Dissertations
Theses and Dissertations

1984

A Description of the Practices of High School Principals in Designing Staff Development Programs in DuPage County

Robert F. Jerrick
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

A Description of the Practices of High School Principals in Designing Staff Development Programs.

This dissertation investigated the similarity between the current staff development practices of the high school principals in DuPage County, Illinois, and the staff development practices of the RPTIM Model of Steven Ray Thompson. Dr. Thompson developed and validated the RPTIM model – Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, Maintenance – in 1981.

The RPTIM Model consists of thirty-eight staff development practices and ten staff development assumptions. Dr. Thompson surveyed professors and practitioners of staff development practices. They responded to the model and indicated that these practices and assumptions are essential to effective staff development programs.

Also investigated were the elements of change, adult learning, and the principal and his/her part in the successful initiation and implementation of staff development activities.

A meaningful difference was discovered between the responses of the practitioners and the principals of the DuPage County High Schools on many of the practices of this model. Some areas of disagreement were:

A) the time needed for the staff development process;

B) the lack of a research-based perspective on the part of the principal;

C) the lack of peer help in the in-service process;

D) the absence of individual staff member input.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Melvin P. Heller, director of the dissertation committee, for his guidance and encouragement throughout the process. In addition, the author wishes to thank Dr. Philip P. Carlin and Dr. Karen Gallagher for their help and advice as members of the dissertation committee.

For their support and cooperation, the author also wishes to thank Mr. Raymond W. Livingston, Superintendent of District 87 and Mr. Bert Weber, Principal of Glenbard North High School.

Special thanks are also extended to Rose Soldat for typing this manuscript, and Ron O'Brien and Mike Riley for their assistance.

Finally, the author must express his gratitude to the five most important people who helped accomplish this task: his wife, Jan, and his children, Julie, Steve, Chris, and Joanne.

VITA

Robert F. Jerrick, the son of Robert F. and Rita M., was born in Chicago, Illinois on September 2, 1942. He attended St. Frances of Rome Grade School and St. Ignatius High School, from which he graduated in 1960. He attended DePaul University from which he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Latin in 1964, and a Master of Arts degree in Latin in 1967. He also attended Northeastern Illinois University from which he received a Master of Arts degree in Guidance and Counseling in 1973. Robert Jerrick also attended the University of Illinois taking course work in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Robert Jerrick taught at St. Patrick High School and Fenwick High School from 1964 to 1968. Since 1968 he has worked as teacher, counselor, administrative assistant, and currently, Dean of Students at Glenbard North High School in Carol Stream, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, PROCEDURE, AND LIMITATIONS

Gary Griffin, of the Research and Development Center for Teacher
Education at the University of Texas, and editor of the Eighty-Second
Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, entitled
STAFF DEVELOPMENT, begins:

> There appears to be little argument that schools, particularly
> those in the public sector, are in serious difficulty. That difficulty
> has manifested itself as concern for quality education, debate regarding
> what schools can and cannot accomplish, confusion over what schooling
> should and should not make present to students, competition among
> differing claims about the most appropriate delivery of instruction,
> sharp disagreements regarding the most appropriate governance and decision
> making structures, and the overall ability (intellectual and institutional)
> of the schools to contribute significantly to the quality of citizens'
> lives in a less than static society.[1]

Since the release of A NATION AT RISK, from the National Commission
on Excellence in Education, which documented the rising tide of mediocrity
in education in this country, the public is demanding, even more, that the
quality of education improve. The purpose of all schools is to increase
the achievement of all students and the research indicates that the one
most influential factor in effecting this purpose is the teacher.
Teaching is living and working toward the optimum growth of students.
John Moffitt, in speaking about staff development said: "Injustices
to children and youth will be certain unless education for teachers
increases in quality and quantity.[2] Gary Griffin also wrote that:

> Schools are in a crisis.... and what better means to respond to the
> crisis than to provide ways for persons in the process to grow and
> understand and change? Staff development programs can be conceived of
> as the most potentially effective means to promote that growth,
> understanding, and change.[3]

[1] Gary Griffin, ed., Staff Development(Chicago: The University of Chicago
   Press, 1983),p.1.

[2] John Clifton Moffitt, In-Service Education for Teachers(New York: The Center

[3] Griffin, Staff Development, p.4.

Staff development is the totality of educational and personal experiences that contribute toward the teachers being more competent and satisfied. E. Lawrence Dale, Director of Personnel & Staff Relations at the Richland Public Schools, Richland, Washington, defined staff development: "staff development is planned activity directed to teachers for the purpose of helping them to increase their own cognitive skills and to improve their techniques of teaching in order to improve students' academic achievement.[4]

Teachers are a most influential factor in bringing about the improvement of student achievement because, while different persons have different curricular perspectives, the teacher has the final say about what is actually taught. Gary Price and Thomas Romberg, professors at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in writing about the influential position of the teacher, advise: " That fact (that teachers have the final say) makes teachers' perceptions of a new curriculum critical to the determination of whether and how it is implemented."[5] In order for teachers, however, to successfully execute their central role, it is imperative for the principal in the local school building to lead. For the concept of staff development to be integrated within all of the activities of the school, the importance of staff development must come down from the principal to all teachers. "The principal is the key element for the adoption and continual use of new procedures within a school.[6]

[4] E. Lawrence Dale, "What is Staff Development," Educational Leadership, (October, 1982), 31.

[5] Thomas A. Romberg and Gary G. Price, "Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development As Cultural Change," in Staff Development, ed by Gary Griffin (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983),p.158.

[6] Fred H. Wood, Frank O. McQuarrie Jr., and Steven R. Thompson,"Practitioners and Professors Agree on Effective Staff Development Practices", Educational Leadership, (October,1982), 29.

The researchers on effective schools, Edmonds, Rutter, Brookover and Lezotte, et al, have verified the observation that schools are rarely effective unless the principal is a good leader. How do effective principals lead and what do they do to bring about increased student achievement? Edmonds found that the principal has to work through his teachers to accomplish this task. He can not do it alone. He must engage with his staff in a spirit of collegiality. In this ever-changing society in which we find ourselves, the principal must ensure that he tends to the need of developing his staff so that they might be more capable of truly "educating" our students. He accomplishes this task through the staff development practices which he designs in collaboration with others.

Gordon Cawelti, Executive Director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, discussed behavior patterns drawn from the research description of principals of effective schools. He indicated, in his editorial in the February, 1984 issue of Educational Leadership, that effective principals have a sense of vision as to the kind of school and learning environment they intend to create. They articulate goals, direct-ions, and priorities, for their schools, to citizens, faculty, and students. Effective principals demonstrate ingenuity in convincing central office personnel, parent groups, business leaders, and others of the school's needs. These principals plan for school improvement and recognize that forward-looking leaders (effective principals) recognize that employees do best in a climate of trust and cooperative endeavor. Principals are a visible entity in all phases of school life and provide active support to teachers. They have knowledge of effective instuction and they

use this knowledge as the basis for setting new priorities as valuable

feedback for teachers. These behavior patterns of vision, resourcefulness,

knowledge of school improvement processes and instructional support and

monitoring will be reflected in their design of staff development practices.

PURPOSE

This dissertation will attempt to discover how principals design

their staff development practices. The RPTIM - Readiness, Planning, Training,

Implementation, Maintenance - model of Wood and Thompson was employed as

the investigative tool. Wood and Thompson determined what staff development

practices were effective when they distributed their survey of School-Based

Staff Development Practices to staff development practitioners in the

field and the members of the National Staff Development Commission.

An analysis of the results of that survey helped to determine what practices

were effective in designing staff development programs.

Michael Bakalis, in his book, A Strategy For Excellence, wrote of the

importance of staff development:

> "Somehow a way must be found to install in teachers a life-long love
> of learning. A way must be found to enable teachers to spend the
> time necessary to individualize programs for their students. A way must be
> found to deliver to all classroom teachers the advances that are occurring
> daily in the field of human learning. A way must also be found to convince
> teachers and administrators that they have a responsibility for their own
> evaluation which will be performed for the central purpose of improving
> the individual's teaching performance."[7]

The design of in-service education programs should strive to attain

the purposes of staff development. D. J. Johnson, in his 1971 publication

entitled Teachers' In-service Education, cited many reasons for developing

---

[7] Michael J. Bakalis, A Strategy For Excellence (Hamden, Connecticut:
Linnett Books, 1974), p. 152.

staff development programs: for the purposes of increasing knowledge, increasing skills, or improving teacher attitudes:

1) to increase the instructional capabilities of teachers;

2) to put teachers in touch with the research on teaching;

3) to enable teachers to share their problems, solutions, and expertise;

4) to give teachers a way to become aware of and consider the efforts of their teaching on students;

5) to extend knowledge;

6) for the consolidation and reaffirmation of knowledge, i.e., the consolidation of both the teachers' academic achievements and their professional philosophy and attitudes;

7) for the regular acquisition of new knowledge;

8) To gain an acquaintance with curricular developments;

9) to gain an acquaintance with psychological developments;

10) to obtain an acquaintance with the sociological base of education;

11) to gain an acquaintance with the principles of organization and administration;

12) for a repetition or extension of original pre-service education after intervals; positive retraining. Everywhere there is some recognition of the need regularly to "recharge the batteries of the teaching profession";

13) conversion courses - converting teachers from work with children at one stage of education, or of one age, to the somewhat different work of teaching children at another stage or of a different age;

14) to acquaint teachers with new aids; i.e., closed circuit TV, computers, etc.;

15) as an introduction to new methods;

16) to familiarize teachers with changes in local and national policy;

17) to enable teachers to understand the new relationship between the teachers and the taught; Goodlad, in his work "A Place Called School," had drawn the conclusion that teachers have judged children on criteria by which they were themselves judged when they were children;

18) To gain an appreciation of our cultural revolution - it is imperative that teachers - above all others - should be sensitized to the cultural modes that are now appearing and that are in conflict with those of an earlier generation;

19) to aid in the development of measuring and testing techniques;

20) to develop a technology of education - the understanding of the aids and conventional teaching which are the foundation of a technology of education;

21) to gain an acquaintance with and participation in education research;

22) to encourage international understanding and exchange.[8]

To accomplish all of these different purposes of staff development, many different models of in-service education have been developed. Regardless of the model, the research has shown that certain training activities will almost always be used in designing staff development programs:

A) diagnosing and prescribing;

B) giving information and demonstration;

---

[8] D. J. Johnson, Teachers' In-Service Education (New York: Pergamon Press, 1971), p. 16-28.

C) discussing application, and

D) coaching.

For most teachers and most skills being taught in in-service education programs, purposeful, structural practice and feedback activities seem to work best.

Researchers, especially Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, have found that teachers in workshops which utilized peer observation techniques improve more than did the teachers in workshops only, with no peer observation. Peer observation not only provides feedback, but its most important function is to stimulate analysis and discussion of the effects of teaching behavior in students. This peer observation should occur in an atmosphere of trust and collaboration.

Coaching functions, in any model, provide companionship, technical feedback, an analysis of application (extending executive control and attaining deep meaning) and provide for an adaptation to students.

The model applied in this dissertation is the RPTIM model of Fred Wood and Steven Ray Thompson - Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance. Their model of thirty-eight practices in designing staff development programs was validated in 1981. Practitioners in staff development throughout the country and the members of the National Staff Development Commission responded to the 38 practices and 10 assumptions contained in the RPTIM model. Their responses indicated that, if utilized, these practices and assumptions would yield effective staff development programs. The task in this dissertation will be to determine whether or not the DuPage County high school principals employ these practices. If they do, the conclusion that meaningful and effective staff development programs are being designed can be drawn.

The RPTIM model is comprised, basically of five stages:

Stage 1 - Readiness

In this stage, there is an emphasis on the selection and understanding of, and commitment to, new behaviors by a school staff or group of educators;

Stage 2 - Planning

The specific plans for an in-service program (to be implemented over a period of 3 to 5 years) are developed to achieve the desired changes or professional practice selected in Stage 1;

Stage 3 - Training

The specific plans for an in-service program, which were developed in Stage 2, are translated into practice;

Stage 4 - Implementation

The implementation stage focuses on insuring that the training becomes part of the ongoing professional behavior of teachers and administrators in their own work setting;

Stage 5 - Maintenance

The maintenance stage begins as new behaviors are integrated into daily practice. The aim of this final stage is to ensure that once a change in performance is operational, it will continue over time.

The design of staff development programs must incorporate the research findings about adult learning, the concept of change, and the role of the principal in effective schools. In chapter two of this dissertation, there will be a review of these elements along with a review of the principles of effective staff development.

John Goodlad said, "that our (educators) work, for which we will be held accountable, is to maintain, justify, and articulate sound, comprehensive

programs of instruction for children and youth."[9] "It is now time to put the right things at the center again. And the right things have to do with assuming comprehensive quality education programs in each and every school under our jurisdiction."[10]

Kenneth Howey and Joseph Vaughn wrote:

Staff development programs will increasingly become an endeavor pursued in relatively small working groups to focus on more specific needs; it will increasingly focus on teachers becoming more expert in fewer domains, and it is likely to be viewed increasingly as a rather natural and common form of cooperative functioning that can be embedded in the job, that is, joint problem-solving, curriculum development, and structural collegial observation and feedback within the school context.[11]

PROCEDURE

In order to gather appropriate data about principals' designs of staff development programs, the School-Based Staff Development Practices Inventory (Appendix A) was distributed to all high school principals - public and private - in DuPage County, Illinois. The principals were asked whether or not they employed the 38 practices of the RPTIM model. They were also asked to what degree they agreed or disagreed with the ten basic assumptions or beliefs of the model. A return of at least 80% of the surveys was seen as sufficient in order to draw meaningful conclusions about the practices of these principals in designing staff development programs from the point of view of the RPTIM model.

Upon receipt of at least 80% of the surveys, a stage by stage analysis

[9] John Goodlad, "Educational Leadership: Toward the Third Era," Educational Leadership, (January, 1978), 326.

[10] Ibid., p. 331.

[11] Kenneth R. Howey and Joseph C. Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development" in Staff Development, ed. by Gary Griffin (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983, p. 96.

was made of the principals' responses to the RPTIM model. Answers or conclusions will be sought to the following questions:

1) Are the effective staff development practices (as identified by the RPTIM model) acceptable, as essential, by the principals of the high schools of DuPage County?

2) What are the common barriers to effective staff development practices (as indicated by the principals' responses to the practices of the RPTIM model).

3) What are the commonly held assumptions about staff development practices (are they in agreement with the assumptions of the RPTIM model).

4) Are there differences between public and private high schools in the design of their staff development practices? (Based upon the principals' responses to the practices of the RPTIM model).

5) Are there any differences in design of staff development programs based upon the size of the school (number of teachers); the staff development experience of the principal; the budget allotted for staff development programs; the age of the principal. (Again, as indicated by the principals' responses to the RPTIM model.)

