	30	X	20	X	10	X	10		
#14					X	NA			X	NA		
#15	X	60	X	30	X	10						
#16					--N A--							
#17	X	30	X	10	X	10	X	5	X	5	Partic Expenses	40
#18					--N O N E--							
#19	X	80			X	10	X	5			Refre shments	5
#20					--N A--							
#21	X	10			X	55	X	5			Travel Lodging	30
#22	X	45		(	X	50	X	4	X	1		
#23					--N A--							
#24					--N A--							
#25	X	80	X	10			X	10				
#26	X	45	X	15	X	30	X	5	X	5		
#27	X	20	X	10	X	60	X	10				
#28					--N A--							
#29					--N A--							
#30					--N A--							
#31	X	60	X	10	X	15	X	5			Refre shments	5
#32					--N O N E--							
#33					--N A--							
#34	X	25			X	75						

that the amount of responses in this category is consistent with the number of principals' centers that indicated that a major purpose of their organization was to provide members with opportunities for personal and professional development. It follows that utilizing funds for programs supports that purpose and is consistent with the literature pointing to an increase in the number of activities devoted to the professional development of school leaders (Barth, 1984).

Only two centers utilize 100% of their funds for a single purpose. In each case all of the funds are used exclusively for programs. Sixty-one percent of the principals' centers utilize their funds for multiple purposes. There doesn't appear to be a consistent pattern to the ways monies are expended or the amount of funds that are utilized for each purpose.

Three (8%) of the respondents indicated that they utilize no funds at all. These are the same principals' centers that receive no funding and are organized and operate on an informal basis.

The categories in which the least percentage of funds were utilized are communications and facilities. Monies expended for communications ranged from 35% to 2%. Formal systems of communication are likely to be required by only the largest centers, thus accounting for the range of funds utilized for this purpose. Funds utilized for facilities ranged from 30% to 1%. These figures may reflect the centers' affiliation, which may include facility usage, the governing structure which will dictate the facility need, or the purpose(s) of the organization.

The results of this research question are consistent with the

literature on teachers' centers that shows that just as no predictable or standard source of income exists, there is also, no standard or model for the utilization of funds (Bell & Peightel, 1976). As with teachers' centers, the purposes of the organization have an impact on how funds are utilized.

What Staffing Patterns are Principals' Centers Utilizing?

The principals' centers surveyed staffed their organizations in a number of ways. As indicated in Table 5 the centers are staffed by the following personnel: 1) Principals; 2) Volunteers; 3) Paid staff; 4) Graduate students; 5) University faculty, and; 6) Others as: consultants, secretaries, bureau director and assistant director, central office staff, director.

The most frequently cited method of staffing was with paid staff. Fifty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they hire personnel to staff their center. The range, in full-time equivalents, of paid staff members, varied from 14 to .05 persons. Thirty-three percent of the principals' centers paying staff members hire only one full-time employee. Only 16% of the centers hire more than five full-time people. These figures are consistent with the data on funding and governance indicating that those principals' centers with the largest amount of funds and most structured forms of governance expend the most monies for staffing.

It is interesting to note that only 8% of the respondents indicated that their center is staffed wholly or in part, by volunteers. The range varies from one volunteer to 20. Principals are utilized as staff members by 14% of the centers with full-time

Table 5

What Staffing Patterns Are Principals' Centers Utilizing?

	Principals FT Equiv		Volunteers FT Equiv		Paid Staff FT Equiv		Grad Students FT Equiv		Univ Faculty FT Equiv		Other FT Equiv	
#1					X	1						
#2			X	1								
#3					X	5						
#4					X	2			X	2		
#5					X	1			X	.25		
#6												
#7					X	1	X	3	X	3		
#8						- NA -						
#9	X	5/6							X	1/6		
#10					X	1.05						
#11											X Consultants	
#12					X	14						
#13					X	8					Secretarial	10
#14	X	2			X	3						
#15			X	20	X	1 1/4	X	3				
#16					X	3						
#17					X	1					Bureau Dir	2
											Asst Dir	
#18						- NA -						
#19	X	1									Central Office Staff	3/10
#20									X	1	Consultants	
#21	X	.05									State Dept Staff	.5
#22	X	3			X	4					Director	1

Table 5 (continued)

	Principals FT Equiv	Volunteers FT Equiv	Paid Staff FT Equiv	Grad Students FT Equiv	Univ Faculty FT Equiv	Other FT Equiv
#23			− NA −			
#24						Consultants
#25			− NA −			
#26			X 11.5			
#27			− NA −			
#28				X 1	X 1	
#29			X 1			
#30			− NA −			
#31		X 2	X 2	X 1		
#32			− NA −			
#33			X 1			
#34			X 1/3			

positions ranging from .05 person to three people.

Graduate students are utilized as staff by 11% of the centers and university faculty provide personnel in 17% of the centers surveyed. These figures are consistent with the data on principals' centers affiliation with other organizations. Those centers affiliated with a university or college have faculty and students as resources to draw upon for staffing purposes.

Forty-one percent of the principals' centers surveyed utilize more than one of the categories of personnel to staff their organization. There is no consistent staffing pattern or number of full-time positions utilized by these centers.

The data derived from this research question is consistent with the findings from the literature on funding and governance (Bell & Peightel, 1976). As in those areas, there is no predictable or standard model for staffing of principals' centers. Rather, the patterns vary in both the types of personnel utilized and the number of positions available within each other.

Who are the Participants in the Principals' Center?

The responses to this research question indicated that participants in the principals' centers surveyed include: 1) Principals; 2) Teachers; 3) Superintendents; 4) Coordinators, and; 5) Others, as: assistant principals, school districts, supervisors, university professors and program directors.

As indicated in Table 6, 52% of the centers membership includes several of the above categories. This is consistent with the literature showing that individuals may belong to a group for a number

Table 6

Who are the Participants in the Principals' Centers?

	Principals	%	Tchrs	%	Supts	%	Coordinators	%	Other	%
#1					---------N A---------					
#2	X	na			X	na	X	na	Asst Principals	na
#3									School Dists.	100
#4	X	90			X	5	X	5		
#5	X	40			X	55	X	5		
#6	X+ Asst Prin	100								
#7	X	100								
#8	X	80					X	20		
#9	X	100								
#10	X	85							mixed	15
#11	X	100								
#12			X	95					schools	5
#13	X	70							super-visors	30
#14					---------N A---------					
#15	X	80			X	10	X	10		
#16									varies w/ program	
#17					---------N A---------				admin.	NA
#18	X	NA								
#19	X	100								
#20	X	90	X	10						
#21	X	100								
#22	X	25					X	331/3	Director	1
#23					---------N A---------					
#24	X	NA			X	NA			X	NA
#25	X	70							Instruct Superv	30
#26	X	84			X	11			Vocational Sch Directors	5
#27	X	85							Superv	15
#28	X	85			X	10	X	5		
#29					---------N A---------					
#30					---------N A---------					

Table 6 (continued)

	Principals	%	Tchrs	%	Supts	%	Coordi-nators	%	Other	%
#31	X	90	X	5	X	5				
#32	X	NA							Univ Prof (2)	
#33	X	90					X	10		
#34	X	100								

of reasons including: they like the activity of the group; they like the people in the group; being in the group can satisfy needs lying outside of the group (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973). In addition, the literature points out that individuals may belong to a number of groups, and to each they bring their unique characteristics to meet their needs in that situation (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973). Thus, it is not surprising to note that membership in a principals' center is not limited to only principals. Professionals in other roles may also elect to participate if they believe that their needs can be fulfilled or if they view the activity as meaningful or the people congenial.