LIMITATIONS

Because this study is restricted only to schools in DuPage County, Illinois, caution should be taken when generalizations are made which apply to other schools in other parts of the country. Secondly, because the schools studied are secondary schools, caution should also be taken when applying the conclusions to other levels of education. Finally, since only one instrument was used to examine staff development practices, care should be exercised in placing too much reliance on its conclusions.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Today, there is a growing insistence upon more effective teaching which parallels the increasing complexity of our changing society. As a result of demands for improved instruction, changes, in education, occur all the time. In fact, one of the few constants is the fact that there is change. Because of this process, teaching, by its very nature, requires continuous adaptation; "Teachers must increase their aptitude to learn in new situations".[12]

Along with the requirements imposed by a more complicated social milieu, there are many other reasons for a clear staff development program which the research has uncovered:

1) There is not a more complicated, enervating or frustrating job in the world than teaching. To keep at it, most teachers need help and encouragement; staff development is an effective means to provide this encouragement;

2) All teachers need an outside observer of their work. Each has unintegrated behaviors that need to be examined through supervision and through staff development practices provided by outside others.

3) Teachers can model appropriate ways of interacting with students by the ways they interact with their staff in their own development and supervision programs;

4) Regular staff development and supervision may assist teachers in identifying problems and needs of a whole school setting before they become crises;

[12] Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, "Power in Staff Development Through Research In Training," <u>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development</u> (1983), 27.

5) The curriculum is constantly changing; new topics need to be integrated into what is taught. New methods of instruction are being developed, tested, and proven useful for student learning. These changes do not just happen, they must be formally planned.

6) Due to economic and social conditions, there is very little teacher turn-over. Educators can no longer count on new people regularly bringing in new ideas. Development and supervisory programs must perform this function.

7) Some people do not know how to best use the resources provided them or how to identify resources they might use effectively. Training identifies these needs and assists utilization.

8) Administrators can set clear expectations, plan ways to reach out, implement new plans, and evaluate the reality of achievements in the context of a staff development and supervision program. There are demonstrable results in student learning when a supervisory program focuses on instruction of students.

In order to accomplish the task of helping teachers solve the problems of each moment and situation, schools are beginning or should be beginning to concentrate more time, money, and resources into the initiation and implementation of staff development programs. This investment in human resources adds to the school's capital in the form of skills and knowledge. Wood and Thompson observe: " The Rand Corporation report on federally supported programs for educational change points out that if schools are to install our improved plans, and perhaps even to survive, the 1980's must be the decade of staff development."[13]

---

[13] Fred H. Wood and Steven R. Thompson, "Guidelines for Better Staff Development," _Educational Leadership_, (February, 1980), 374.

Staff development or in-service education (these terms will be used interchangably throughout this dissertation) can be defined in various ways. It is the totality of educational and personal experiences that contributes toward an individual's being more competent and better satisfied in an assigned professional role. Under the general heading of staff development, the most commonly cited objectives in the research include: a) improving skills; b) expanding subject matter skills, c) planning and organizing instruction, d) increasing personal effectiveness, e) solving problems, f) conducting workshops, g) organizing and providing information about resources, h) researching ideas for evaluating practices and procedures, and i) conducting needs assessments.

Staff development has also been defined as a state of mind and a commitment to the growth of others. It is synonymous with a change in human behavior: the behavior of school children, and the behavior of teachers. Teachers' behavior will change because, through in-service education programs, their knowledge and skills will increase. In-service education is a direct teacher development effort that is focused on instruction and teacher-student relationships which will have obvious positive effects on the school and on student learning.

In conclusion, staff development or in-service education is a planned effort directed to teachers for the purposes of helping them to increase their cognitive skills and to improve their techniques of teaching toward the end of increasing student achievement. In response to this increasing demand by the public for an increase in the quality of schools and an accompanying demand for accountability, the schools are now concentrating on staff development programs. Schools are taking their cues from business and industry and are recognizing that it is in their best interests to

provide administrators with support, time, and money. However, teachers, as a whole, resist these efforts. Past experiences in staff development programs have created skepticism about the efforts put into in-service education because often teachers have seen no tangible rewards. Why is there skepticism, and why are teacher attitudes toward staff development programs so negative? State and national studies conducted during the last five years consistently suggest that the majority of teachers, administrators, and college personnel are not satisfied with current in-service programs. The most common defects reported, in those studies, are poor planning, organization activities that are impersonal and unrelated to the day-to-day problems of participants, lack of participant involvement in the planning and implementation of their in-service, inadequate needs assessment, and unclear objectives. The lack of follow-up in the classroom after training takes place is very common. While educators are generally negative about the way in which current staff development practices are organized, nearly all teachers and administrators see in-service education as crucial to improved school programs and practice.

A second reason for skepticism regarding staff development is the view of teachers held consciously or unconsciously by many administrators and reflected in the way that staff development is designed. The research indicates that those responsible for staff development seem to be what Douglas McGregor calls Theory X administrators. These Theory X administrators view teachers as: a) disliking in-service training and trying to avoid involvement in professional growth, b) needing to be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled, and forced to work toward the goals of the school and to participate in in-service education, and c)

preferring to be directed and wishing to avoid responsibility for their in-service education.

A third reason for skepticism is that in-service education has had a districtwide focus, distant from the needs of teachers in their own schools. In fact, the need for local school staffs to plan or think together is usually ignored when staff development time is provided. Yet, there is increasing evidence that shows the largest unit of successful change in education is the individual school and not the district. The major flaw in staff development programs appears to be that administrators have ignored what is known about the adult learner and adult learning, just as they have accused teachers of ignoring the individual child and how he or she learns.

Finally, administrators have not modelled the kinds of practices in in-service training which they ask teachers to use in their classrooms. "Most in-service has not had clear objectives, been individualized, provided options and choices in learning activities, been related to the learner interests and needs, developed responsibility, and promoted trust and concern."[14]

To combat the skepticism and negative attitudes toward in-service education, innovations have been born, enjoyed a brief flourish, but soon withered under the weight of bureaucratic red tape, budget constraints, and internal politics. As a result, an assumption arose that anything a teacher might learn from in-service rarely was valuable enough to justify the usurpation of classroom time. In such an environment, however, schools still had to be able to adapt to a changing society and the

[14] Ibid., p. 375.

changing needs of the people who live in it. "Teaching staffs today are
in a stable state with low turnover compounded by the fact that the
intellectual stimulation of enthusiastic young colleagues fresh out
of college is also missing."[15]

To counteract the historical skepticism and negative attitudes toward
in-service education, goals must be established prior to any considerations
of objectives, purposes or guidelines. Staff development researchers cite the
following goals as appropriate for in-service education:

a) to establish and carry out a plan for strengthening personal-
professional performance,

b) to demonstrate increased competence in selected teaching skills,

c) to develop the knowledge and skills essential to implementing newly
adopted programs,

d) to develop/refine curricular programs to improve student learning,

e) to develop increased problem-solving and communication skills while
addressing organizational problems,

f) to carry out action-research on important teaching-learning problems.
"We would build a synergistic environment where collaborative enterprises
are both normal and sustaining and where continuous training and study, both
of academic substance and the craft of teaching are woven into the fabric
of the school, bringing satisfaction by virtue of an increasing sense of
growth and competence".[16]

There will never be an abundant supply of outstanding talent to fill
every teaching position, so there must be a plan to develop those teachers
who are in the system as well as those who are recruited. This development

[16] Joyce and Showers, "Power", p.1.

should be aimed at changing the behavior of personnel toward a predetermined goal, a goal determined by factors relating to the position, the person, and the organization. Most such goals will be related to performance management, replacing the narrower concept of supervision. Appraisal of this performance will be basic to the initiation of plans for improving individual performance. Emerging school systems will grant much more autonomy to local school attendance units than is now the case. Consequently, development programs will become highly decentralized, aimed at making each individual effective in his/her assignment, and enhancing his/her contribution to the goals of the work unit in which he/she is located. Ironically, although the individual school is the most logical unit for improvement, as indicated in the research, few districts support site-based staff development focused on instructional matters, much less other problems identified as significant by a faculty. Development programs in the future will be focused upon goals. The prime concerns of these programs will include the answers to these questions:

a) What behavior do we wish to change?
b) What is the present condition or level of behavior that we wish to change?
c) What is the desired condition that we wish to achieve in personnel performance?
d) How can we link learning theory to staff development programs?
e) What types of training shall be employed (classroom, on-the-job, apprenticeships)?
f) What types of newer training technologies shall be employed (computers, projectors, closed-circuit TV, programed text materials and video cassettes)?
g) What indicators shall we use to evaluate the effectiveness of development programs.[17]

As schools begin to contend with the fact that staff development is

---

[17] Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, _Educational Organization and Administration_ (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983), p. 363.

absolutely crucial, and after goals have been established, guidelines
will be determined. Before ever deciding what characteristics make for
effective staff development, these guidelines and their underlying philosophy
should be realized. Certain guidelines, gleaned from the research, should
be at the base of staff development. They are:

a) in-service or staff development should be primarily teacher-oriented
    and teacher-centered;

b) in-service should arise from the needs which are pinpointed by
    the staff, and guided and developed by a staff committee;

c) staff development must be characterized by diversity and flexi-
    bility;

d) it should be a planned, sequential activity for each individual
    in which one in-service activity is linked to another and one
    year's program is linked to that of the following year;

e) staff development should be well-prepared around those specific
    training requirements that each individual sees as important and
    relevant to his/her own professional development.

With these guidelines as the foundation on which to build, principles
may now be developed to set the staff development effort onto its
desired path. Edgar A. Kelly and Elizabeth A. Dillon, in their article
in the April, 1978 issue of the NASSP Bulletin, cited the following ten
principles of effective staff development programs:

1) Staff development should be related to the goals of the district
    and to the translation (the transfer concept which will be mentioned
    later) of those goals into improved student achievement – the bottom
    line of all inservice efforts;

2) It should evolve from the diagnosis of district, building, and
    individual needs followed by the design and delivery of programs to
    meet the identified needs and evaluted by reference to stated objectives;

3) Provide continuous staff development for all levels of professional staff, including administrators;
4) Relate inservice to goal-setting by individual staff members with appraisal in terms of accomplishment of stated self-improvement projects;
5) concentrate on changes in both subject matter and methodology;
6) Utilize the "multiplication principle" of recognizing staff members for competence in specific skills so that they, in turn, can train others;
7) Relate theory and application in such a way as to result in measurable change in staff behavior and be spread over a long enough period of time to ensure that changes in behavior are relatively permanent;
8) Provide continuation of preservice training, visualizing preservice training as the beginning of a continuum of development which is the joint responsibility of the local school district and institutions of higher education;
9) Provide activities which are well-planned and well executed for maximum benefits to staff members and to students and;
10) Actively initiate effective change within the school or school district.[18]

In constructing staff development programs, administrators need to consider that when teachers learn new teaching strategies, this learning, in itself, increases their ability to learn other new strategies. As they become more highly skilled learners, teachers will understand the transfer process better. The process of transfer is simplified by concentrating on over-learning; first the new skill, then an initial application, and finally a real grasp and understanding.

In concluding this section on guidelines and principles of staff development, some final comments would be appropriate regarding the establishment of guidelines for staff development programs. Researchers agree that teachers should help plan it and that teachers ought to help select the items for the program. Staff development should always be thought of as an effort to promote the overall effectiveness of the educational system. It should not be viewed as remediation of difficulties.

[18] Edgar A. Kelley and Elizabeth A. Dillon, "Staff Development: It Can Work For You", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 417 (April, 1978), 3-4.

Experiences in staff development programs should be individualized on

the basis of differences in teachers' experience, expertise, motivation,

and specific needs. It should be well planned, and it should take place

on a convenient schedule, and it should be designed around stated goals

and objectives, not only those of teachers, but also those of the district.

At the conclusion of the specific in-service activity, there should be a

follow-up and a positive reward system. " Teacher education must be

planned, planned about the seminal issues that figure in effective class-

room instruction and planned about subjects that will positively influence

long range professional growth."[19]

Before proceeding with the actual components of an effective staff

development program, namely, its characteristics, its function, and the

typical nature of the process, further contributions of research in the

area of in-service education need to be examined. "It is critical that

the design of in-service education for elementary and secondary school

personnel be grounded in our best practice and research.[20] Staff devel-

opment topics should be drawn from the research on teaching effectiveness.

Researchers have told us that teachers are wonderful learners. Bruce

Joyce and Beverly Showers observed:

> Nearly all teachers can acquire new skills that "fine tune" their
> competence. They can also learn a considerable repertoire of teaching
> strategies that are new to them. The second message from research is
> more sobering, but still optimistic; in order to improve their skills
> and learn new approaches to teaching, teachers need certain conditions -
> conditions that are not common in most inservice settings even when
> teachers participate in the governance of those settings. The third

---

[19] Robert Byrne, "Inservice Programs – What Are The Essentials For Making
Them Effective," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 6.

[20] Fred H. Wood, Steven R. Thompson, and Sister Frances Russell, "Designing
Effective Staff Development Programs," Association For Supervision and
Curriculum Development, 1981, 60.

message is also encouraging; the research base reveals what conditions help teachers to learn. This information can be used to design staff development activities for classroom personnel.[21]

To increase one's repertoire is to develop the attitude to teach; the ability to coordinate objectives, students, and learning environments with increasing skill and effectiveness. Moreover, the more teachers develop their repertoire, the more they develop the ability to add to that repertoire at will. Researchers agree that the best teachers are those teachers who seek to enlarge their understanding and knowledge. Staff development programs which increase the teachers' cognitive skills and teaching skills will enable teachers to produce mature citizen-adults by developing in all students the essential skills of problem-solving, decision making, and choice making.

Thus far, the goals, guidelines, and principles of staff development programs have been examined. It is now time to discuss the basic component parts of a staff development program which are common to all staff development programs. Researchers insist that, in any in-service program, there should be a forecasting of the problem of transfer throughout the training process. During the training, teachers should develop very high degrees of skill prior to classroom practice. "The program should provide explicitly for executive control which consists of understanding the purpose and rationale of the skill and knowing how to adapt it to students, apply it to subject matter, modify or create instructional materials attendant to its use, and blend it with other instructional approaches to develop a smooth and powerful whole."[22]

[21] Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, "Improving In-Service Training: The Messages of Research", Educational Leadership, (February, 1980), 379.

[22] Joyce and Showers, "Power", p.8.

In-service education programs should provide for practice in the workplace immediately following skill development. Opportunities for coaching by peers should always be available. Finally, staff development programs should generate a learning how to learn effect.

Staff development programs are more successful where there exists a spirit of collegiality, collaboration, and experimentation. Teachers themselves say that in-service practices are most effective when they have an opportunity to share their ideas and to practice, that is, to try out new techniques in their classrooms. Therefore, the major responsibility for planning and implementing in-service programs should be given to local school staffs.

When deciding upon in-service topics, the research cites that teachers demand the answers to several questions: Is the rationale stated clearly and specifically? How well does the new practice fit in with each teacher's own philosophy of teaching? How much effort will be required and what will be the payoff or reward?

In any in-service effort, since the ultimate goal is increased student achievement, effective teaching is the prime objective. Crucial to effective teaching is the self-awareness of the teachers and an understanding of human interaction. It is the teacher who must evaluate and plan for reinforcement or change of behavior and then carry out these plans. This is why the needs of each teacher must be met and the reason why all staff development programs must be individualized. Morphet, Johns, and Reller cite four critical components of staff development programs:

> that the organization bear responsibility for development; that in-service should embrace all personnel employed by the system; personnel development is aimed at satisfying two kinds of expectations - the contribution required of the individual by the school system and the material and emotional rewards anticipated by the individual staff

members as performance residuals; and that staff development is a deliberate investment in human capital (skills and knowledge of personnel) which represents a valuable asset of the system, one which is essential to its stability as well as to its viability.[23]

Jensen, Betz, and Zigarmi indicate that the component parts of successful group-based in-service programs include: "the securing of administrative commitment, the planning for faculty involvement, the conducting of a needs assessment, the establishing of major inservice goals by the total group, the instillation of specific objectives, the implementing of a program according to an established time-line, and the employment of evaluation and follow up." [24]

Staff development programs have a two-fold content: the fine tuning of existing skills and the learning of a new repertoire of unfamiliar skills or stragegies. Since skills or strategies will be peculiar to the students being taught, in-service education should be developed at the local school building level based upon what teachers in a particular building decide they want and need. Staff development programs must emerge from within the local staff and a continuous balance must exist between content and strategies. In-service programs should combine, in about equal proportions, the presentation of customary, established material along with the introduction of new professional practices. Professional growth efforts in order to be successful and have an impact on teaching behavior must be spaced over time.

Staff development programs, by definition, are developmental. Single session efforts are ineffective. Because it involves the mutual

[23] Morphet, Johns, Reller, "Educational", p. 363.

[24] Darrell Jensen, Loren Betz, and Patricia Zigarmi, "If You Are Listening To Teachers, Here Is How You Will Organize In-Service", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 417 (April, 1978), 13.

adaptation of newly learned procedures to fit particular situations,
time, and a lot of it, is needed.

Different goals and objectives for different individuals is likely to
be the rule rather than the exception among teachers. Not only should the
time allotted for in-service education be a consideration, but also the
grouping of participants. Researchers agree that there should be opportuni-
ties for discussion and reflection in small support groups. Teachers
appreciate the personal nature of small discussion groups which enhance
the eventual adoption of new teaching practices because they enable
greater opportunities for discussing the application of the new techniques.

In addition to the two-fold content of fine-tuning existing skills
and teaching new skills or strategies, other component parts of staff
development programs are the orientation to the structure and operations
of local schools and exploratory and innovative activities. In all
in-service programs, therefore, consideration must be accorded the content,
the form, and the leadership.

In summarizing this section on the component parts of effective
staff development programs, Kelley and Dillon listed six such components:

a) an organized set of goals, purposes, and objectives for the school
   and the school district;
b) a systematic plan for the assessment of the achievement, behav-
   ioral, and attitudinal characteristics adopted by a school or
   school district as evidence of curricular effectiveness and the
   effectiveness of instruction and teaching;
c) an organized personnel management system which relates recruitment
   practices, selection practices, staff placement and transfer poli-
   cies and procedures, and supervision practices to both the
   stated goals of the school or school district and to the staff
   development programs and activities.

d) a locally adopted definition of staff development which both defines and limits the functions to be served by staff develpment programs;

e) organizational practices for the assignment of staff development functions as responsibilities of specified roles;

f) a clear organizational commitment to staff development must be present. This entails more than the presence of a positive attitude. The willingness to utilize and expend resources - time, space, fiscal support, and personnel - must be evident.[25]

An example of a clear, organizational commitment to staff development

is an actual school board policy regarding personnel development:

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY

Personnel Development

All employees shall be provided opportunities for the development of increased competence beyond that which they may attain through the performance of their assigned duties. In light of their impact upon the lives of students and in keeping with the adopted philosophy, goals, and objectives of the school district, opportunities for the professional staff shall be especially rich and varied.

Planning for personal development shall be a cooperative one, under the direction of the superintendent of schools or his designee, involving, appropriately, employees and their organizations, students and adults of the school district.

The board places top priority in schedule planning and in budget formulation on personnel development programs for this school district. The board believes that school district sponsored staff development activities should be conducted within the normal work week and that costs thereof should be paid from district funds.

The board expects periodic evaluation reports concerning the impact of personnel development activities upon staff growth and student learning.[26]

After decisions have been made regarding the goals and objectives of

staff development programs, after guidelines have been mutually

defined, and after the component parts have been reviewed, characteristics

---

[25] Kelly and Dillon, "Staff Development", p.4-5.

[26] In-Service Education, Current Trends In School Policies and Programs (Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association,

of successful in-service education programs are carefully studied. Now is
the time for the actual planning of the in-service program - the process.
Ralph Fessler, in his article in the March, 1983 edition of the NASSP
Bulletin, states:

> All staff development programs must include: a commitment from the
> administration, a needs assessment and diagnosis, the development of
> a plan, and its implementation and evaluation. Attention to all
> stages and the proper sequencing of each step is crucial. Only
> under these conditions can supervisor diagnosis and teacher self-
> appraisal lead to agreement regarding teacher growth needs, and
> ultimately to a professional growth program that is appropriate,
> responsive, and well-received.[27]

Within the process, there should be only a few, narrow, clearly defined
objectives with hands-on experiences available. Included should be a
regularity of effort, a complementarity of effort between the program for
student development and that for staff development, a defined sequence of
increasingly significant experiences, which follows the research on adult
learning with the content complementing the attitude and experience of
adult learners, and constant evaluation. Watchwords of the process
stage could be: overview, standards, diagnosis, presentation, practice,
closure and application assignments.

During the in-service education process, teachers should be provided
with a demonstration of the new teaching strategy, and then teach it
before each other, practicing it and receiving feedback from their peer
observers. The researchers agree that peer observers are a very potent
source of constructive help because they do not make critical comments
but rather offer suggestions. Joyce and Showers maintain:

> Where the fine tuning of style is the focus of the inservice ,
> modeling, practice under simulated conditions, and practice in the

---

[27] Ralph Fessler and Peter J. Burke, "Interaction: An Essential In Devel-
oping Professional Growth Programs", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461
March, 1983), 43.

classroom, combined with feedback, will probably result in considerable
desired changes. Where the mastery of a new approach is the desired
outcome, presentations and discussions of theory and coaching to appli-
cation are probably necessary as well. If the theory of a new
approach is well presented, the approach is demonstrated, practice
is provided under simulated conditions with careful and consistent
feedback, and that practice is followed by application in the classroom
with coaching and further feedback, it is likely that the vast
majority of teachers will be able to expand their repertoire to the
point where they can utilize a wide variety of approaches to teaching
and curriculum. If any of these components are left out, the impact
of training will be weakened in the sense that fewer numbers of
people will progress to the transfer level (which is the only level
that has significant meaning for school improvement). The most
effective training activities, then, will be those that combine theory,
modeling, practice, feedback, and coaching to application. The know-
ledge base seems firm enough that we can predict that if these
components are in fact combined in inservice programs, we can expect
the outcomes to be considerable at all levels.[28]

This first section has dealt with the foundations, the goals, and the

objectives of staff development or in-service education programs. Why

there is a vital need for such programs has been discussed along with

definitions of staff development and the necessary guidelines which

should be incorporated in order to enhance the opportunity for success.

Also discussed were the characteristics of effective staff development

programs and the elements of its successful implementation.

In the following sections, key ingredients of the successful in-

service program will be investigated, namely, the concept of change and

the nature of adult learning. The final key ingredient which will be

investigated will be the principal and his practices in the successful

design of in-service education programs, which is the focus of this

dissertation.

[28] Joyce and Showers, "Improving In-Service", p. 384-385.

CHANGE

"None of us are willing to change very much." [29]

Schools cannot meet their responsibility without changing because change is always occurring and change is a normal aspect of human growth and development and a condition of no-change represents the atypical or the abnormal state of affairs. Richard Dempsey writes: "Change has been defined as the perceived phenomenon which occurs when the balance and stability of a situation is altered; when there is substitution of one thing for another."[30] It is also the force that motivates continuous study and alteration of the curriculum.

Throughout the research it has been determined that certain assumptions are held about the teacher and the concept of change. The teacher in the classroom is a significant factor in the teacher - student system; if the teacher changes, the teacher - student system changes. The teacher is assumed to be a rational and competent professional who ultimately makes the final decision and is held responsible for what occurs in the classroom. Other assumptions which have been offered by the researchers about change are: individual and group behavior can best be modified through a systematic approach; a change in one part of the system will always influence other parts, therefore, altering the whole system; any modification or change which the initiator of the change deems desirable, will usually progress on several levels of desirability by those affected by it (the different stages of adult development); within reasonable

[29] Charles E. Kozoll and Curtis Ulmer, ed., Inservice Training: Philosophy, Processes, and Operational Techniques, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p.23.

[30] Richard A. Dempsey and Rodney P. Smith, Differentiated Staffing, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p.49.

limits, the overt effect of change may be predicted; and within the framework of a rapidly changing society, the maintenance of the status quo may represent a form of planned change.

Change occurs successfully, that is, in a desired direction, when staff developers are aware of certain facts or principles regarding change. People change when they see a need to change. Peters and Waterman, in their book In Search of Excellence, state: "Instead of trying to overcome resistance to what people are not ready to do, find out what they are ready to do."[31] Teachers must understand and agree that they have growth needs before they will be receptive to efforts to help them meet those needs. People change when they know how to change. All change involves risk and imposed change implies that the individual or his mode of operation is not as acceptable to others as he would like it to be. Most people like themselves the way they are, and usually find themselves and their behaviors acceptable to others. People change when they are actively involved in the change process, a process which the research indicates involves:

a) developing a need for change;

b) establishing a consulting relationship between the change agent and the clientele;

c) clarifying the problem;

d) setting specific goals and objectives to attain the desired change;

e) transforming intentions into actual change efforts;

f) stabilizing the new level of structure;

[31] Thomas J. Peters, and Robert H. Waterman, In Search of Excellence (New York: Harper and Row, 1982), p. 149.

g) allowing teachers to assume responsibility for effecting

lasting change.

The desire to change develops only when the teacher becomes involved in some action or process that involves change. People change when they are secure in changing, and when they are encouraged and supported to change. In this instance, the principal can be the primary supporter. In writing about the principal's role in the change process, Dempsey and Smith stated: " In order to help another person, he must attend less to what he does to or for him and more to what he is in the relationship.[32] Finally, people change some attitudes slowly.

Before considering principles of effective change, some of the major barriers to its successful implementation need to be mentioned. If teachers have not changed their knowledge, attitudes, or skills in a direction consistent with the implementation process, the new program will likely be in trouble. Lovell and Wiles compiled a very detailed list of major barriers to change:

> 1) Lack of commitment to system goals;
> It would be appropriate to add a corroborating statement on the importance of just such a commitment, at this point. Peters and Waterman, in In Search of Excellence, quoted Thomas Watson, Jr., the president of IBM: "I firmly believe that any organization, in order to survive and achieve success, must have a sound set of beliefs on which it premises all its policies and actions. Next, I believe that the most important single factor in corporate success is faithful adherence to those beliefs. And, finally, I believe if an organization is to meet the challenge of a changing world, it must be prepared to change everything about itself except those beliefs as it moves through corporate life. In other words, the basic philosophy, spirit, and drive of an organization have far more to do with its relative achievements than do technological or economic resources, organizational structure, innovation and timing. All these things weigh heavily in success. But they are, I think, transcended by how strongly the people in the organization believe in its basic precepts and how faithfully they carry them out."[33]

---

[32] Dempsey and Smith, Differentiated Staffing, p.77.

[33] Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Excellence, p. 280.

2) Inadequate feedback;
3) Inadequate knowledge about the conditions of teaching and learning;
4) Attitudes toward or values about the proposed change;
5) Satisfaction with the status quo;
6) Inadequate skill development;
7) Strong vested interests in the status quo;
8) Lack of organization support;
9) Closedness rather than openness in the system;
10) Lack of compatibility between the change proposal and other dimensions of the organization;
11) Threat to individuals;
12) Inadequate knowledge about restraints and possibilities in a situation;
13) static organizational structure;
14) Inadequate expertise for solving problems;
15) Threat to officials of the organization;
16) Inadequate rewards for change efforts.[34]

Dr. Keith Davis also referred to a change barrier when he wrote about the emotional impact that change can have on teachers. "Teachers react emotionally to change and are often not particularly influenced by the cold hard logic for change. Though people react individually and differently to change, they sometimes unite through social action to make a uniform response... the self-correcting tendency toward equilibrium in the social system known as homeostasis."[35]

> Teachers are also afraid to change. Joyce and Showers wrote about
> fear: "Learning to use new skills involves greater effort than the
> use of old ones. New skills feel more awkward and less neutral than
> familiar ones for some time. The use of an important new skill
> involves some risk. Instruction goes less smoothly until the new
> skill is mastered... The more important the skill, the more powerful
> it is, the greater the discomfort will be because it disrupts more
> behavior than a trivial skill".[36]

Thus far, assumptions regarding change, a definition of change, and barriers to change have been discussed. Before moving from the discussion

[34] John T. Lovell and Kimball Wiles, Supervision For Better Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1983), p. 125-126.

[35] Keith Davis, Ph.D. Human Relations At Work — The Dynamics of Organizational Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p.403.

[36] Joyce and Showers, "Power", p.9.

about change to the concept of adult learning, conditions which promote change will be addressed. To bring about successful change (change in desired ways), the researchers are in agreement on the following:

1) people must want to change;

2) the principal must be able to accept without anxiety or false-hood the concerns of other persons;

3) the principal must experience a positive and unconditional regard for the worth of the people with whom he works;

4) the principal must experience an empathic understanding of how the other person feels and what he is experiencing;

5) the principal must communicate his positive unconditional regard and empathic understanding for the other person to him.

Four of these five conditions for the successful adoption of change involve the principal which is one of the key reasons for the writing of this dissertation.

The review of the literature indicates that for change to be implemented successfully (in the desired direction), it is appropriate for teachers to collaborate to set direction for change, stability, and improvement and to identify and control to some extent the external and internal forces affecting the system. Teachers must become sensitive to the discrepancies between the objectives, processes, and results that exist in their schools and the objectives, processes and results to which they aspire. A school is involved in a continuous process of change and this change is achieved through some sort of problem solving activity. Each teacher, as an individual, changes only as his/her own values, attitudes, understandings, and skills change (in-service must, therefore, be individualized). New skills or strategies must be introduced on a

small scale. Small scale change is possible and acceptance will be more
certain if minor concepts and insights are introduced gradually (therefore,
staff development should cover a long period of time).

The acid test of any in-service effort is whether or not teachers
actually change their teaching behavior in desired ways.