Teachers are members in only 8% of the principals' centers surveyed. The literature on membership points out that a group is perceived as the environment within which an individual moves; it provides the primary source of reference (Thelen, 1954). As indicated in the first research question, the most frequently cited purpose of the centers was to provide personal and professional development for its members. The professional growth needs of principals and teachers may overlap in some areas, but, for the most part, will differ. Thus, teachers may benefit from some of the activities and programs offered by a principals' center, but will have a limited number of their own personal and professional needs met in other activities and programs. Participation in principals' centers by teachers is minimal and is, therefore, consistent with both the literature on membership and the data on the stated purposes of the organizations.

Superintendents are members in 23% of the principals' centers. Though this figure is somewhat higher than that of teachers, it still

reflects a small number of participants. Once again, this can be attributed to the purposes of the organization being incongruent with the personal or professional needs of the individual. In addition, the literature indicates that an important element of a principals' center is that it provide activities and programs based on what prinipals want to know and do (Barth, 1981). There are no constraints in that setting, because principals occupy the same rung on the bureaucratic ladder, deal with many of the same problems and pressures and neither evaluate nor are evaluated by one another (Barth, 1981). The nature of the superintendent's position is discordant with this element. There is a defined bureaucratic hierarchy that exists between the two positions. Though there are advantages to be gained in providing opportunities for principals and superintendents to interact and exchange ideas and opinions, none of the principals' centers surveyed viewed that as a major purpose of their organization.

Coordinators are participants in 23% of the centers surveyed and others, including assistant principals, university personnel and supervisors participate in 32% of the centers. These figures again support the literature that asserts that the attractiveness of a group is increased if members believe that their needs can be fulfilled by belonging to that group (Naper & Gershenfeld, 1973).

Table 6a indicated the percentage of principals in each center from 1) Urban schools; 2) Suburban schools; 3) Rural schools. Seventy-nine percent of the centers have participants from more than one of those categories. This finding is consistent with the literature showing that one of the factors associated with the

Table 6a

Are the Principals Served by Your Organization From:

	Urban Schools	%	Suburban Schools	%	Rural Schools	%
#1	X	20	X	15	X	65
#2	X	NA	X	NA	X	NA
#3	X	25	X	50	X	25
#4	X	45	X	45	X	10
#5	X	15	X	75	X	10
#6	X	NA	X	NA	X	NA
#7	X	30	X	40	X	30
#8	X	NA	X	NA		
#9	X	20	X	20	X	60
#10					X	NA
#11	X	40	X	50	X	10
#12	X	30	X	70		
#13	X	25	X	50	X	25
#14	X	NA	X	NA	X	NA
#15	X	2	X	20	X	78
#16	X	5	X	30	X	65
#17	X	25	X	25	X	50
#18			X	100		
#19	X	30	X	70		
#20	X	20	X	60	X	20
#21	X	20	X	30	X	50
#22	X	NA	X	NA	X	NA
#23	--------------NA--------------					
#24	X	NA	X	NA	X	NA
#25	--------------NA--------------					
#26	X	30	X	30	X	40
#27	X	NA	X	NA		
#28	X	10	X	15	X	75
#29	--------------NA--------------					
#30	--------------NA--------------					
#31			X	100		
#32	X	NA	X	NA	X	NA
#33	X	1/3	X	2/3		
#34	X	70	X	20	X	10

professional growth of school principals is exposure to school leaders

from diverse settings. Those centers that draw a heterogeneous group

of people, each bringing a variety of experiences, ideas, and

backgrounds, expand the approaches to solving problems (Barth & Van

Der Bogart, 1984).

Eighty-five percent of the principals' centers, in the survey

population, have participants from suburban schools, 79% of the

centers have members from urban schools and 67% of the centers have

members from rural schools. These figures indicate that membership in

principals' centers is attractive to school leaders from all types of

settings. This data also supports the literature emphasizing a

consistent need for meaningful, practical, responsive assistance for

school leaders (Barth, 1981).

What Programs do the Principals' Centers Offer?

As indicated in Table 7 the types of programs offered by the

principals' centers surveyed ranged from: 1) Single events; 2)

On-going series; 3) Conferences; 4) Academic courses; 5) Support

groups; 6) Informal get-togethers, and; 7) Others, as: a week-long

academy, a ten-day summer experience, annual re-training programs, a

principals' assessment center, two-day institutes, seminars and

on-site consultations, provision of mini-grants for principals to do

workshops, dinner meetings, and year-long programs.

Of these categories the following four were identified most

frequently as the types of programs offered: 1) Single events; 2)

On-going series; 3) Conferences, and; 4) Support groups. The type of

program most frequently offered (61% of the respondents indicated that

Table 7

What Programs Do The Principals' Centers Offer?

	Single Event	On-Going Series	Conferences	Academic Courses	Support Groups	Informal Get-Togethers	Other
#1	X	X	X		X		
#2	X	X					
#3		X	X		X		
#4		X	X		X		
#5	X		X				
#6	X	X	X		X	X	Week-long academy
#7	X		X	X			
#8	X	X	X		X		
#9							10 day summer experience
#10	X	X			X	X	
#11							Annual re-training prog
#12	X	X	X	X	X	X	
#13	X	X	X	X	X		Principals Assess Cent
#14	X	X					Two-day Institutes
#15		X	X				Sems, On-Site Consults
#16	X		X				
#17			X				
#18					X		
#19		X			X		
#20						X	Summer Institute
#21		X	X		X		
#22	X	X	X		X	X	
#23				NO ANSWER			
#24	X		X				
#25	X	X	X		X		
#26	X	X					
#27	X	X	X			X	Mini-grants for principals to do workshops

Table 7 (continued)

	Single Event	On-Going Series	Conferences	Academic Courses	Support Groups	Informal Get-Togethers	Other
#28	X						
#29	X	X		X	X		
#30				NO ANSWER			
#31	X	X	X		X		
#32	X		X			X	
#33	X	X	X		X	X	Dinner Meetings
#34							Year-long program
Totals 21		20	20	4	16	8	10

68

this program format was utilized) was a single event. Experience and research are showing that increasing numbers of school leaders are investing in their own development. Principals are taking an active role in not only determining their professional development needs but are also providing a large part of that training (Barth, 1981). A single event program focusing on a specific need or topic facilitates this goal in that it addresses a defined problem or issue, involves limited preparation time by the presenter, allows for varied formats to accommodate different learning styles, interests and needs, and permits a larger variety of topics to be addressed and a greater number of individuals to be involved during the course of a year. This type of format also has its limitations. Because the presentation alone takes most of the session time, there is little opportunity for principals to ask questions, comment, share and bring their own resources into the session.

Both on-going series and conferences were identified by 58% of the respondents to the survey as the types of programs offered by their centers. An on-going series offers an opportunity for a more in-depth study of a topic than does a single event format. It also provides an opportunity for relationships to be established among a limited number of participants and enables members to bring their own resources, problems, and solutions to successive sessions. In contrast, conferences offer a type of format that encourages large numbers of participants to come together and interact on a less personal level. This is a low-risk event, in which people can be observers and takers rather than participants and givers. Both types

of programs offer opportunities for school leaders to be instrumental in their own training and growth.