ADULT LEARNING

The next ingredient of staff development programs which must be
considered is the concept of adult learning. How do teachers learn?
What should the organizational climate be? What do teachers want to learn
from in-service education? What is the essence of adult learning?

The essense of adult learning is that we can all learn together.
"Get the people involved to come up with solutions to problems they're
having, then stand at the sidelines to applaud them."[37]

Researchers suggest that staff development programs should
be based upon the research on adult learning. The content should comple-
ment the attitudes and experiences of adult learners. Teachers do not
want to be treated as if they were still engaged in pre-service training.
Peters and Waterman stated:

> Treat people as adults. Treat them as partners; treat them with
> dignity; treat them with respect. Treat them... as the primary
> source of productivity gains. These are fundamental lessons from
> the excellent companies research. In other words, if you want
> productivity... you must treat your workers as your most important
> asset. There was hardly a more pervasive theme in the excellent
> companies than respect for the individual.[38]

---

[37] Kozoll and Ulmer, Operational Techniques, p.21.

[38] Peters and Waterman, Excellence, p.238.

In order for teachers to successfully participate in in-service education, they should determine their own in-service needs, be actually involved in program planning and operation, and receive in-service training as an integral part of their workday. "Teachers are not habitual readers of scholarly journals: they rely on information from colleagues about "what works."[39] The research reveals that the methods of in-service most popular with teachers include:

a) demonstration of materials and techniques;

b) directed small group discussions;

c) work groups resulting in production;

d) lectures followed by discussion; and

e) brainstorming.

To successfully teach teachers, there should be:

1) guided reflection about the change to be introduced and integration of changes into staff members repertoire;

2) personal support as well as challenge;

3) provision of opportunities to try out the necessary new roles (similar to the point regarding the successful implementation of change);

4) continuity of emphasis on a particular improvement, set of goals, a focus on desired change in teacher behavior.

It has been mentioned previously that many teachers have negative feelings toward in-service education due to non-productive and poorly planned programs which they have attended. The resourceful school district must ask itself: "What kinds of in-service programs are needed

---

[39] John W. Smyth, "Educational Leadership and Staff Development: Stop the Train(ing), I Want to Get Off", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 64.

and what kind will be well received by its faculty?" Hilmar Wagner, associate professor of curriculum and instruction at the University of Texas, offers 10 suggestions on what teachers like at in-service meetings.

1) Teachers like meetings in which they can be actively involved. Just as students do not want to be passive, most teachers prefer Dewey's "learning by doing."

2) Teachers like to watch other teachers demonstrate various techniques in their teaching field. Demonstration teaching can serve as a model that teachers can take back to their classrooms. (RPTIM practice 24 states that peers should help to teach one another by serving as in-service leaders)

3) Teachers like practical information - almost step-by-step recipes - on how others approach certain learning tasks. Too often, inservice programs are theoretical and highly abstract. (RPTIM practice 6 states that current educational practices not yet found in the school should be examined.)

4) Teachers like meetings that are short and to the point. The introduction of guests at a meetings is often ego-filling for those introduced, but cuts into valuable inservice time.

5) Teachers like an in-depth treatment of one concept that can be completed in one meeting rather than a generalized treatment that attempts to solve every teacher's problems in one session.

6) Teachers like well-organized meetings.

7) Teachers like variety in inservice programs. If the same topics are covered every time, attendance may drop off.

8) Teachers like some incentive for attending inservice meetings; released time, salary increments, advancement points on rating scales. (RPTIM practice 30 states that teachers who attempt to implement new learnings like to be recognized for their efforts)

9) Teachers like inspirational speakers occasionally. Such speakers often give a staff the necessary drive to start or complete a school year.

10) Teachers like to visit other schools to observe other teachers in situations similar to their own. These visits, even when observing poor teachers, are highly educational.[40]

Adult learners can be at different stages of development and each stage of development has certain characteristics which are addressed by different aspects of instruction. Educators also vary widely in their competencies and readiness to learn. Wilsey and Killion discuss the stages of adult learning. Their information is drawn from the work of Joyce, Bents and Howey, and their interpretation of Santmire.

[40] Inservice Education, Current Trends, p. 13.

Stage 1 learners must have an environment that is highly structured.
Presentation of practical information should emphasize what to do,
how to do it, and the circumstances in which it should be done.
Instructors should model behaviors applicable in classroom settings
including what to say to students and sample materials to be used.
Several examples of how principles apply in specific situation need
to be demonstrated. Outlines, handouts, and other support materials
should be organized in sequence to help learners focus on what is
important. Discussions should include practical examples and applic-
ations rather than theory or generalizations. Ample time for the
consolidation and application of ideas must be allowed. Follow-up
is necessary for learners at this stage since they are often insecure
in applying new learnings and prone to abandoning ideas that do not
work immediately. Follow-up assistance needs to be directive.
Learners at this stage benefit from a supervisor who is willing to
tell them what to do and how to do it.

In Stage 2, the training environment needs to provide choices in
content and its presentation. Specific applications of ideas become
a secondary focus rather than central to the presentation. Discussions
that include various points of view relative to the issue should be
concluded with a rationale of why the views are held. Follow-up
assistance should be collaborative, allowing learners to express
their opinions and suggest alternative actions.

Learners, in Stage 3, should be given opportunities to participate
in the planning and delivery of staff development programs. Training
should include discussions that allow learners to share their view-
points and experiences so that colleagues may learn from each other.
In this way learners are able to develop broader, more comprehensive
perspectives. Follow-up assistance should be collaborative or
non-directive. These learners benefit from active participation in
identifying relevant issues and possible solutions.

Stage 4 learners need an environment that allows them to work easily
and comfortably in a variety of ways. They should select and pursue
topics of personal interest. Opportunities for critical and creative
thinking should be available. Follow-up assistance should be non-
directive, allowing these learners to design their own targets and
standards for achieving their goals.[41]

In attending to the ingredient of adult learning, it must be kept in
mind that there is, at all times, an interaction of personality development
and environment. If staff developers are always mindful of how teachers
learn, what they like and don't like, and the developmental stages of

---

[41] Cathy Wilsey and Joellen Killion, "Making Staff Development Programs
Work", Education Leadership, (October, 1982), 37.

adult learning, successful in-service education can result. The research indicates that teachers can acquire a number of models of teaching provided that they receive intensive training. Teachers at a higher conceptual level can acquire additional repertoire more easily than low conceptual level teachers.

It seems evident that in order to satisfy most of the needs of adult learners, in-service education instruction should be modified to de-emphasize formal operational tasks and concentrate more on direct, concrete, and informal experiences.

PRINCIPAL

"The school principal is the gatekeeper for adoption and continual use of new practices and programs in a school."[42]   Also, the key element for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school is the principal.

Researchers agree that the role of the principal in the initiation and implementation of staff development programs is absolutely vital. To further emphasize the importance of the role of the principal, David Squires stated: "that the single best predictor of organizational development success was the principal's estimation, before the project was implemented, of how successful it was likely to be."[43]

A strong principal is one of the hallmarks of an effective school and any attempt to make a substantial lasting impact on a school must

[42] Wood, Thompson, Russell, "Designing", p. 63.

[43] David A. Squires, William G. Huitt, and John K. Segars, "Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective", Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981, 107.

involve the principal. "Furthermore, the school administrator must play a central role in in-service programs if they are to be successful."[44]

In addition to playing that central role, the principal should actively participate in the in-service program to ensure its success. "Active participation by school administrators is essential to the success of an in-service education program."[45] If the staff development program is to be successful, then it should be viewed as important by the staff. "In order for professional development to be viewed as important by staff, they must observe the principal as "staff development personified", one who is committed to and involved in personal-professional development activity."[46]

The findings in the research support the thinking that principals themselves have the greatest need for in-service education, and not only so that in-service is viewed as important by the staff. Principals have the greatest need for in-service because:

a) modern education programs are complex and this trend appears to be destined to continue;

b) the impact of change demands new thinking and behavior;

c) destructive forces and criticisms of public education have become so intensive that new insights and interpretations must be developed;

d) the administrator can no longer "go it alone"; he desperately needs the knowledge that is available within the staff;

[44] John N. Mangieri and Richard E. Kemper, "Administrators: The Keys to Successful In-Service Programs", NASSP Bulletin, Volume 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 26.

[45] Ibid., p. 29.

[46] Joseph F. Rogus, "Building an Effective Staff Development Program – A Principal's Checklist", NASSP Bulletin Volume 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 16.

e) research must be continuous and must be made available to

   him by others;

f) he must play a major role in human relations, both within

   the school or school system and with the public.

As the gatekeeper for the adoption and continual use of new practices

and programs within the school, the principal will serve in many different

types of leader roles. Sergiovanni wrote about the principal's different

leadership roles:

> He is the technical leader assuming the role of "management engineer".
> He is a human leader assuming the role of human engineer. He will be
> adept at building and maintaining morale and using such processes as
> participatory decision making. He is the educational leader assuming
> the role of "clinical practitioner", bringing expert professional
> knowledge and bearing as they relate to teaching effectiveness,
> educational program development, and clinical supervision. He is
> the symbolic leader assuming the role of "chief" and by emphasizing
> selective attention (the modeling of important goals and behaviors)
> signals to others what is of importance. Finally, he is the cultural
> leader assuming the role of "high priest", seeking to define, streng-
> then, and articulate those enduring values, beliefs, and cultural
> strands that give the school its unique identity.[47]

It has already been stated that the principal has a need for in-service.

In fact, he has the greatest need. He is the leader and the director

of the educational enterprise. So that he might provide the proper

direction, he must be knowledgeable of both the cognitive element and the

skills and strategies of teaching - the basic two-fold content of all

staff development programs.

Principals must show commitment to the concept and vision of the

staff development project at the outset. It has already been mentioned

that Squires maintains that the single best predictor of organizational

development success was the principal's estimation, before the project

---

[47] Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling",
Educational Leadership (February, 1984), 6-9.

was implemented, of how successful it was likely to be. Principals must
work to achieve clarity for all participants and buffer the staff by
negotiating with competing environmental pressures. They should secure and
provide the necessary resources and social support as well as actively
participate themselves. Principals must have the competence and/or the
personality to provide the needed leadership for change, and the ability
to define problems, decide on solutions, implement those solutions, and
evaluate the results. They are the providers of logistical and psycholog-
ical support and the synthesizers and orderers of the many different
ideas that the staff has about staff development and should carefully
listen to what the staff says about their desires. They must learn to
separate individual opinion from group consensus. They should continually
search out what have been the weaknesses of in-service programs as well
as the strengths and let the staff know that they are continually interested
in constructive criticism. They must decide which information to use and
at what point.

Even though the principal must be all of the above, and the research
so indicates, he sometimes resists staff development efforts. Researchers
have discovered several reasons for this resistance. He fears that the
staff does not have the ability to cope with the change. However, princi-
pals who have had successful in-service education programs had confidence
in the training of their diverse staff populations to accept new goals.
Principals often resist in-service because they fear that members of the
organization can not cope with change. However, if an appropriate climate
is developed within the organization, this fear should not be present.
Peters and Waterman, when summarizing what seemed to be most important to

the excellent companies, found that the leaders of those companies unanimously agreed that it was their marvelously informal environments. "The name of the successful game is rich, informal communication. The astonishing by-product is the ability to have your cake and eat it, too; that is, rich, informal communication leads to more action, more experiments, more learning, and simultaneously to the ability to stay better in touch and on top of things."[48] Encouraged by the creation of a conducive climate, some teachers, who have dug themselves into a rut, might find the strength to climb out. " There is no question but that the principal has a great influence on teachers morale and performance in the classroom and, consequently, on how well or whether pupils learn."[49] Principals sometimes resist change (staff development) because they fear that there are inadequate financial resources. They need to consider the cost of in-service education with great emphasis on initiatives within the school, particularly as they relate to the more efficient use of existing resources. The best teachers of teachers are teachers themselves, as has been indicated previously. The research, in general, and Hilmar Wagner, in particular, support this concept. Conducting in-service in this way would add hardly any financial burden. In those districts where the financial burden is not as heavy, a recommendation made by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching might be considered. "Every principal should have a School Improvement Fund, discretionary money with which to provide time and materials for program development and for special seminars and

---

[48] Peters and Waterman, In Search, p. 124.

[49] Donald P. Mitchell and Anne Hawley, Leadership in Public Education Study — A Look At the Over-Looked (Academy for Education Development, Inc., 1972), p. 17.

staff retreats. Principals should also have more control over the selection and rewarding of teachers".[50] Finally, some principals resist change because they feel that the staff lacks the motivation to make the necessary effort. This fear could be eliminated if they (principals) were to always seek ideas from a diverse rather than a uniform group and allow all of them to help in reaching a decision. Principals ought to approach interactions with teachers on a collegial basis rather than by emphasizing positional status. They should approach working with teachers in a manner that reflects recognition that teachers can do the job. It is then possible for him to do what he can to make it easier for teachers to do their jobs. A principal must work at maintaining open communication. This requires much more than providing information to teachers; it requires accepting information from teachers with consideration given to their values and feelings. "A manager's number one problem today can be summed up in one word: communication."[51]

Another area of concern for principals is adult learning. The principal must have knowledge of how adults learn. He needs to have an understanding of, and sympathy for, the way in which teachers acquire new concepts and eventually incorporate them into classroom practice. He should be knowledgeable in the ways teachers interpret and use new ideas. He has to be familiar with what research on teaching and learning actually tell us. "Principals must acknowledge where teachers are in terms of their individual development as teachers, and then help them to gain

[50] Ernest L. Boyer, "High School: A Report On Secondary Education in America", The Education Digest, (January, 1984), 40.

[51] Editors, "The Number One Problem", Personnel Journal (April, 1966), 237.

fresh insights and understandings into the complexities of their own class-
rooms."[52]

To elaborate even more on the spirit of collegiality and collabora-
tion (necessary elements of successful adult learning) that must exist if
staff development efforts are to be successful, it is essential for
principals to involve teachers in appropriate ways and at appropriate
times. A principal should strive to provide opportunities for the teachers
in a school to experience the vision - "the capacity to create and commun-
icate a view of a desired state of affairs that induces commitment among
those working in the organization, and to obtain a sense of purpose so
that they might come to share in the ownership of the school enterprise
more fully.[53]

Through such sharing in the ownership of the school enterprise,
teachers would know that their involvement in decision-making is
expected because their information and judgements are valued and needed.
The principal should expect teachers to be involved in things which he
considers important, and assure them of the opportunity to be involved in
those things that they themselves consider important. Principals ought
to provide opportunities for teachers to identify and work with one
another in ways that will assist them in gaining acceptance from their
peers. They should provide considerable latitude for experimentation,
recognizing that such experimentation will not always be successful and
the right to be wrong is essential for improvement to occur. Peters and
Waterman state: "Steven Jobs, the originator of the successful Apple

[52] Smyth, "Education Leadership", p. 64

[53] Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence", p. 81.

computer says: People were asking me, "How does Apple do it?" "Well, we
hire really great people and we create an environment where people can
make mistakes and grow".[54]

Prior to involving the staff in these collegial efforts toward
productive in-service education, researchers indicate that principals
should perform certain administrative tasks. They should enable the
teachers to acquire the necessary information and skills (such as attending
workshops and conferences) in areas where they have an interest or a need
with the expectation that they will be able to use and share with the
rest of the staff the new ideas and techniques. They should use their
influence to secure adequate supplies and equipment to support instructional
needs. They should make provision for supply and equipment needs for
teachers wishing to implement new ideas and plans. Provisions for support
services must be made, wherever possible, that relieve the teacher of
tasks not related to the instructional program of the school. The school
day ought to be organized in such a way as to provide the teacher with
individual planning time as well as planning time with appropriate instruc-
tional colleagues.