Support groups constitute 16% of the programs offered by principals' centers. This type of program addresses a major purpose identified by principals' centers - to develop a network of mutual support. The literature shows that principals are very often coping with feelings of isolation. A support group provides an on-going resource to address the need for interaction and support and, in addition, provides a more intimate format for sharing experiences, concerns, ideas and successes (Barth, 1981).

Informal get-togethers account for the type of program offered by 23% of the principals' centers. A format of this type is limited in the amount of planning or leadership required and may loosely address a specific topic or issue.

Academic courses are offered by 11% of the centers surveyed. This is an area that has potential not only for centers affiliated with universities, but for others, as well. Current literature points out that principals have the capacity and ability to provide professional growth and encourage effective practice in their colleagues (Barth, 1981). The universities and colleges that traditionally have been the only source for academic courses have not been entirely successful in providing a meaningful, relevant curriculum for practitioners (Brown, 1974). Association with a principals' center may provide the needed impetus for universities and colleges to review and revise their traditional courses. In addition, principals' centers may serve as a resource for identifying

instructors and group leaders.

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents indicated that their center offers a variety of programs. This is consistent with the literature that emphasizes that individuals bring such different assumptions about learning, and such different needs and goals to activities and programs that no one type of program or format can satisfy or be comfortable for everyone (Levine, 1984). As a result, teaching and learning must be continually approached from a variety of perspectives and a range of program options and session formats must be offered.

How are Principals' Centers Evaluated for Effectiveness?

The following methods are utilized by the principals' centers surveyed to evaluate the effectiveness of their organization: 1) Annual evaluation by membership; 2) Annual evaluation by governing board; 3) Individual program or activity evaluation, and; 4) Others, as: an on-going dialogue, outside examination of effects of academic experiences, 60 day follow-up evaluation, and evaluation by program committee.

As indicated in Table 8, 88% of the centers utilized some method of evaluation. This is consistent with the literature showing that evaluation is an integral part of a process of growth (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973). When groups utilize evaluation as a means for modifying or changing goals, activities, or roles, they continue to grow in effectivenss - the extent to which a group is successful in attaining its task related purposes and objectives; and in efficiency - the extent to which a group satisfies the needs of its members

Table 8

How Are Principals' Centers Evaluated for Effectiveness?

	Annual Evaluation by Membership	Annual Evaluation By Governing Board	Individual Program or Activity Evaluation	Other
#1	X	X	X	
#2			X	
#3		X	X	
#4			X	
#5		X	X	
#6	X		X	
#7		X	X	
#8				On-going dialogue
#9	X	X	X	Outside examination of
#10	NO ANSWER			effects of Acad experience
#11	X	X		
#12			X	
#13		X	X	
#14			X	
#15	X		X	
#16	X		X	
#17			X	
#18	NO ANSWER			
#19				Perceived influence of rslts
#20	X			
#21			X	
#22	X		X	
#23			X	
#24				Informal
#25	X			
#26		X	X	60 day follow-up evaluation
#27			X	
#28			X	
#29			X	
#30	NO ANSWER			
#31	X	X	X	
#32	NO ANSWER			
#33	X	X		Evaluation by prog committee
#34				Unobtrusive measures
Totals	11	10	22	7

(Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973).

Forty-one percent of the respondents indicated that their principals' center utilizes more than one method of evaluation to measure the effectivenss and efficiency of their organization. Research data supports the development of evaluation methods that are relevant to the purposes and objectives of the group (Lippitt, 1961). The literature indicates that as a result of an on-going evaluation process groups may change because: they have gained knowledge about their resources; there is increased experience in working as a group; there may be an emergence of new standards; and the emotional level of the group may have changed (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973).

The method of evaluation most frequently utilized by the principals' centers surveyed is an individual program or activity evaluation. This is consistent with the literature showing that no one style or program format can be satisfying or comfortable for everyone and that activities must accommodate different learning styles, interests and needs (Barth & Van Der Bogart, 1984). Thus, an evaluation of individual programs and activities serves as a valuable resource for designing future programs that will be responsive to the needs and interests of the participants.

An annual evaluation by the membership is conducted by 32% of the centers. This type of evaluation tends to be broader in scope than an individual activity or program evaluation and focuses more directly on the purposes and objectives of the organization rather than being limited to only the programming aspect.

An annual evaluation by a governing board is utilized by 29% of

the principals' centers. As indicated in the second research question (How are principals' centers organized for governance?) 61% of the centers surveyed are governed by an advisory board or policy-making council. Thus, this evaluation method is limited to those centers employing this type of governing structure. It is interesting to note that this method is not utilized as the sole source of evaluation by any of the centers. Rather, respondents to the survey indicated that it is always used in conjunction with an annual evaluation by the membership, an individual program or activity evaluation or another method of evaluation. The focus of an evaluation by a governing board is limited by the number of responses it can elicit and is, therefore, not reflective of the needs and opinions of the entire membership.

The responses to this research question support the literature that indicates that development and implementation of a method of evaluation is integral to the ongoing growth and improvement of an organization (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973). There is, however, no consistent method of evaluation utilized by the principals' centers surveyed.

Additional Data

The following data were not specifically addressed by the research questions. They are, however, relevant to the study and provide additional information about the organization and operation of principals' centers.

Are There Any Other Organizations with Which Your

Organization is Affiliated?

As indicated in Table 9 principals' centers may be affiliated with other organizations. These include: 1) School districts; 2) University or colleges; 3) State Department of Education; 4) Teachers' center; 5) Principals' association, or 6) Others as: Council for Basic Education, School Board Association, Regional Service Centers, National Association, Regional Service Centers, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Elementary School Principals, Educational Service Centers, Development Council.

The most frequently cited organizations that the principals' centers surveyed are affiliated with are State Departments of Education (38%) and Universities (35%). Twenty-six percent of the principals' centers are affiliated with school districts, 23% are affiliated with principals' associations and 11% have an affiliation with a teachers' center. Only three (8%) of the centers have no affiliation with any other organizations. These three centers are informally organized with no governing structure or funding.

Forty-one percent of the respondents indicated that their centers are affiliated with more than one organization. There doesn't appear to be a consistent pattern to the types of organizations involved when there are multiple affiliations. Fifty percent of the principals' centers are affiliated with only one other organization. State Departments of Education and universities are cited equally as being the type of organizations most often associated with a principals' center when there is only one affiliation. School districts and

Table 9

Affiliation:

	School District	University	State Dept of Educ	Tchrs Ctr	Princ Assoc	Other	None
#1	X	X			X	ACSAS Admin Organiz	
#2							X
#3						Intermediate Unit	
#4	X	X	X			Council for Basic Ed, Inst for Ed Leadership, Ga Schl Bds Assoc, Ga Assoc of Ed. Leaders, Metro Coop Ed Services	
#5		X 2 major state U's	X				
#6					X	NASSP, NAESP	
#7		X		X		Regional Service Centers	
#8							X
#9	X	X	X		X		
#10				X			
#11		X	X			Case (Umbrella orgn of adminis assoc)	
#12							X
#13	X					NAESP, NASSP, NJ County Princ & Supervisors Assns	
#14			X			Fla Assoc of Schl Admin	
#15	X						
#16			X				
#17			X		X		
#18	X						
#19	X						
#20		X					
#21		X					
#22			X		X		
#23		X					

Table 9 (continued)

	School District	University	State Dept of Educ	Tchrs Ctr	Princ Assoc	Other	None
#24						Greater Wilmington Dev. Council	
#25			X				
#26			X				
#27	X				X		
#28	X		X		X	Educ Service Ctr	
#29		X	X	X			
#30			X				
#31		X					
#32		X					
#33						Coop Educ Servs	
#34				X			
Totals 9		12	13	4	7	11	3

teachers' centers were also listed as individual organizations
frequently affiliated with principals' centers.