By following the results of the findings on adult learning, the
principal will provide for a reward structure. He will design ways in
which a deserving teacher can acquire peer approval, the highest form of
professional recognition. According to research, this may include teachers
teaching teachers, placing teachers in positions of leadership where they
have the opportunity to give and grow, recommending excellent teachers to
others, and using teachers as models to improve the overall program. A

---

[54] Peters and Waterman, In Search, p.286.

principal will use all available means to recognize excellence of performance of teachers. This may include newspapers, notes of appreciation, letters, individual comments, and announcements. He will encourage teachers to become members of productive groups and thereby attain recognition through association with the achievements of these groups. He will see to it that, when students are recognized for their accomplishments, the teachers who contributed to the success of these students are also recognized. Finally, he will provide recognition for teachers making exceptional contributions by giving additional support, such as time, and resources, that will enable them to continue their exceptional work. In the adult learning section of this chapter, the essence of adult education was identified as getting the people involved to come up with solutions to problems they are having. The final part of the quotation read - then stand at the sidelines to applaud them. The principal does the applauding, the recognition through the various means described above.

Joseph Rogus compiled a list of the practical items with which a principal must be concerned when dealing with in-service education:

FORMAL PROCESSES:
    A) Commitment
        1) Is a statement of commitment to the importance of staff development included in the school's policy statements?
        2) Are financial resources committed to staff development programming.
        3) Do I regularly demonstrate commitment to assist staff members in their personal-professional growth?
        4) Do I have a staff development planning committee for the building?
        5) Is the planning committee representative of the faculty members?
    B) Needs Assessment and Diagnosis
        1) Are goals for the staff development program established?
        2) Are program goals disseminated to faculty?
        3) Is provision made for gathering needs assessment data from:
            a) teachers
            b) administrative staff
            c) central office staff

        d)   other data sources; e.g. student plan, achievement
            data, attitude inventories, etc.
   4) Are program objectives determined from the data collected?
   5) Are program objectives achievable given the limited resources
       available?
   6) Do program objectives reflect the range of difference among
       departments and individuals?

C) Development
   1) Are planned learning activities congruent with
       objectives selected?
   2) Within planned program activities, are the principles of
       "adult learning" honored?
   3) If consultants are to be involved in program delivery, is the
       way they are used defensible?
   4) If an inservice program is to be part of the planned activities,
       are the principles of effective inservice followed?

D) Implementation and Evaluation
   1) Can the plan be carried out and conceived?
   2) Is the plan being carried out as conceived?
   3) Where changes in the initial plans are necessary, is the
       substance of the plan maintained?
   4) Are evaluation mechanisms keyed to the objectives established?

II. INFORMAL PROCESS

A) Day-to-Day Interactions
   1) Do I consciously interact positively each day with as many
       individual faculty members as I can?
   2) Do I reinforce staff for work effectively done?
   3) Do I go out of my way to assist staff in pursuing their own
       professional growth?

B) Administrative Involvements
   1) Do I involve staff in program-related discussions?
   2) Do I delegate authority along with responsibility?
   3) Do I carry out the personnel evaluation program from a staff
       development perspective?

C) Modeling
   1) Do I read and show my enthusiasm for ideas with staff?
   2) Am I actively pursuing my own professional growth?[55]

Raymond Lemley, the principal of Daniel Hand High School, in Madison,

Connecticut, showed his concern for daily attention to in-service education:

> As instructional and educational leader, the principal accepts the
> capacity and capability of people to learn. The essence of what I do
> on a day-to-day basis is directly related to my view of the potential
> in everyone to learn - and that means to grow, to change, to move
> from one point of intellectual development to another. In addition,
> principals accept or at least assert that they accept the fact that

---

[55] Rogus, "Building An Effective", p.10.

people seem to learn better when involved in the learning.[56]

Effective staff development programs have principals who are more concerned with instruction, who communicate their views about instuction, who take responsibility for decisions relating to instruction, and who coordinate instructional programs and emphasize academic standards.

[56] Raymond E. Lemley, "Evaluation: The Key to Effective Learning," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 115.

RPTIM Model Of Staff Development

READINESS - PLANNING - TRAINING - IMPLEMENTATION - MAINTENANCE

In order to determine what practices in staff development design are
considered effective, a national study of staff development practices was
done in 1981. It was mentioned in chapter one that the Survey of Effective
Staff Development Practices was mailed to the regular membership of the
Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) and the National
Staff Development Commission (NSDC). These two professional organizations
represented a national sample of professors (COPIS) and practitioners (NSDC)
with expertise in the area of staff development. The 50 COPIS members had a
major committment to research, teaching, and service in the area of supervision
and professional development. The 378 NSDC full members were all actively
engaged in planning and conducting staff development programs for school
personnel. Eighty-six percent of the professors and eighty-one per cent of
the practitioners reported their perceptions. The results of this national
survey showed strong support for all practices in the model.

RPTIM MODEL PRACTICES

Stage 1: Readiness

1. A positive school climate is developed before other staff develop-
   ment efforts are attempted.

2. Goals for school improvement are written collaboratively by teachers,
   parents, building administrators, and central office administrators.

3. The school has a written list of goals for the improvement of school
   programs during the next three to five years.

4. The school staff adopts and supports goals for the improvement of school programs.

5. Current school practices are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.

6. Current educational practices not yet found in the school are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.

7. The school staff identifies specific plans to achieve the school's goals for improvement.

8. Leadership and support during the initial stage of staff development activity are the responsibility of the principal and central office staff.

Stage II: Planning

9. Differences between desired and actual practices in the school are examined to identify the in-service needs of the staff.

10. Planning of staff development activities relies, in part, on information gathered directly from school staff members.

11. In-service planners use information about the learning styles of participants when planning staff development activities.

12. Staff development programs include objectives for in-service activities covering as much as five years.

13. The resources available for use in staff development are identified prior to planning in-service activities.

14. Staff development programs include plans for activities to be conducted during the following three to five years.

15. Specific objectives are written for staff development activites.

16. Staff development objectives include objectives for attitude development (new outlooks and feelings.)

17. Staff development objectives include objectives for increased knowledge (new information and understanding).

18. Staff development objectives include objectives for skill development (new work behaviors).

19. Leadership during the planning of in-service programs is shared among teachers and administrators.

STAGE III: Training

20. Staff development activities include the use of learning teams in which two to seven participants share and discuss learning experiences.

21. Individual school staff members choose objectives for their own professional learning.

22. Individual school staff members choose the staff development activities in which they participate.

23. Staff development activities include experiential activities in which participants try out new behaviors and techniques.

24. Peers help to teach one another by serving as in-service leaders.

25. School principals participate in staff development activities with their staffs.

26. Leaders of staff development activities are selected according to their expertise rather than their position.

27. As participants in staff development activities become increasingly

competent, leadership behavior becomes less directive or task-oriented.

28. As participants in staff development activities become increasingly confident in their abilities, the leader transfers increasing responsibility to the participants.

STAGE IV: Implementation

29. After participating in in-service activities, participants have access to support services to help implement new behaviors as part of their regular work.

30. School staff members who attempt to implement new learnings are recognized for their efforts.

31. The leaders of staff development activities visit the job setting, when needed, to help the in-service participants refine or review previous learning.

32. School staff members use peer supervision to assist one another in implementing new work behaviors.

33. Resources are allocated to support the implementation of new practices following staff development activities (funds to purchase new instructional materials, time for planning, and so forth).

34. The school principal actively supports efforts to implement changes in professional behavior.

STAGE V: Maintenance

35. A systematic program of instructional supervision is used to monitor new work behavior.

36. School staff members utilize systematic techniques of self-monitoring to maintain new work behaviors.

37. Student feedback is used to monitor new practices.

38. Responsibility for the maintenance of new school practices is shared by both teachers and administrators.

Ninety per cent or more of both the practitioners (NSCD) and professors (COPIS) believed that 32 of the 38 practices that define the Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance stages should be used when inservice programs were designed. Over seventy per cent reported similar support for the remaining six practices.

Strong positive support was also found for the ten assumptions (beliefs) that the RPTIM model is based upon:

1. All school personnel need inservice throughout their careers.

2. Significant improvement in educational practices takes considerable time and long-term inservice programs.

3. Inservice education should focus on improving the quality of school programs.

4. Educators are motivated to learn new things when they have some control over their learning and are free from threat.

5. Educators vary widely in their competencies and readiness to learn.

6. Professional growth requires commitment to new performance norms.

7. School climate influences the success of professional development.

8. The school is the most appropriate unit or target of change in education.

9. School districts have the primary responsibility for providing the resources for inservice training.

10. The principal is the key element for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school.

Well over ninety per cent of both the practitioners and professors agreed with all of the assumptions except that "the school is the most appropriate unit of change, not the district or the individual". While about three-fourths of the professors agreed or stongly agreed with this assumption, only a little more than half of the practitioners agreed with it.

There appears to be, with limited exception, strong support for the assumptions and the practices among the practitioners (NSDC) and the professors (COPIS). Based on the high degree of support for the practices and assumptions of the RPTIM model, it can be concluded that this five-stage approach to staff development does have face validity. It describes what a group of experts in the area of staff development believe ought to be operational practice when planning, delivering, and institutionalizing the results of inservice programs.

Those who are concerned with designing effective staff development need to begin to use this model to move beyond opinions; to determine what really does work in school settings. They need to find out what is required to implement the five stages.

RPTIM MODEL

Different models of staff development are based upon different assumptions. The assumptions held by the designers of the model will lead to distinct approaches in planning staff growth programs. Other assumptions about in-service programming have led to different models. Some of those assumptions regarding staff development are:

A) a way of implementing districtwide change and goals;

B) a way of addressing teacher needs;

C) a way of eliminating weaknesses in teachers or principals;

D) as developmental or professional growth;

E) a way of helping educators do their present jobs more effectively;

F) training based upon personal needs and interests of teachers or administrators.

The assumptions behind the RPTIM model are, for the most part, supported by research and appear to be common to successful in-service programs:

1) All personnel in schools, to stay current and effective, need and should be involved in in-service throughout their careers;

2) Significant improvement in educational practice takes considerable time and is the result of systematic, long-range staff development;

3) In-service education should have an impact on the quality of the school program and focus on helping staff improve their abilities to perform their professional responsibilities. The highest priority should go to improving competencies "to do one's job" while involving teachers in defining the nature of instructional practices and programs in their school;

4) Adult learners are motivated to risk learning new behaviors when they believe they have control over the learning situation and are free from threat of failure. To the extent possible, in-service should be structured to avoid the threat and anxiety of failure.

5) Educators vary widely in their professional competencies, readiness and approaches to learning, therefore, individualization is essential in effective staff development programs;

6) Professional growth requires personal and group commitment to new performance norms. Educators are much more likely to be open to new learning when they and their peers have cooperatively developed a

commitment to changes in their behavior and have a desire to behave differently.

7) Organizational health, including factors such as social climate, trust, open communication, and peer support for change in practice, influence the success of professional development programs.

8) The school is the primary unit of change; not the district or the individual.

9) School districts have the primary responsibility for providing the resources and training necessary for a school staff to implement new programs and improve instruction.

10) The school principal is the gatekeeper for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school.

The five stages of RPTIM are: Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance. While these stages are discrete and tend to be sequential, they are part of an ongoing, overlapping cycle of inservice education.

STAGE I: Readiness

In the readiness stage, a school climate that supports change in professional behavior is developed, with communications being clear and open. The school staff identifies possible solutions to instructional and programmatic problems. Individual and group commitments to and understandings of the desired changes in professional behaviors are established. Teachers will develop shared belief statements about what their school should be like and they will focus on broad based support. It is essential that the principal demonstrate administrative support and he must understand why a faculty decides to make particular changes. The principal, along with the teachers, commit themselves to new but shared norms for professional behaviors. Both

principal and teachers should operate under the assumption that the school is
an organic, goal-oriented unit that is the target for norms, values, and
behaviors that must change.

The results of stage one should be:

a) a written set of in-service goals which the faculty of a school helps
   select, understands, and is committed to implement;

b) a description of the specific programs and practices selected to
   achieve these goals;

c) a broad, very general four-to-five year plan for implementing the
   desired change in an ongoing program;

d) a climate conducive to growth will be established;

e) common expectations for improvement will be developed; and

f) a commitment to professional growth will be made.

STAGE 2: Planning

In the planning stage, stage II, goals, established in stage I, will be
refined into specific in-service objectives; knowledge objectives, strategies
or skill objectives, and attitude objectives. Principals must trust teachers
and value their involvement to use clinical supervision techniques that allow
teachers to select areas where they will improve their instruction.

A needs assessment will be conducted. Different forms of assessing
needs may be used, such as interviews, questionnaires, supervisor judgements,
student test data, and external evaluators. No decision about the needs of
teachers should be made without their involvement. Information ought to be
provided about the learning styles of those for whom the in-service program
will be planned.

Available resources, such as time, materials, personnel, and funds will be determined. The final focal point of stage II is the tentative design of the in-service effort. It could be workshops, visitations, graduate courses, or practica. Whatever the design, plans for in-service activities should include:

a) opportunities to build relationships and communication among the participants;

b) time when participants can interact freely and share what they are learning;

c) pre-and-post assessments;

d) learning options to accommodate differences in achievement and learning style uncovered in the needs assessment and differences in competence detrimental in the pre-assessment. It would be very beneficial to use an in-service steering committee.

The results of this planning stage will be:

1) goals and programs to be implemented;

2) specific in-service objectives to be addressed in the in-service activities;

3) an overall, four or five year sequence of activities for training staff and for putting the desired changes into practice;

4) a detailed description of the major in-service workshops and other activities that have been planned for the first 12 to 18 months of the four years;

5) a list of resources – personnel and material – that can be used to implement the in-service activities;

6) a budget to support the in-service program and changes in the school program.

The plan should be evaluated to determine its workability and potential to achieve the desired goals and program changes.

STAGE 3:   Training

In the third stage, training, effective training activities are guided by what is known about adult learning. The primary vehicle for in-service education is the workshop -- a group of people participating in structured activities during a specified period of time to accomplish predetermined goals and tasks which will lead to new understandings and changes in professional behaviors.

The participants should have options concerning what learning activities they pursue. It is critical to involve them in selecting at least some objectives, activities, and materials they will use in a workshop. This involvement responds directly to the adult learner's need for control over his own learning. Also, adults learn a great deal through informal interactions.