Affiliation with another organization can provide a principals'
center with many benefits including: funding, personnel, facilities,
equipment and program resources. As indicated in the literature on
teachers' centers (Bell & Peightel, 1976) those organizations have
more formalized governing structures. On the other hand, principals'
centers having no affiliation with any other organization have greater
autonomy and control over all aspects of the centers' operation.
Clearly, though, given the positive aspects of both affiliation or
non-affiliation, the trend is for principals' centers to associate
with one or more organizations.

<u>To What Extent Are Principals Involved in the Following Activities?</u>

Principals are involved in a variety of activities within a
principals' center. These include: policy making, planning
activities, offering activities, budget decisions, day-to-day
management of the organization, fund-raising, evaluation of activities
and staffing. As indicated in Table 10, the amount of principals'
involvement in each of these activities varies from center to center.

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that principals
are greatly involved in policy making. Only in one center do
principals have no involvement in this area. It is important to note
that principals' centers with no formalized structure of governance or
financing would also have little or no reason to feature policy making
activities.

Ninety-one percent of the respondents indicated that principals

Table 10

To What Extent Are Principals Involved in the Following:

	Policy Making				Planning Activities				Offering Activities				Budget Decisions				Day-to-Day Management of Organization				Fundraising				Evaluation of Activities				Staffing			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
#1				X	X						X				X				X			X			X							X
#2	No pol				X				X				no budg				none				none				X				none			
#3		X					X		X						X				X			X			X							X
#4	X					X				X			X						X		X				X				X			
#5		X				X			X				X						X			X				X						X
#6	X				X				X				X				X					X			X				X			
#7	X				X					X				X				X			X				X					X		
#8	X				X				X				X				X				X				X				X			
#9	X				X				X				X				X					X			X				X			
#10	X				X	X			X				X				X					X			X						X	
#11		X					X				X				X		X					X				X						X
#12	NA				X				X				NA				NA				NA				X				X			
#13	X		X		X					X			X				X						X			X						X
#14		X				X				X					X				X				X		X						X	
#15						X			X				X						X		X				X							X
#16						X				X					X				X				X			X						X
#17	X				X				X				NA				NA				NA				X				NA			
#18	X				X				X				None				X				NONE				X				NONE			
#19	X				X				X				NA				X				NA				X				X			
#20		X			X						X				X				X				X		X							X
#21			X				X			X					X		X						X				X		X			
#22	X						X		X					X					X				X		X					X		
#23			X		X				NA				NA						X				X		X							X
#24	NA				X						X			X			NA				NA						X		NA			
#25	X				X				X				NA				NA				NA				X				X			

Table 10 (continued)

	Policy Making				Planning Activities				Offering Activities				Budget Decisions				Day-to-Day Management of Organization				Fundraising				Evaluation of Activities				Staffing			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
#26		X				X					X				X			X					X		X							X
#27	X				X				X				X				X				X				X				X			
#28	X				X				X				NA				NA					X			X							X
#29		X				X					X				X			X				X					X					X
#30		NA				NA			NA				NA				NA				NA				NA				NA			
#31	X				X					NA			X					X			NA				X						X	
#32	X				X				X				NA				NA				NA				X				NA			
#33	X				X				X									X				X			X				X			
#34		NA							X								NA				NA				NA				NA			

*Great amount
of involvement   no involvement

    1   2   3   4

are highly involved in planning activities. This is consistent with
the literature on principals' centers pointing out that these centers
are organized to facilitate activities emanating from the concerns,
needs, and aspirations of the principals themselves (Barth, 1981).
All of the centers have principals involved, to some degree, in
planning activities.

In light of the high percentage of principals involved in
planning activities it is not surprising to note that in 70% of the
centers surveyed, principals are also greatly involved in offering
programs and workshops. This is consistent with the literature
showing that principals are extremely capable of planning and
implementing their own professional development activities (Barth &
Van Der Bogart, 1984). In addition, the literature points out that
there is increased personal and professional recognition when
principals are involved as "producers as well as receivers of ideas,
services, and skills" (Barth & Van Der Bogart, 1984, p. 92). There is
a low percentage (2%) of centers that do not involve principals in
offering activities.

The percentage of principals' centers involving participants in
activities relating to budgeting varies from 20% of the centers where
members are greatly involved to 26% of the centers who do not involve
principals at all. Responses in this category reflect the method of
financing and amount of funds utilized by each center.

Of all the activities listed on the survey, principals are least
involved in the day-to-day management of the centers and in
fund-raising. Only 11% of the centers surveyed have principals

greatly involved in daily management activities. In contrast, 58% of the respondents indicated that principals have little or no involvement in this area. Fund-raising activities also do not elicit a great deal of involvement by principals. Five percent of the respondents indicated that there is a great amount of involvement by principals, while in 50% of the centers principals have little or no involvement in this area.

Responses to the survey indicated that in 85% of the centers principals are highly involved in evaluation. Only one center does not involve principals in this activity. The high percentage of involvement in this area is consistent with the literature emphasizing the importance of on-going evaluation (La Plant & Doresh, 1984; Napier & Gershenfeld, 1973; Lippitt, 1961).

Survey responses indicated that in the area of staffing 23% of the centers have principals greatly involved while in 23% of the centers principals have no involvement in activities relating to staffing.

Responses to this question indicated that the activities within a principals' center that principals are most involved in are: planning, offering programs and evaluation. These findings are consistent with the literature stating that the essential idea of a principals' center is that its activities are initiated and directed by principals, for principals (Carmichael, 1982); and, for the purpose of bringing school leaders together to take an active role in not only determining their professional development needs but also in providing a large part of that training (Barth, 1981).

Summary

This chapter presented and analyzed data for the purpose of studying the organization and operation of principals' centers in the United States.

From these data it can be concluded that there is no standard model of a principals' center. Of the 34 responses to the survey instrument, no two were exactly the same. There is only one characteristic that appears in all of the centers surveyed – a stated purpose for organization. In all other areas each principals' center is defined by its own unique characteristics.

Chapter IV presents a summary, conclusions, and recommendations based on this data.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The focus of this study was to investigate the concept of the principals' center as a resource for the professional growth of school leaders. A survey of the organization and operation of principals' centers located throughout the United States was conducted. Identification of the population to be included in the study was derived from a listing of principals' centers compiled by the Harvard University Principals' Center. Additions to that list were obtained from a survey of the literature related to programs currently operating for the purpose of professional development of school leaders. Forty-one principals' centers were identified.

The following research questions provided the focus for an analysis of the organization and operation of each center:

1) For what purposes are principals' centers organized?

2) How are principals' centers organized for governance?

3) How are principals' centers funded?

4) How are the funds utilized?

5) What staffing patterns are principals' centers utilizing?

6) Who are the participants in the principals' centers?

7) What programs do the principals' centers offer?

8) How are principals' centers evaluated for effectiveness?

A questionnaire was developed as the means of data-gathering. In addition to the research questions the questionnaire included questions that would provide data relevant to the development of a model of a principals' center. Both forced response and narrative response items were included in the questionnaire format.

After field testing the questionnaire, revisions were made. The survey instrument, accompanying cover letter and pre-addressed post-paid envelope were then mailed to the directors of the principals' centers identified as the population of the study. A follow-up letter was sent to those directors not responding within the given time frame.

Questionnaires were completed by 34 centers. As the survey instruments were received they were coded by number. To tabulate the responses to the questionnaire the items were categorized to answer the research questions. Tables were formulated to summarize both the research questions and additional relevant data. A narrative description of the findings was written to accompany each of the tables.

Based on the responses to the questionnaire, conclusions were drawn and implications about the function of principals' centers as a means of providing professional development opportunities for principals were identified.

Conclusions

The investigation led to conclusions relating to the purposes of the study as stated in the first chapter. Each of the research questions provided a focus for the conclusions to be discussed:

1) <u>For what purposes are principals' centers organized?</u>

All of the principals' centers surveyed have a defined purpose or purposes. The major purpose of many of the principals' centers surveyed is to provide opportunities for personal and professional· development. As evidenced by the results of this survey, recognition of the necessity of providing and sustaining the professional growth of principals is resulting in increased support and help for educational leaders.

In addition to providing opportunities for personal and professional development a number of the centers indicated that a purpose of their organization is to identify the expressed needs of principals and to provide inservice activities and programs that will address these needs. Programs based on the needs of the learners are acknowledged to be more effective than those prescribed from outside sources. Thus, the goal to provide personal and professional development opportunities is being supported by programs and activities based on the self-identified needs of the participants.

Although each of the principals' centers surveyed has a purpose there is no standard number or type of purpose(s) and no consistent goals. It is interesting to note that having a defined purpose is the only common feature that exists among the centers. Each centers' method of organizing and operating are different in every other aspect.

2) <u>How are principals' centers organized for governance?</u>

The governing structures of the principals' centers surveyed varied from formal systems of governance to informal agreements. Two

factors that appeared to influence the structure of governance implemented were: the size of the organization; and the amount of financial resources it has. Results of this study indicated that those principals' centers that bring members together on an informal basis, that are single controlling units with minimal resources, generally have loosely knit governing structures or none at all. In contrast, principals' centers that involve the cooperation of two or more institutions or organizations and have greater financial resources generally have policy-making boards.

The type of governing structure utilized by many of the centers is an advisory board or policy-making council. The composition of these boards varies in the number of members included and the positions held. The responsibilites and activities of board members also vary.

Formalized by-laws, as part of the structure of governance, were developed by several principals' centers. As was the case with the type of governing structure utilized, the size of the organization and the amount of financial support it receives appear to be the factors determining the need for a formalized set of by-laws.

The importance of having a governing structure to effectuate the coordination of the resources of the organization is recognized by nearly all of the principals' centers surveyed. Although there is no standard form of governance the fact that all but a few of the centers have some type of governing structure demonstrates the importance of this characteristic of principals' centers.

3) <u>How are principals' centers funded?</u>

Funding of principals' centers appears to come from a wide variety of sources. The one source of funding most frequently cited by respondents to the survey is a State Department of Education. Several of the principals' centers receive all of their funding from this source. More than half of the centers surveyed, however, receive funding from more than a single source. There doesn't appear to be a consistent pattern to the combination of sources or the amount of funds from each. None of the centers, in the survey population, are supported by federal funds. This reflects the shifting of focus from the federal government to the states and individual districts and schools as the critical forces for change and improvement of local schools. Only three of the centers receive no funding at all. These centers are informally organized with no governing structure, formalized system of evaluation, or consistent leadership.

The principals' centers surveyed received funding from a number of sources with amounts of revenue ranging from minimal to substantial amounts. Thus, there doesn't appear to be a standard source of financial support for principals' centers.

4) <u>How are the funds utilized?</u>

The principals' centers surveyed utilized their funds in a variety of ways. The most frequently cited category for the utilization of funds was programs. The frequency of response in this area is consistent with the number of principals' centers that stated that a major purpose of their organization was to provide members with opportunities for personal and professional development. Only two

centers utilized their funds for a single purpose. In each case all of the funds were used exclusively for programs. Three of the centers expended no funds at all. These are the same principals' centers that receive no funding and are organized and operated on an informal basis. A large number of centers utilized their funds for multiple purposes. There doesn't appear to be a consistent pattern to the ways monies are expended or the amount of funds utilized for the varying purposes.

Just as no predictable or standard source of funding existed among the principals' centers studied, there was, also, no standard pattern or model for the utilization of funds.

5) <u>What staffing patterns are principals' centers utilizing?</u>

The principals centers studied staff their organizations in a number of ways. Over half of the centers hire at least one full-time person to staff their organization. The trend appears to be that those principals' centers with the largest amount of funds and most formalized governing structures expend the most monies for staffing. Few of the centers turn to volunteers or practicing principals as staff. Those centers affiliated with a university or college have faculty and students as resources to draw upon for staffing purposes. Many of the centers are staffed by personnel from several of the categories listed above.

As evidenced from the data there is no predictable model for staffing of principals' centers. The pattern varies in both the types of personnel utilized and the number of positions available within each center.

6) Who are the participants in the principals' centers?

Participants in principals' centers may include practitioners who are not principals. Clearly, professionals, in roles other than principal, elect to participate in activities and programs offered by principals' centers. The number and type of programs that they attend vary according to their professional and social needs and interests.

Teachers are members in only three of the principals' centers. The professional development needs of principals and teachers may overlap in some areas, but, for the most part, differ. Thus, teachers may benefit from some of the activities and programs offered by a principals' center but the opportunties are limited.

Superintendents also have limited their participation in principals' centers. In addition to not having their specific needs and interests addressed, the position of superintendent on the bureaucratic ladder may add constraints to the interaction between participants who are principals. Coordinators, assistant principals, university personnel and supervisors also comprise a small percentage of members in principals' centers. Again, the attractiveness of membership in this type of group is limited for those not in the role of principal.

The number of principals' centers that draw participants from rural, suburban and urban schools is high, thus emphasizing the need for meaningful, practical assistance for school leaders in all geographic areas. Heterogeneity among members of a principals' center is desired. When members contribute their own unique experiences, ideas and backgrounds it is possible to achieve a broader perspective

when viewing common concerns or problems.

Before joining a group, potential participants must like the activity of the group, the people in the group and the group must provide a means to satisfy personal needs. Principals' centers that facilitate activities and programs emanating from the concerns, needs and goals of its members are successful in attracting participants and sustaining membership in the organization.

7) <u>What programs do the principals' centers offer?</u>

A variety of programs are offered by principals' centers. The type of program most frequently offered by the centers surveyed is the single event. This type of format focuses on a specific topic or defined issue, allows for varied settings to accommodate different learning styles, interests and needs, and permits a larger variety of topics to be addressed and a greater number of individuals to be involved during the course of a year. This format also has its limitations. Because the presentation alone takes up most of the session time, there is little opportunity for participants to ask questions, comment, share, and bring their own resources into the session.