Principals are key people in school improvement and change; their encouragement of staff to participate in workshops, their involvement in in-service with teachers, and their assistance to teachers in follow-up after training, increase significantly the chance of real, lasting change in professional performance among the faculty.

An essential feature of effective in-service education is the opportunity to participate in simulations or experience-based learning. The more the teachers see the students, school facilities, instructional materials, and equipment used in the training as similar to their own situation, the more likely they are to view the experiential activities and what is to be learned as real and applicable to them. Teachers are willing to learn something that they perceive will be useful to them back in the classroom.

STAGE 4: Implementation

During stage four, implementation, the participants will have a written plan available to them for actualizing their learning. Throughout this phase, the principal should help monitor and support the plan along with monitoring help from other teachers who also attended the workshop. The use of clinical supervision by peers or principal provides an excellent opportunity for educators to request assistance in implementing the things they have learned into their daily work behaviors.

In this stage, the principal must legitimize the changes learned from the in-service:

1) by giving formal and informal recognition to people who are making the desired changes, and

2) through budgeting funds and other resources to support specific changes in practice.

This recognition could occur through:

a) newspaper releases;

b) reports in district newsletters;

c) access to additional professional travel funds;

d) opportunities to participate as inservice leaders for other educators; and

e) provision for released time.

STAGE 5: Maintenance

The fifth and final stage of the RPTIM model is the maintenance stage. In this stage, continuous monitoring must be established to determine whether

new behaviors are still being practiced and to determine whether the new

goals are being met. The key element during this stage is continuous

review. To summarize, Wood and Thompson said:

> Professional growth is a complex, human task. It requires a climate
> conducive to learning and change. It is based upon clear goals and
> objectives derived from careful needs assessment. It is promoted by
> the effective use of diverse resources. It includes opportunities for
> field testing, feedback, and adjustment, all these things take time to
> achieve.[57]

In conclusion, Wood, Thompson, and Russell cite the following as the

critical characteristics of professional development programs:

- Inservice education should be conducted in a supportive climate of trust,
  peer support, open communication, and staff commitment to a set of clearly
  understood norms for functioning in an institution (clear roles, program
  definition, instruction procedures, goals)

- Inservice education goals should be based upon a common set of expecta-
  tions held by the participants for normative behaviors that are essential
  to performing their professional roles in their institution.

- Successful inservice education requires support from administration and
  school boards including time, personnel, training materials, and funds
  to enable the training necessary to implement educational programs in
  their school district.

- Decisions concerning the objectives, experiences, and assessment of
  inservice education should be cooperatively developed by those involved
  in and affected by the training program.

- Inservice education should be based upon assessed needs of participants.
  A need is defined as a gap between the expected professional performance
  and actual performance in the work setting.

- Inservice education should model the instructional behaviors desired of
  participants.

- Inservice education programs should be demanding and set high but reason-
  able standards of performances for participants.

[57] Wood, Thompson, Russell, "Designing Effective", p.88.

- Inservice education programs should have three major components:
  1) attitude
  2) pedagogical skills
  3. substantive knowledge

- Inservice education should be decentralized; focus on actual school problems, goals, needs, plans; and be conducted whenever feasible, in the school setting.

- Inservice education should prepare educators to implement research findings and best practice related to carrying out their job responsibilities.

- Inservice education should emphasize the use of rewards (such as opportunity, increased autonomy, participation in decision-making, increased competence, success and advancement) which have been shown to promote high commitment and performance.

- Inservice education should be based upon clear, well understood, specific goals and objectives that are congruent with institutional and personal goals.

- Inservice education should provide options for participants that will accomodate individual professional needs and learning styles (timing sequence, pace, interests, goals, delivery systems).

- Inservice education should be experientially based wtih opportunities to select, adapt, and try out new professional behaviors in real and simulated work settings.

- Central office personnel and school administrators should support inservice education through their participation in training activities with their peers and subordinates.

- Inservice education programs should provide for follow-up and "on call" assistance to educators as they use their new skills and understandings in the work setting after they have been trained.

- Leadership in inservice education programs should be situational and emphasize authority by competence and expertise rather than by position.

- Evaluation of inservice education should be both formative and summative and should examine the immediate effect on participants, extent of transfer to the work setting, and the effect in achieving institutional goals.[58]

[58] Ibid., pp. 88-90.

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

PART A - Presentation of Data

In part A of this chapter each staff development practice and assumption is listed. After each practice, and assumption (beliefs), the results of the survey will be given along with all comments which the respondents made. Twenty-four (24) out of twenty-nine (29) principals responded. Five private school principals responded.

PRACTICE 1:

A positive school climate is developed before other staff development efforts are attempted. The practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory.

> Yes - 23 - 95.8%
> No - 1 - 4.2% (public high school)

COMMENTS:

"Yes - close contact with small faculty"

Yes - through activities which establish confidence between administration and staff, i.e., personal contact, support through recognition."

"Yes - day to day practices of honest dealings with staff."

"Yes - open communication - small group faculty meetings."

"No - the above must be done in order to achieve a positive
school climate"

"Yes - through questionnaires sent home to parents asking for their
participation in school board meetings - principal meets with student
council."

"Yes - promoting good morale."

"Yes - through open communications, trust, and a supportive
relationship.

"Yes - staff development is planned by teachers."

"Yes - inservice planning committee - and there is open
communication, trust, and supportive relationships."

"Yes - round table discussions, faculty welfare committee, faculty get togethers after athletic events, principal very available for individual faculty visits."

"Yes - Committee structure of decision making."

"Yes - Variety of faculty input groups - Principal's Advisory Council, District Curriculum Council - Staff Development Council - Superintendent's Advisory Council "Open Door" policy - District Committee on Excellence."

PRACTICE 2:

Goals for school improvement are written collaboratively by teachers, parents, building administrators, and central office administrators. [On the national validation survey of 1981, of the original inventory, this practice was viewed as essential because of at least a 70% positive response].

                    Yes - 17 - 70.8%
                    No - 7 - 29.2% (one private school)

COMMENTS:

"No - parents have not been involved."

"Yes - sometimes difficult because of time constraints. However, the more involvement, the better the results."

"Yes - Parents not involved - we have spent two years as a school and district writing performance objectives."

"Yes - comprehensive need assessment in spring of each year by the faculty advisory committee (FAC)."

"Yes - fall Institute Day is devoted to this - school board members and selected parents are invited to participate in this session."

"Yes - started at grassroots (teachers/department chair people) then reviewed by parents at parent advisory meetings."

"Yes - education committee of school board membership consists of board members, parents, faculty, and administrators." "Yes - working with staff through in house structure with information moving up and down."

"Yes - every year goals are written and made public to everyone."

"Yes - Steering Committee comprised of all groups mentioned."

PRACTICE 3:

School has a written list of goals for the improvement of school programs during the next three to five years. [Viewed as an essential practice (70% positive response) on the national validation survey of 1981 of the original inventory]

              Yes - 17 - 70.8%
              No - 7 - 29.2% (one private school)

COMMENTS:

"Yes - essential - long range planning is necessary."

"Yes - we have, more or less, but only for instruction; no other elements considered."

"No - great idea but, perhaps, more ideal than practical."

"Yes - identified by Faculty Advisory Council, administration, and curriculum committee."

"Yes - this follows from board of education short and long range goals."

"Yes - we have a five year plan, done by Anderson/Roethe Co., next fall (84) we will have a North Central Evaluation."

"No - only on a one year basis."

"Yes - especially through North Central Visitations and suggestions."

"No - 83-84 only."

"Yes - we have a five year long range projection."

"Yes - District Steering Committee - District Curriculum Council and more recently, the District Committee on Excellence, have developed long range improvement plans for the district.

PRACTICE 4:

The school staff adopts and supports goals for improvement of school programs. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

              Yes - 20 - 83.3%
              No - 4 - 16.7% (two public and two private schools)

COMMENTS:

"Yes - grassroots approach - personal and department goals should be encouraged. These should be incorporated into building and district goals."

"Yes - they were involved in the writing - they have an investment."

"Yes - meetings, discussions and consensus."

"Yes - department goals and individual performance objectives."

"Yes - through the departments."

"Yes - dialogue at a lot of meetings - every faculty meeting has a "Round Table" discussion time."

"Yes - done on departmental level on an annual basis for one year only."

"Yes - serve on curriculum committee, education committee."

"Yes - involvement in the goals."

"Yes - because they are professional and want to improve plus a great deal of administrative quality circle type of work."

"Yes - Faculty Welfare Committee - Faculty Meetings Round Table discussions."

"Yes - involve staff in goal setting process."

"Yes - involved in development."

PRACTICE 5:

Current school practices are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

<div align="center">

Yes - 19 - 79.1%
No - 4 - 16.7% (one private school)
Unclear - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - through a needs assessment format."

"Yes – through a semi-organized system using the administrative structure, i.e., departments."

"unclear"

"Yes – informally."

"Yes – committee work."

"Yes – through school's Instructional Advisory Council."

"Yes – Administrative Council advises administration and vice versa. Analysis and recommendations follow."

"Yes – faculty and committee meetings monthly."

"Yes – committee compares practice with goals."

"Yes – follow up studies – teacher input-testing."

"Yes – Faculty Life Committee evaluation."

"Yes – Staff Development Advisory Council functions to develop programs based on goals."

PRACTICE 6:

Current educational practices not yet found in the school are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) in the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
\text{Yes} & - 14 - & 58.3\% \\
\text{No} & - 6 - & 25\% \quad (\text{two private schools}) \\
\text{No Answer} & - 1 - & 4.2\% \\
? & - 1 - & 4.2\% \\
\text{Some} & - 1 - & 4.2\% \\
\text{Neither} & - 1 - & 4.2\%
\end{array}
$$

COMMENTS:

"Yes – visitations of other successful programs – reading of current research."

"Yes – by materials read and considered by Central Office, chairpersons, administration, and teachers."

"Yes - committee work."

"Yes - administrative considerations."

"Yes - faculty is asked where there is a weakness/potential weakness. What specifically needs to be improved? Can it be improved? If so, how?

"Yes - committee compares practices with goals."

"Yes - professional staff involved in Professional Growth."

"Some"

"Yes - chairperson committee research and input."

"Yes - attendance of key staff people at out of district workshops."

PRACTICE 7:

The school staff identifies specific plans to achieve the school's goals

for improvement. [Viewed as an essential practice (70% positive response) on

the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<div align="center">

Yes - 19 - 79.1%
No - 4 - 16.7% (one private school)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - meetings and discussion using a committee structure, if necessary."

"Yes - teachers being in charge of specific program areas."

"Yes - through departments with administrative approval."

"Yes - proposal by staff members, analysis, and action."

"Yes - teachers work on it for department goals. Administration/department chairpeople for total school goals."

"Yes - teachers and administration."

"Yes - goals planning process."

"Yes - Development Committee and Board of Directors."

"Yes - written departments."

"Yes - through the various advisory councils mentioned."

PRACTICE 8:

Leadership and support during the initial stage of staff development activity is the responsibility of the principal and central office staff. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

Yes - 20 - 83.3%
No - 3 - 12.5% (one private school)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS: .

"Yes - the principal must "sell" hard based on legitimate needs and assessment.

"Yes - we do not undertake as many activities as other schools, but we work for 100% success on those used."

"Yes - with direct input/support of department heads."

"Yes - instructional leader is principal."

"Yes - but, we team this with department chairs or it won't work."

"Yes - plus department chairs."

"Yes - not exclusively - staff involvement per previous responses."

"No - building staff."

"Yes - Administrative team (Principal/Assistant Principals/ Deans."

PRACTICE 9:

Differences between desired and actual practices in the school are examined to identify the inservice needs of the staff [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

Yes - 16 - 66.6%
No - 7 - 29.2% (one private school)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - through self-examination by staff."

"Yes - by series of small group faculty meetings, on school time."

"Yes - by teacher evaluation process where teachers work on specific agreed upon growth activities."

Yes - each year we have a list for inservice. It is revised and rated as to numerical priorities."

"Yes - we never truly reach the desired practices."

"Yes - committee compares practice with goals."

"Yes - survey"

"Yes - principals, director of curriculum and department chairpersons identify needs."

PRACTICE 10:

Planning of staff development activites relies, in part, upon information gathered directly from school staff members. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\text{Yes} - 19 - 79.1\% \\
\text{No} - 3 - 12.5\% \quad \text{(no private schools)} \\
\text{No Answer} - 2 - 8.4\%
\end{array}
$$

COMMENTS:

"Yes - informal discussion - follow up on ideas."

"Yes - teacher committee."

"Yes - Directly and indirectly through examination and evaluation of current practices."

"No - generally no, most of impetus comes from administration and central office."

"Yes - informally in some cases, and, in others, there's a formal structure."

"Yes - Faculty Advisory Committee and department meetings."

"Yes - through surveys and through departments."

"Yes - faculty meetings."

"No - through leadership positions."

"Yes - staff development committee - has faculty member from each department."

"No, but - development committee and board of directors and a student welfare committee."

"Yes - through the committee set up."

"Yes - needs assessment instrument."

PRACTICE 11:

In Service planners use information about the learning styles of participants when planning staff development activities. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

                    Yes -   8 - 33.3%
                     No - 15 - 62.5% (two private schools)
              No Answer -   1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"No - idealistic, but hardly practical."

"Yes - from staff evaluation data annually gathered."

"Yes - questionnaire primarily."

"Yes - use Hunter's teaching techniques - we know how far each has gone."

"Yes - along with many other proven elements enhancing learning."

"No - no thought given to learning styles."

"No - good idea - not tried."

"No - However, choice is a frequent ingredient of inservice halfdays and institute days."

PRACTICE 12:

Staff Development programs include objectives for inservice activities covering as much as five years. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

                    Yes -   3 - 12.5%
                     No - 19 - 79.1% (three private schools)
              No Answer -   2 - 8.4%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - three to five years - allow for staff turnover."

"Yes - but five years is at the outer limit."

"No - inservice is on a year to year basis."

"No - three to four years."

"No - three years and then recycle."

"More like three years."

"No - normally three year specific plans, although the general theme of instructional improvement is long range."

PRACTICE 13:

The resources (time, money, materials) available for use in staff development are identified prior to planning inservice activities. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

                    Yes - 18 - 75%
                     No - 5 - 20.8% (one private school)
              No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - check budget prior."

"Yes - good budgeting."

"Yes - careful planning on building and central office level."

"Yes - by the district director of curriculum."

"Yes - prioritize inservice needs - time is a large factor—what can we reasonably accomplish - money is allocated for this."

"Yes - through recommendations from buildings to central office."

"Yes - Central office during budget development."

"Yes - budgeting projections."

"Yes - budget item."

PRACTICE 14:

Staff development programs include plans for activities to be conducted during the following three to five years. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

<div style="text-align:center">

Yes - 11 - 45.8%
No - 12 - 40.0% (three private schools)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - again, allow for turnover of staff."