Both an on-going series format and conferences are other popular types of sessions offered by principals' centers. An on-going series offers an opportunity for members to spend a longer period of time to develop a more thorough understanding of a topic and enable the participants to share and bring their own resources, problems and solutions to successive sessions. In addition, it also provides an opportunity for relationships to be established among a limited number

of members. In contrast, conferences offer a type of format that
encourages large numbers of participants to come together and interact
on a less personal level. This is a low-risk type of event, in which
people can be observers and takers rather than participants and
givers. Both types of programs offer opportunities for school leaders
to be involved in their own training and professional growth.

Close to half of the principals' centers in the study facilitate
the formation of support groups. This type of program becomes a
resource for small groups of principals to identify common problems,
discuss approaches and techniques to resolve these problems, share
experiences, ideas and successes.

More than three-quarters of the centers surveyed offer a variety
of programs and formats. There is increased recognition that
individuals bring differing assumptions about learning and such
differing needs and goals to activities and programs that no single
format or type of program can satisfy or be comfortable for all
participants. As a result, the principals' centers are approaching
learning from a variety of perspectives and are offering a range of
program options and session formats.

8) How are principals' centers evaluated for effectiveness?

Over three-quarters of the centers surveyed employ some method of
evaluation. Recognition that evaluation is integral to continued
growth and change is resulting in continuing emphasis on this
dimension of group process. Fourteen of the principals' centers
utilize more than one method of evaluation to measure the
effectiveness and efficiency of their organization.

The individual program or activity evaluation is the method of assessment most frequently used by the principals' centers in the survey population. This form of evaluation provides immediate feedback about the effectiveness of a program or activity and serves as a valuable resource for designing future programs that are responsive to the needs, interests and learning styles of the participants.

An annual evaluation by the members is conducted by several of the centers. Broader in scope than an individual program or activity assessment, this type of evaluation focuses more on the purposes and goals of the organization. An annual evaluation by a governing board is limited to those centers that are governed by an advisory board or policy-making council.

Though the principals' centers surveyed generally support the tenet that development and implementation of a method of evaluation is integral to the ongoing growth and improvement of their organization, there is no consistent method of evaluation utilized by all of the centers.

Recommendations/Principals' Center Model

As a result of this study a model for the formation of a principals' center has been developed. The focus of this plan is organized around the research questions that formed the basis of this study. The recommendations for this model will, therefore, be presented in the same format. Additional data not specifically addressed by the research questions, but gathered from the survey instrument, has also been utilized in the development of this plan.

This model is based on an affiliation between a university and a principals' center. The data from this study point out many advantages to having a university in partnership with a principals' center: a university can provide academic and physical resources; it attracts a wide variety of individuals and offers a wealth of sources of information, human energy and knowledge. In addition, a university is highly visible, it is linked with the world of research, has ongoing support from alumni, has fund-raising capabilities and there is an emphasis on writing and publication. In contrast to the number of advantages to affiliating with a university, the greatest disadvantages to such a partnership center around the questions of purpose, governance, and identity. When ownership is shared, purpose and governance must also be shared. Principals lose the privilege of complete autonomy, but gain in the areas described above. On balance, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages and the recommended model is based on an affiliation with a university.

1) <u>Organization</u>

The primary purpose of the principals' center is to provide opportunities for practicing school leaders to engage actively in their own personal and professional development. To support this purpose the activities of the center should be planned to:

A) Encourage principals to:

    1) sponsor and lead workshops and discussions;

    2) provide support to each other in dealing with issues of concern;

    3) share resources related to professional growth.

B) Provide participants with knowledge and skills that can be implemented in their schools.

C) Encourage an exchange of ideas between school practitioners and university students and faculty.

D) To encourage and assist others committed to the professional development of principals to establish their own models for professional growth.

2) <u>Governance</u>

An advisory board should be created to oversee the activities of the center. Members should be selected to represent both the university and the principals. The composition of the advisory board may include the following representation:

A) Director – appointed by the university

B) Assistant Director – appointed by the university

C) Graduate Student – appointed by the university

D) Chicago Principal – (public); High School

E) Chicago Principal – (non-public); High School

F) Suburban Principal – (public); High School

G) Suburban Principal – (non-public); High School

H) Chicago Principal – (public); Middle School

I) Chicago Principal – (non-public); Middle School

J) Suburban Principal – (public); Middle School

K) Suburban Principal – (non-public); Middle School

L) Chicago Principal – (public); Elementary School

M) Chicago Principal – (non-public); Elementary School

N) Suburban Principal – (public); Elementary School

O) Suburban Principal - (non-public); Elementary School

Geographic representation may be another factor in determining the composition of the advisory board.

School leader representatives on the advisory board should be selected by the current board from those members expressing an interest in serving on the board. New members for the board should be solicited each year (the month to be determined).

An individual term on the advisory board should last two years with approximately half of the board being replaced each year.

Formalized by-laws should be written if the size and financial resources of the organization warrant their development.

3) Funding sources

Funding of the principals´ center may come from the following four sources:

    A) Membership fees

        1) Individual (The amount to be determined)

        2) System - allowing groups of principals within a school system to join at a reduced rate (The amount to be determined)

    B) Support from the university

    C) Foundation and corporate grants

    D) Conference revenue

4) Expenditure of funds

Funds may be expended in the following areas:

    A) Programs

    B) Communications - printing, mailing, etc.

C) Staffing

D) Supplies

E) Refreshments

Budgeting responsibilities should be a function of the advisory board.

5) <u>Staffing</u>

The day-to-day responsibilities of maintaining a principals' center are varied and time consuming, yet integral to the success of the organization. Because of the demands of the principals' job, practitioners have a limited amount of time to devote to the daily operation of a principals' center. The alternative to having principals involved in the day-to-day activities is hiring staff to provide these services. The trade-off is less intimate involvement of members but increased ease and speed of services.

The size of the staff and the amount of time each staff member expends on the daily operation of the center should be determined by the size of the membership and the number of programs and activities planned. For the first year of operation, it should be anticipated that a Director, Assistant Director and a graduate student would be employed half time by the principals' center. Part-time secretarial help may also be needed.

6) <u>Participants</u>

Membership in the principals' center should be open to anyone who supports the purposes and goals of the center and pays the membership fee. In order to encourage diversity among its membership, participants should be drawn from private, public, parochial,

elementary, middle and high schools. In addition there should be representation from urban, suburban and rural communities and people at all stages of professional development. University students and faculty should be encouraged to participate in all activities.

7) Programs

A program advisory board composed of members from the central advisory board should work with staff members to plan the centers' programs. The program advisory board should conduct needs assessments to identify areas of interest or concern to members, select program themes, and suggest program formats and speakers. Staff members should have the responsibility of scheduling programs, selecting speakers and determining formats.

Because the central theme of a principals' center is that of a place where school practitioners play a key role in their own professional development, principals should participate fully in the presentation of programs. A network of "people resources" should be developed through membership surveys and personal recommendations. University faculty may also be a resource for presenting programs or facilitating activities.