"Yes - usually stated in fairly general terms."

"Yes - two years."

"No - not yet."

"No - one to three years."

"Yes - e.g. clinical supervision/clinical teaching."

PRACTICE 15:

Specific objectives are written for staff development activities. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory.]

<div style="text-align:center">

Yes - 13 - 54.2%
No - 10 - 41.6% (three private schools)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - absolutely essential."

"Yes - as an annual staff evaluation activity."

"Yes - through staff formation."

"Yes - by staff planners."

"No - the last three years, the district has dedicated all inservice and staff development time to an alternative format for a North Central self-study; consequently, no specific objectives for staff development have been generated."

"Yes - part of needed guidelines in applying for halfday inservice days from ISBE."

PRACTICE 16:

Staff Development objectives include objectives for attitude development.

[This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) in the 1981

national validation of the original instrument].

<div align="center">

Yes - 16 - 66.7%
No - 7 - 29.1% (one private school)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - affective domain critical."

"Yes - these arise naturally as those teachers involved work on the project."

"Yes - what do we need to do to make (High School) a better school is a key question."

"Yes - definitely."

"Yes - somewhat."

PRACTICE 17:

Staff development objectives include objectives for increased knowledge

(new information and understanding). [This practice was viewed as essential

(70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original

inventory]

> Yes - 20 - 83.3%
> No - 2 - 8.3% (one private school)
> No Answer - 2 - 8.3%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - a 'new' plan that becomes obsolete before it is finished is wasted time."

"Yes - only as a by-product."

"Yes - definitely."

"Yes - motivation, retention, rate and degree - Madeline Hunter model."

"Yes - effective schools research, clinical teaching, learning styles."

PRACTICE 18:

Staff development objectives include objectives for skill development (new work behaviors). [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original instrument].

> Yes - 20 - 83.3%
> No - 3 - 12.5% (one private school)
> No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - one must have the right skills to match the right job."

"Yes - definitely."

"Yes - somewhat."

PRACTICE 19:

Leadership during the planning of inservice programs is shared among teachers and administrators. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

> Yes - 22 - 91.6%
> No - 1 - 4.2% (private school)
> No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - informal discussion in curriculum committee."

"Yes - a committee of teachers and administrators."

"Yes - teachers must be included in the planning."

"Yes - teachers are involved in the presentation of inservice programs."

"Yes - committees and Quality Circles."

"Yes - with direct input and supervision by department heads."

"Yes - faculty meetings."

"Yes - teachers are happy to show their skills."

"Yes - more teachers than administrators."

"Yes - through department chairpersons and appointed individuals."

"Yes - department level."

"Yes - department heads."

"Yes - inservice committees."

"Yes - committees"

"Yes - administrative - faculty inservice committee."

"Yes - Staff Development Advisory Council."

PRACTICE 20:

Staff Development activities include the use of learning teams in which two to seven participants share and discuss learning experiences. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory]

$$Yes - 6 - 25.0\%$$
$$No - 17 - 70.8\% \text{ (five are private schools)}$$
$$No Answer - 1 - 4.2\%$$

COMMENTS:

"No - other systems."

"Yes - we have four to five cadres (teachers/administrators) working throughout the district."

"Yes - small groups not necessarily two to seven."

"Yes - called a cadre, made up of those exhibiting the ability and interest".

"Yes - staff development training teams are four to eight persons who learn new techniques together, share their experiences and then teach their colleagues."

PRACTICE 21:

Individual staff members choose objectives for their own professional learning. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<div align="center">

Yes - 13 - 54.1%
No - 9 - 37.5% (two private schools)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
Both - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - individual goal setting requirement."

"Yes - in some cases."

"Yes - with help of department chairperson."

"Yes - with input from department heads and administration."

"Yes - what they need to make them better."

"Yes - minimal - just promote."

"Yes - sometimes they have a choice of several sessions."

"Yes - to some extent."

"Yes - within parameters."

PRACTICE 22:

Individual school staff members choose the staff development activities in which they participate. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<div align="center">
Yes - 11 - 45.8%
No - 12 - 50.0%   (four private schools)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
</div>

COMMENTS:

"No - no choice by individuals."

"Yes - they usually have a choice of several activities."

"Yes - with input from department heads and administration."

"No - assignment of administrators."

"Yes - to a degree - we sometimes recommend what they should do."

"Yes - sometimes."

"No - not generally, but on occasion."

"Yes - sometimes."

"No - design for the building."

"Yes - from survey (elective)."

"Yes - half-day choices."

PRACTICE 23:

Staff development activies include experimental activities in which participants try out new behaviors and techniques. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<div align="center">
Yes - 13 - 54.1%
No - 9 - 37.5%   (two private schools)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
Sometimes - 1 - 4.2%
</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes, computer usage."

"Yes - Madeline Hunter - Hemispheric Learning."

"Yes - learning styles."

"Sometimes - not as a rule."

"Yes - What do we need to do to make (High School) a better school

is the key question."

"Yes - have been working on Hunter's style for five years."

"Yes - clinical teaching."

"Yes - teaching behaviors, management techniques."

PRACTICE 24:

Peers help to teach one another by serving as inservice leaders. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory.

> Yes - 16 - 66.6%
> No - 6 - 25.0% (two private schools)
> No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
> Both - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - this is done in our Chapter One Basic Skills Activity."

"Yes - on a very limited basis - our teachers are reluctant to serve as models or leaders."

"Yes - if the individual staff members chooses to exercise this option."

"Yes - teachers love this."

"Both - on occasion."

PRACTICE 25:

School principals participate in staff development activities with their staffs. [This practice was viewed as essential (70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

> Yes - 22 - 91.6%
> No - 1 - 4.2% (public school)
> No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - leading in discipline."

"Yes - in selected activities."

"Yes - improvement of instruction."

"Yes – some of us are cadres, working throughout the district."

"No – delegated – administration."

"Yes – as members of the cadre."

PRACTICE 26:

Leaders of staff development activities are selected according to their expertise rather than their position. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

                    Yes – 19 – 79.1%
                     No – 4 – 16.7% (one private school)
              No Answer – 1 – 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes – works better that way."

"Yes – definitely – many classroom teachers participate on cadres."

"Yes – nearly always important."

"Yes – plus interest and potential."

PRACTICE 27:

As participants in staff development activities become increasingly competent, leadership behavior becomes less directive as task-oriented (re: whoever is the leader of the staff development program). [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

                    Yes – 13 – 54.1%
                     No – 8 – 33.3% (one private school)
              No Answer – 1 – 4.2%
         Does not apply – 1 – 4.2% (private school)
                      ? – 1 – 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"Yes - we now have a "cadre" of leaders."

"Yes - we haven't reached that point yet."

"Yes - responsibility is shifted to building principal."

PRACTICE 28:

As participants in staff development activities become increasingly confident in their abilities, the leader transfers increasing responsibility to the participants (re:whoever is the leader of the staff development activity). [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of ·the original inventory].

<pre>
              Yes - 13 - 58.3%
               No - 8 - 33.3% (one private school)
        No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
                ? - 1 - 4.2%
</pre>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - moving slowly."

"Yes - with accountability."

PRACTICE 29:

After participating in inservice activities, participants have access to support services to help implement new behaviors as part of their regular work. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<pre>
              Yes - 19 - 79.1%
               No - 4 - 16.7% (two private schools)
        No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
</pre>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - resources are administrators, chairpeople, and professionals, i.e., ASCD people."

Yes - when possible."

"Yes - for the most part."

"Yes - cadre members go into the classrooms to help."

"Yes - sometimes."

"Yes - the cadre members."

"Yes - e.g., department chairs, work with faculty on a continuing basis with clinical teaching. Principals work directly with department chairs on clinical supervision."

PRACTICE 30:

School staff members who attempt to implement new learnings are recognized and rewarded for their efforts. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

$$
\begin{array}{rrrl}
\text{Yes} - & 16 & - & 66.6\% \\
\text{No} - & 4 & - & 16.6\% \quad \text{(all public schools)} \\
\text{No Answer} - & 1 & - & 4.2\% \\
\text{Does Not Apply} - & 1 & - & 4.2\% \quad \text{(private school)} \\
\text{Both} - & 1 & - & 4.2\% \\
? - & 1 & - & 4.2\%
\end{array}
$$

COMMENT:

"Yes - follow up in regular evaluation."

"Yes - released time, budget allocation."

"Yes - by letter, not monetarily."

"Yes - citation at department/faculty meetings."

"Yes - they receive a higher rating."

"Yes - no money, just a pat on the back."

"Yes - become staff development presenters."

"Yes - not $. The usual "pat on the back" and public recognition at faculty meetings, board meetings, etc."

"Both - not monetarily."

"Yes - by accepting/implementing."

"Yes - personal letter, newspaper and newsletter article memoranda to Board."

"Yes - teach others and are praised."

PRACTICE 31:

The leaders of staff development activities visit the job setting, when needed, to help the inservice participants refine or review previous learning. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
              Yes - 17 - 70.8%
               No -  4 - 16.6%  (one private school)
        No Answer -  1 -  4.2%
  Does not Apply -  1 -  4.2%
                ? -  1 -  4.2%
```

COMMENTS:

"Yes - as much as possible."

"Yes - when possible."

"Yes - if they can."

"Yes - always."

"Yes - have budget for this."

"Yes - when requested."

"Yes - always."

PRACTICE 32:

School staff members use peer supervision to assist one another in implementing new work behaviors. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
              Yes - 10 - 41.6%
               No - 13 - 54.2%  (four private schools)
        No Answer -  1 -  4.2%
```

COMMENTS:

"No - a goal for the future."

"Yes - Chapter One program."

"Yes - in some departments, i.e., math, science, English."

"Yes - optional."

"Yes - this is working good."

"Yes - not as much as I would like."

PRACTICE 33:

Resources (time, money, materials) are allocated to support the implementation of new practices following staff development activities (funds to purchase new instructional materials, time for planning, etc.) [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

                    Yes - 20 - 83.3%
                     No - 3 - 12.5% (one private school)
              No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

COMMENTS:

"No - not specifically."

"Yes - line item in district budget under "In-Service."

"Yes - but funds are too scarce."

"Yes - limited."

"Yes - no problem."

"Yes - especially $."

"Yes - films, tapes, workshops."

"Yes - budget."

PRACTICE 34:

The school principal actively supports efforts to implement changes in professional behavior. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<div align="center">

Yes - 22 - 91.6%
No - 0 -
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%
? - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - try and provide material/equipment/finances necessary."

"Yes - by participating and vocally supporting the leaders."

"Yes - by trying to encourage and motivate teachers/leaders to try new approaches."

"Yes - through the evaluation process - improvement of instruction."

"Yes - specifically ask teachers to bombard me with ideas and suggestions."

"I don't understand."

"Yes - in service."

"Yes - directly involved in appraisal of all faculty."

PRACTICE 35:

A systematic program of instructional supervision is used to monitor new work behavior. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<div align="center">

Yes - 17 - 70.8%
No - 6 - 25.0% (two private schools)
No Answer - 1 - 4.2%

</div>

COMMENTS:

"Yes - Bellon model of instructional supervision."

"Yes - top priorty."

"Yes - by department heads primarily."

"Yes - department chairs and all building administrators work on this."

"Yes - becomes part of class observation focus (if teaching related)."

"Yes - administrative teams visit classes."

"Yes - each non-tenured teacher is observed at least 12 hours

each year; in addition, another 18 hours per teacher is devoted to instructional supervision conferences. Department chairs also observe tenured teachers at least once every three years."

"Yes - directly involved in appraisal of all faculty - also department chairs appraise faculty each semester."

PRACTICE 36:

School staff members utilize systematic techniques of self-monitoring to

maintain new work behaviors. [This practice was viewed as essential (at least

70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
            Yes - 11 - 45.8%
             No - 11 - 45.8%  (four private schools)
      No Answer -  1 -  4.2%
              ? -  1 -  4.2%
```

COMMENTS:

"Yes - meetings, brain picking and observation of others."

"Yes - self-evaluation based upon specific criteria."

"Yes - in theory."

"Yes - annual job targets."

"Yes - annual goal setting and self-evaluation."

PRACTICE 37:

Student feedback is used to monitor new practices. [This practice was

viewed as essential (at least 70% positive response) on the 1981 national

validation of the original inventory].

```
            Yes - 12 - 50%
             No - 11 - 45.8%  (two private schools)
           Both -  1 -  4.2%
```

COMMENTS:

"Yes - surveys."

"Yes - not organized at this time."

"No - unfortunately."

"Yes - informally."

"Yes - students evaluate staff every three to four years."

"Yes - survey."

"No - not yet."

"Yes - not as much as we would want - currently developing this area."

"Yes - they serve on curriculum committee."

"Yes - not required - optional."

"Yes - some use questionnaires, other informal feedback."

"Yes - Questionnaires, Verbal Comments, Student Government Reps."

"Both - depends on the instructor."

PRACTICE 38

Responsibility for the maintenance of new school practices is shared by both teachers and administrators. [This practice was viewed as essential (at lease 70% positive response) on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

$$\text{Yes} - 22 - 91.6\%$$
$$\text{No} - \ 2 - \ 8.4\% \quad \text{(public schools)}$$

COMMENTS:

"Yes - mostly administrators."

"Yes - scratch teachers and add department heads."

PART II

ASSUMPTION 1

All school personnel should be involved in professional development throughout their careers to stay current and effective. [This assumption was agreed or strongly agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
           Strongly Agreed  -  22
                    Agreed  -   2
                  Combined  -  24  =  100%
```

ASSUMPTION 2

Significant improvement in educational practice takes considerable time and is the result of systematic, long-range staff development. [This assumption was agreed or strongly agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
           Strongly Agreed  -  15
                    Agreed  -   8
                  Combined  -  23  =  95.8%
```

ASSUMPTION 3

In-service education should focus on improving the quality of the school program. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
           Strongly Agreed  -  17
                    Agreed  -   6
                  Combined  -  23  =  95.8%
```

ASSUMPTION 4

Educators are motivated to learn new things when they have some control over their learning and are free from threat. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory.

```
           Strongly Agreed  -  18
                    Agreed  -   6
                  Combined  -  24  =  100%
```

ASSUMPTION 5

Educators vary widely in their professional competencies, readiness for learning, and approaches to learning. [This assumption was strongly agreed or

agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<pre>
            Strongly Agreed - 13
                    Agreed - 11
                  Combined - 24 = 100%
</pre>

ASSUMPTION 6

Professional growth requires commitment to new performance norms. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<pre>
            Strongly Agreed -   6
                    Agreed - 16
                  Combined - 22 = 91.6%
</pre>

ASSUMPTION 7

Organizational health, including factors such as social climate, trust, open communication, and peer support for changes in practices, influences the success of professional development programs. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<pre>
            Strongly Agreed - 14
                    Agreed - 10
                  Combined - 24 = 100%
</pre>

ASSUMPTION 8

The school is the most appropriate unit of change, not the district or the individual. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by only 50% of the practitioners on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

<pre>
            Strongly Agreed -   8
                    Agreed -   3
                  Combined - 11 = 45.8%
</pre>

ASSUMPTION 9

School districts have the primary responsibility for providing the resources and training necessary for a school staff to implement new programs and improve instruction. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
Strongly Agreed  -   9
        Agreed  -  11
      Combined  -  20  =  83.3%
```

ASSUMPTION 10

The school principal is the "gate-keeper" or key element for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school. [This assumption was strongly agreed or agreed to by 90% of the respondents on the 1981 national validation of the original inventory].