The place and time of program events should vary according to the nature of the activity. Whenever possible sessions should be held at the university. Meeting at the university provides a central location, a neutral setting and an environment that is removed from the principals' daily workplace. A public school setting may also inhibit some of the social interaction that can occur in a more neutral environment.

A variety of format options and program activities should be planned. These may include: _workshops, special events_ or _dinner meetings_ which are characterized as individual events featuring a speaker and large numbers of members; _on-going series_ that meets several times with the same group leader, topic, and participants; _case-study sessions_ using real-life situations summarized in writing, distributed and read in advance and then discussed and analyzed by participants; _collegial circles_ which bring together three to five administrators who will meet on a regular basis to identify common problems and concerns and discuss strategies to resolve these problem areas; _peer pairs_ which would team two principals to identify common problems, strengths and personal characteristics and work toward establishing a confidential sharing of concerns and reactions; _summer institutes_ that bring together a limited number of participants to interact on a more sustained basis. A residential setting, designated theme, group facilitators and careful planning are essential ingredients for this format. In addition, a _materials exchange_ could be established. This service would have two dimensions: 1) facilitate the sharing and exchange of operational materials, i.e. policy booklets, handbooks, newsletters, bulletins, scheduling techniques, 2) accumulate periodicals, books, journals that can be housed at the univerity for members to sign out.

8) _Evaluation_

Regular assessment of individual programs and speakers should be planned. Evaluation forms should be completed at the conclusion of every activity to determine the effectiveness of the program, topic,

speaker or facilitator, and format. The program advisory board should
review these evaluations regularly and planning of future activities
should reflect the information gleaned from these assessments.

An annual evaluation and needs assessment of the entire
membership should be conducted to assist in planning for the next
year, to address key issues of the organization, and to provide input
to the adivsory board.

Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of this study, several recommendations are presented
to researchers for further study.

1) Researchers should study what impact a principals´ center has
on schools and classrooms to determine if the belief that principals
who are supported in their personal and professional growth have an
effect on schools.

2) From the perspective of the individual, there should be a
study of the impact of membership in a principals´ center in relation
to personal and professional development.

3) Study the feasibility and implications of principals´ centers
providing preservice training and academic courses for school leaders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abt Associates. (1979). A proposal for the development of case study training materials on the role of the principal. (Unpublished)

Amir, Y. (1969). The effectiveness of the Kibbutz-born soldier in the Israel defense forces. Human Relations, 22 (4), 333-344.

Aronson, E. (1970). Who likes whom and why. Psychology Today, 4 (3), 48-50.

Aronson, E., & Linder, D. (1965). Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 1 (2), 156-171.

Barth, R. (1981). A principals' center. Journal of Staff Development, 2 (1), 53-69.

Barth, R. (1982). Now what? Principal, 61 (4), 8-9.

Barth, R. (1984). The professional development of principals. Educational Leadership, 42 (2), 93-94.

Barth, R., & Levenson, M. (1981). The principals' center. Harvard Graduate School of Education Association Bulletin, 26 (1), 8-9.

Barth, R., & Van Der Bogart, R. (1984). What is a principal's center? Educational Leadership, 42 (4), 91-93.

Bell, H., & Peightel, J. (1976). Teacher centers and inservice education. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Berkowitz, L. (1954). Group standards, cohesiveness and productivity. Human Relations, 7, 509-519.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1975). Federal programs supporting educational change: The findings in review (Vol. 4). Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change: Factors affecting implementation and continuation (Vol. 7). Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change: Implementing and sustaining innovations (Vol. 8). Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Best, J. (1970). Research in education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Brookover, W.B., & Lezotte, L.W. (1977). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.

Brown, C. (1974). The principal as learner. Principal, 53, 19-23.

Bunker, R. (1976). Open education as a humanistic approach. In T. Timmerman & J. Ballard (Eds.), Yearbook of humanistic education. Amherst: Mandala.

Bunker, R. (1977). Beyond inservice toward staff renewal. Journal of Teacher Education, 28.

Bunker, R. (1979). Staff renewal in an urban junior high. Middle School Journal, 10 (4).

Bunker, R., & Hruska, M. (1978). Inservice education: One approach. Massachusetts: State Department of Education.

Burrell, D. (1976). The teachers centre: A critical analysis. Educational Leadership, 33 (66), 422-427.

Buxton, A. (1979). A distinctive option in inservice: The teachers' center meets individual needs and institutional goals (Occasional Paper #5). San Francisco: Teachers' Centers Exchange.

Carmichael, L. (1982). Leaders as learners: A possible dream. Educational Leadership, 40, 58-59.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1968). Group dynamics. New York: Harper and Row.

Deutsch, M. (1959). Some factors affecting membership motivation and achievement motivation. Human Relations, 12, 81-85.

Devaney, K. (1977). Surveying teachers' centers - from grassroots beginnings to possibility of federal support (Occasional Paper #1). San Francisco: Teachers' Center Exchange.

Devaney, K., & Thorn, L. (1975). Exploring teachers' centers. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

DeVault, M. (1974). Teacher centers: An international concept. Journal of Teacher Education, 5 (1), 37-40.

Doresh, J.C., & LaPlant, J.C. (1984). Inservice for school administrators: A status report. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Edelfelt, R., & Lawrence, G. (1975). In-service education: The state of the art. In R.A. Edelfelt & M. Johnson (Eds.), Rethinking inservice education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37 (1), 15-24.

Edmonds, R. (1981). The characteristics of effective schools: Research and implementation. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Goldhammer, K., Becker, G., Withycombe, R., Doyel, F., Miller, E., Morgan, C., De Loretto, L., & Aldridge, B. (1971). Elementary school principals and their schools: Beacons of brilliance and potholes of pestilence. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Good, C. (1963). Introduction to educational research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Hampton, D., Summer, C., & Webber, R. (1982). Organizational behavior and the practice of management. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman & Co.

Homans, G. (1950). The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Hruska, M. (1977). Reconceptualizing inservice education: A teacher designed staff development program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Isaac, S. (1971). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp.

Jackson, J. (1959). Reference group processes in a formal organization. Sociometry, 22, 307-327.

Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1973). Concepts of teacher centers. Washington, D.C.: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service), No. ED 075 375.

Karius, G., & Prince, G. (1981). How principals respond to collegial teams: The Colorado Springs experience. Journal of Staff Development, 2 (1), 47-52.

Kelley, H.H. (1951). Communication in experimentally created hierarchies. Human Relations, 4, 39-56.

Lawrence, G. (1974). Patterns of effective inservice education. Florida: State Department of Education.

Levine, S. (1984). Principals' centers as contexts for professional development. Principals' Centers Exchange Newsletter, 2-3.

Levinson, C.V. (1984). Establishing a school executive management institute: Another opportunity for excellence. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Levinson, D. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lippitt, G. (1961). How to get results from a group. In L. Bradford (Ed.), Group development. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories.

Lo Presti, P. (1982). Building a better principal. Principal, 61 (4), 32-34.

Lott, A., & Lott, B. (1969). Liked and disliked persons as reinforcing stimuli. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11 (2), 129-137.

Mangers, D. (1978). The school principal: Recommendations for effective leadership. Sacramento: Task Force for the Improvement of Pre- and In-Service Training for Public School Administrators, The California Legislature.

Martin, P. (1977). A teachers' center for nine rural towns: Can grassroots grow from seeds planted on top? (Occasional Paper #2). San Francisco: Teachers' Centers Exchange.

Mazzarella, J. (1982). Portrait of a leader. Principal, 61 (4), 28-31.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McIntyre, K. (1979). Training programs for principals. Theory into Practice, 18 (1), 28-32.

Morris, V.C., Crowson, R., Hurwitz, E., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1984)(a). The urban principal: Middle manager in the educational bureaucracy. Phi Delta Kappan, 689-692.

Morris, V.C., Crowson, R.L., Porter-Gehrie, C., & Hurwitz, E. (1984)(b).

Principals in action. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

Napier, R., & Gershenfeld, M. (1973). Groups: Theory and experience.
    Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Nicholson, A., Joyce, B., Parker, D., & Waterman, F. (1976). The
    literature on inservice teacher education: An analytic review.
    Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, The National Dissemination
    Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 129734m).

Ninane, P., & Fiedler, F.E. (1970). Member reactions to success and
    failure of task groups. Human Relations, 23 (1), 3-13.

Nur, M. (1981). Collegial support groups: Principal development through
    networking. Journal of Staff Development, 2 (1), 35-46.

Olivero, J. (1980). The principalship in California: The keeper of the
    dream. Burlingame: Association of California School
    Administrators.

Pellico, L., Stevenson, K., & Surratt, T. (1984). Do it first, then
    talk about it: A principalship practicum. Phi Delta Kappan, 65,
    429.

Perry, W.G. (1968). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in
    the college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Quey, R.L. (1971). Functions and dynamics of group works. American
    Psychologist, 26 (10), 1081.

Rogers, V. (1976). Why teachers centers in the U.S.? Educational
    Leadership, 33 (6), 406-413.

Rubin, L. (1971). Authentic teacher growth. Educational Leadership,
    28 (7), 701-703.

Rubin, L. (1972). Improving in-service education: Proposals and
    perspectives for change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Rubin, L. (1978). The in-service education of teachers. Boston: Allyn
    & Bacon.

Seashore, S. (1954). Group cohesiveness in the industrial work group.
    Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration. New York: Harper &
    Row.

Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. (1981). What principals can do: Some
    implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta
    Kappan, 63, 178-182.

Snoek, J.D. (1959). Some effects of rejection upon attraction to the group. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Stotland, E. (1959). Determination of attraction to groups. Journal of Social Psychology. 49, 71-80.

Strother, D. (1983). Practical applications of research. Phi Delta Kappan, 293.

Thelen, H.A. (1954). Dynamics of groups of work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thornbury, R. (1974). Teachers' centers. New York: Agathon.

Tsouderos, J. (1955). Organizational change in terms of a series of selected variables. American Sociological Review. 20, 207-210.

University Council for Educational Administration. (1973). The preparation and certification of educational administrators: Summary of a UCEA commission report. Columbus, Ohio.

Van Dalen, D. (1973). Understanding educational research: An introduction. New York: McGraww Hill.

Watt, H. (1979). Teachers stages of development. Vermont: (Mimeographed).

Wicker, A.W. (1969). Size of church membership and members support of church behavior settings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 13 (3), 278-288.

Yeomans, E. (1972). Preparing teachers for the integrated day. Boston: National Association of Independent Schools.

Zigarmi, D. (1981). Leadership and school climate: A data-based approach to administrative training. Journal of Staff Development, 2 (1), 93-115.

APPENDIX A

Dear

       I am presently conducting a study to analyze the organization and operation of principal-centered professional development programs throughout the country. This study is being conducted as part of my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago.

       In order for me to ascertain the current status of "Principal Centers" (the term I am using to identify programs which focus on the growth and development of principals as leaders), I am asking you to complete the accompanying questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by _____, 1984.

       In the analysis and reporting of the data, specific institutions will not be identified.

       Thank you for taking the time to provide this information.

               Sincerely,

               Barbara Unikel

BU:mlw
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

Name of Organization_____

Address_____

_____Phone No._____

Contact Person_____

What are the major purposes of your organization?_____

_____

_____

_____

Are there any other organizations with which your organization is affiliated?

	Yes
School District	___
University	___
State Dept. of Education	___
Teachers' Center	___
Principals' Association	___
Other (Please Specify)	_____

What is the governing structure of your organization? Please describe the decision-making process, including the number of individuals involved, the voting process, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Does your organization have by-laws? Yes___ No___. Please send a copy of your by-laws with the completed questionnaire.

To what extent are school principals involved in the following activites in your organization:

	Great Amount of Involvment		No Involvment	
Policy Making	1	2	3	4
Planning Activities	1	2	3	4
Offering Activiites	1	2	3	4
Budget Decisions	1	2	3	4
Day-to-day Management of the Organization	1	2	3	4
Fund-raising	1	2	3	4
Evaluation of Activities	1	2	3	4
Staffing	1	2	3	4

Is your organization funded by:

	Yes	Percentage of Total Budget
Business	___	_____
University	___	_____
Private Foundation	___	_____
State Dept. of Education	___	_____
School District	___	_____
Federal Funds	___	_____
Membership Fees	___	_____
State Associations	___	_____
Workshop Fees	___	_____
Other (Please Specify) _____		
	Total:	100%

Do your members pay a fee to belong? Yes___ No___ Amount_____

How are the funds utilized?

	Percentage
Staffing	
Professional	_____
Clerical	_____
Programs	_____
Communication	
Newsletters, mailings, etc.	_____
Facilities	_____
Other (Please Specify) _____	
Total:	100%

How is your organization staffed? (Express in full-time equivalents)

Principals	_____
Volunteers	_____
Paid Staff	_____
Graduate Students	_____
University Faculty	_____
Other (Please Specify) _____	

What facilities does your organization use for its activities? (i.e. meetings, programs, planning sessions, office, etc.)

	Percentage
Schools	_____
University	_____
Business	_____
State Dept. of Education	_____
Other (Please Specify) _____	

Membership is composed of:

	Percentage
Principals	_____
Teachers	_____
Superintendents	_____
Coordinators	_____
Others (Please Specify) _____	

Number of Members _____

Have you established upper limits on membership? Yes___ No___

   If yes, what number is your membership limited to?_____

Are the school principals served by your organization from:

	Percentage
Urban Schools	_____
Suburban Schools	_____
Rural Schools	_____

The types of programs offered are:

	Yes
Single Event	_____
On-Going Series	_____
Conferences	_____
Academic Courses	_____
Support Groups	_____
Informal Get-togethers	_____
Others (Please Specify)	_____

Please respond to the next two questions by stating the title or position held by the person(s) in charge of these areas.

   Who decides on the programs?_____

_____

   Who is responsible for making the arrangements for the programs?_____

_____

What methods are utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of your organization?

	Yes	No
Annual Evaluation by Membership	____	____
Annual Evaluation by Governing Board	____	____
Individual Program or Activity Evaluation	____	____
Other (Please Specify)		

Please send any examples of literature you might have, i.e. statement of written philosophy, brochure of activities, etc. that are relevant to this study.

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the findings of this study, please check here /__/. I would be pleased to send you the results.

Thank you

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Barbara W. Unikel has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor, Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Philip Carlin
Associate Professor and Chairman, Administration and
Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Elizabeth Hebert
Lecturer, Administration and Supervision, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

April 19, 1985   _Max A Bailey_
Date   Director's Signature