```
Strongly Agreed  -  14
        Agreed  -   9
      Combined  -  23  =  95.8%
```

Priority listing of the thirty-eight staff development practices from the practice receiving the highest YES percentage to the practice receiving the lowest YES percentage.

1. 95.8% Yes - A positive school climate is developed before other staff developments are attempted. (A positive climate is characterized by open communications, trust, and supportive relationships.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

2. 91.6% Yes - Leadership during the planning of inservice programs is shared among teachers and administrators.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

2. 91.6% Yes - School principals participate in staff development activities with their staffs.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

2. 91.6% Yes - The school principal actively supports efforts to implement changes in professional behavior.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

2. 91.6% Yes - Responsibility for the maintenance of new school practices is shared by both teachers and administrators.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

6. 83.3% Yes - The school staff adopts and supports goals for improvement of school programs.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

6. 83.3% Yes - Leadership and support during the initial stage of staff
    development activity is the responsibility of the principal and central
    office staff.

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

6. 83.3% Yes - Staff development objectives include objectives for increased
    knowledge (new information and understanding).

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

6. 83.3% Yes - Staff development objectives include objectives for skill
    development (new work behaviors).

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

6. 83.3% Yes - Resources (time, money, materials) are allocated to support
    the implementation of new practices following staff development activities
    (funds to purchase new instructional materials, time for planning, etc.)

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

11. 79.1% Yes - Current school practices are examined to determine which ones
    are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development
    activities are planned.

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

11. 79.1% Yes - The school staff identifies specific plans to achieve the
    school's goals for improvement.

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

11. 79.1% Yes - Planning of staff development activities relies, in part, upon
    information gathered directly from school staff members.

    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

11. 79.1% Yes – Leaders of staff development activities are selected according to their expertise rather than their position.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

11. 79.1% Yes – After participating in inservice activities, participants have access to support services to help implement new behaviors as part of their regular work.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

16. 75% Yes – The resources (time, money, materials) available for use in staff development are identified prior to planning inservice activities.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

17. 70.8% Yes – Goals for school improvement are written collaboratively by teachers, parents, building administrators and central office administrators.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

17. 70.8% Yes – The school has a written list of goals for the improvement of school programs during the next three to five years.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

17. 70.8% Yes – The leaders of staff development activities visit the job setting, when needed, to help the inservice participants refine or review previous learning.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

17. 70.8% Yes – A systematic program of instructional supervision is used to to monitor new work behavior.
(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

21. 66.6% Yes - Differences between desired and actual practices in the school are examined to identify the inservice needs of the staff.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

21. 66.6% Yes - Staff development ofjectives include objectives for attitude development (new outlooks and feelings).

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

21. 66.6% Yes - Peers help to teach one another by serving as inservice leaders.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

21. 66.6% Yes - School staff members who attempt to implement new learnings are recognized and rewarded for their efforts.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

25. 58.3% Yes - Current educational practices not yet found in the school are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

25. 58.3% Yes - As participants in staff development activities become increasingly confident in their abilities, the leader transfers increasing responsibility to the participants. (re: whoever is the leader of the staff development activity.)

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

27. 54.1% Yes - Specific objectives are written for staff development activities.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

27. 54.1% Yes - Individual school staff members choose the staff development activities in which they participate.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

27. 54.1% Yes - Staff development activities include experimental activities in which participants try out new behaviors and techniques.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

27. 54.1% - As participants in staff development activities become increasingly competent, leadership behavior becomes less directive or task-oriented. (re: whoever is the leader of the staff development program).

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

31. 50% Yes - Student feedback is used to monitor new practices.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

32. 45.8% Yes - Staff development programs include plans for activities to be conducted during the following three to five years.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

32. 45.8% Yes - Individual school staff members choose the staff development activities in which they participate.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

32. 45.8% Yes - School staff members utilize systematic techniques of self-monitoring to maintain new work behaviors.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

35. 41.6% Yes - School staff members use peer supervision to assist one another in implementing new work behaviors.

(70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

36. 33.3% Yes – Inservice planners use information about the learning
    styles of participants when planning staff development activities.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

37. 25% Yes – Staff development activities include the use of learn-
    ing terms in which two to seven participants share and discuss
    learning experiences.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the intial inventory.)

38. 12.5% Yes – Staff development programs include objectives for
    inservice activities covering as much as five years.
    (70% constituted an essential practice on the initial inventory.)

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA – PART ONE

Practice #1 – The Yes response of 95.8% on this practice is meaningfully higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #2 – The Yes response of 70.8% on this practice is almost the same as the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #3 – The Yes response of 70.8% on this practice is almost the same as the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #4 – The Yes response of 83.3% on this practice is higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #5 – The Yes response of 79.1% on this practice is higher than the 70% response on the initial inventory.

Practice #6 – The Yes response of 58.3% on this practice is lower than the 70% positive on the initial inventory.

Practice #7 – The Yes response of 79.1% on this practice is higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #8 – The Yes response of 83.3% on this practice is higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #9 – The Yes response of 66.6% on this practice is lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #10 – The Yes response of 79.1% on this practice is higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #11 - The Yes response of 33.3% on this practice is very meaningfully
  lower than the 70% postive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #12 - The Yes response of 12.5% on this practice is exceedingly
  lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

Practice #13 - The Yes response of 75% on this practice is slightly higher
  than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #14 - The Yes response of 45.8% on this practice is meaningfully
  lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #15 - The Yes response of 54.1% on this practice is meaningfully
  lower than the 70% postive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #16 - The Yes response of 66.6% on this practice is slightly lower
  than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #17 - The Yes response of 83.3% on this practice is higher than the
  70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #18 - The Yes response of 83.3% on this practice is higher than the
  70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #19 - The Yes response of 91.6% on this practice is meaningfully
  higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #20 - The Yes response of 25% on this practice is exceedingly lower
  than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #21 - The Yes response of 54.1% on this response is meaningfully
  lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #22 – The Yes response of 45.8% on this practice is meaningfully

    lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #23 – The Yes response of 54.1% on this practice is meaningfully

    lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #24 – The Yes response of 66.6% on this practice is slightly

    lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #25 – The Yes response of 91.6% on this practice is meaningfully

    higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #26 – The Yes response of 79.1% on this practice is slightly

    higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #27 – The Yes response of 54.1% on this practice is meaningfully

    lower than the 70% response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #28 – The Yes response of 58.3% on this practice is lower than the

    70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #29 – The Yes response of 79.1% on this practice is slightly

    higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #30 – The Yes response of 66.6% on this practice is slightly lower

    than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #31 – The Yes response of 70.8% on this practice is almost the

    same as the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #32 – The Yes response of 41.6% on this practice is mean-

    ingfully lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #33 - The Yes response of 83.3% on this practice is higher than the

   70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #34 - The Yes response of 91.6% on this practice is meaningfully

   higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #35 - The Yes response of 70.8% on this practice is almost the same

   as the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #36 - The Yes response of 45.8% on this practice is meaningfully

   lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #37 - The Yes response of 50% on this practice is meaningfully

   lower than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

PRACTICE #38 - The Yes response of 91.6% on this practice is meaningfully

   higher than the 70% positive response on the initial inventory.

The response to the assumptions on this inventory is almost exactly the

same as the initial responses on the 1981 inventory. The responses to assump-

tions 1 through 7, and 10, are 90% or higher (with the response to assumption

9 at 83.3%) while the response to assumption 8 is 45.8% rather than the

response of 50% on the initial 1981 inventory.

In part two of this analysis, each stage of the RPTIM model is analyzed.

Stage One - Readiness Stage - Emphasis on selection and understanding of, and commitment to, new behaviors by a school staff or group of educators.
The principals nearly reach consensus on practice 1. They indicate strongly that it is important to them to establish close personal contact with their staff members. They want to establish open lines of communication and an atmosphere of trust, while building strong supportive relationships. By doing these things, they hope to build a positive climate within the building which will continually promote good morale.

Although the principals indicate a strong desire to build close relationships with individual staff members, they do not see the necessity to consult individuals in long range projects such as goal setting and objectives writing. For tasks such as these, groups, like academic departments, are the primary source of information for, and assistance to, principals. The principals indicate that it is too time consuming and too difficult to involve everyone, especially the parents. There are written lists of goals. These lists, however, are departmentally written and cover only a one year or two year period. The principals' practice of establishing only one, or, at most, three year plans conflicts with the suggestions of researchers who insist that long range planning is essential to staff development.

The principals reveal that their leadership is vital during the initiation phase of staff development programming. However, they also state that the role of the department chairperson is almost as important as theirs in this phase. They repeatedly state that they, along with their department heads, provide leadership and support during this initial

stage. The principals emphasize again the role of department chairs in

in their comments to practice 7. These comments reveal that when principals

refer to the school staff they are referring not to individual staff members,

but to collective instructional units. In other words, principals do not

appear concerned whether or not individual staff members support their

efforts as long as they have the support of academic departments.

The principals strongly agree that it is important to examine current

educational practices, but not those practices which are found outside

the local building. Their many comments throughout the inventory indicate

that there are many time constraints when dealing with staff development

activities. Looking outside the local building at other educational

practices would take too much time.

In concluding this analysis of the Readiness Stage, certain points

can be highlighted:

1) the principals indicate that the department chairpersons play a

    very important leadership role.

2) the principals believe that long range planning means one or two

    years and not a 3 - 5 year period, which differs from the findings

    of the research.

3) the principals seek input from academic departments rather than

    individual teachers.

4) research indicates that a positive school climate is a climate which

    emphasizes trust and close personal contact. This implies an emphasis

    on each individual and his relationship to the principal. However,

    the principals of DuPage County do not seek the input of individual

    staff members in projects such as goal writing. Further instances

of their emphasis on groups will be seen in the analyses of the other
stages of this model.

Stage Two - Planning Stage - The specific plans for an inservice program
(to be implemented over a period of 3 to 5 years) are developed to
achieve the desired changes or professional practices selected.

In reacting to practice 9, (examining the differences between
desired and actual practices) the principals indicate that this is not
an essential practice. Yet, they do indicate that gathering information
from staff members is important. The difference would appear to be that
information gathering is a comparatively easy process while delineating
the differences between actual and desired practices would be more
difficult and time consuming. This would be in line with the previous
comments which the principals made regarding ever-present time constraints.

The issue of time resurfaces in practice 12 (five year objectives).
Their response to this practice is the lowest positive response on the
entire inventory. They reject the idea that staff development objectives
should cover as much as five years. Their comments reveal that a
shorter time period is preferable. One to three year plans are preferred
by those principals who offer comments. Since the research indicates
that at least 3 to 5 years are needed to successfully implement new work
behaviors, the principals' emphasis on a 1 to 3 year period could explain,
in part, why staff development activities have historically been so poorly
accepted and implemented.

To practice 3 in the Readiness Stage, which referred to a 3 to 5
year period, the principals respond at the essential level. By comparing
their responses to that practice and to practice 12, it would appear
that the principals, in this inventory, work and plan within a 1 to 3

year period of time with three years being the outer limit. Practice 14

(activities for three to five years) yields the same kind of response as

does practice 12. Here again is a practice which specifies a certain

amount of time - 3 to 5 years. The principals' comments to practice 14

reinforce that the 1 - 3 year period of time seems to be what is preferred.

It might be assumed that the responses to practices 1 and 16 would

be similar because the attitudes of staff members (practice 16) is the

essential ingredient in a positive school climate (practice 1). However,

there is a discrepancy between the principals' responses and comments to

practices 16 (attitude development) and 1 (positive school climate).

Although the principals respond with a resounding 95.8% positive response

to practice 1, they only gave a 66.6% positive response to practice 16.

The principals indicate that it is essential to have present a

positive school climate where there is a high degree of close contact,

trust, and a supportive environment. Yet, in practice 16, they do not

perceive that attitude development is essential as an objective for staff

development programming. One possible explanation for this is that

attitude development is a less easily measured area with which to work

than the areas of skill development and the acquisition of increased

knowledge. This explanation is supported by the principals' responses

and comments, especially to practices 9, 16, 17, 18, and 20. Skill

development and the acquisition of knowledge are more easily measured

than attitude development.

The principals' responses to practices 17, and 18 - new knowledge and

new skill acquisition - are higher than their responses to practice 16 -

attitude development. This discrepancy would support the conclusion that

the principals prefer to deal with such easily measured areas as skill

development and knowledge acquisition as opposed to attitude development.

The responses to practice 19, regarding leadership during the planning of in-service, shows a preference on the part of the principals for working through the department chairperson structure. The principals reveal the strong presence of the department chairperson and the teacher committee structure. In the analysis of the readiness stage, the point was made that teachers appear to be viewed not so much as individuals, but as members of departments or committees whose collective opinion is sought.

Practice 11, which refers to the different learning styles of adults, is rated very low by the principals. Their comments to this practice reveal that they haven't even given this factor any thought. Along with comments suggesting that this factor is not even considered, were comments stating that this is just too impractical. The research indicates that consideration of learning styles is important to effective staff development. Principals must be aware of this element of effective in-service activities. Perhaps principals who are not aware of the importance of adult learning styles need inservice themselves to reach such an awareness. Research has shown that principals have the greatest need for in-service. There is also a possible link between this practice and practice 16, which deals with attitudinal objectives for staff development activities. Aside from the time constraints similar to both, they also are both difficult to measure. Attitudes and learning styles can be considered less easily measured areas than skill development and acquisition of new knowledge.

In concluding this analysis of the planning stage, certain points can be highlighted:

1) time, resources, and material are examined in this survey. But these

principals consider only time to be an important constraint to
their staff development efforts.

2) the principals prefer a one to three year period of time for staff
development activities as opposed to a three to five year period.

3) the more easily measured areas of knowledge acquisition and
skill development are preferred as objectives for staff development
rather than the objective of attitude development.

Stage Three - Training Stage - plans are translated into practice.

The principals' responses to practices 21 and 22 (individual choice
of objectives and activities) would seem to reinforce the conclusion
already drawn that principals tend to view their staffs not so much as
individuals but rather as members of instructional units. Their comments
to practices 21 and 22 are indicative of their preference for department
chairperson coordination. It would certainly seem that if principals are
truly desirous of achieving a positive school climate (practice 1) their
responses and comments to these two practices would have been far more
positive.

This obvious preference for the department structure, with a department
chairperson, is reflected again in their responses and comments to practice
20 (use of learning teams). They emphatically respond NO to practice 20,
rejecting the use of learning teams comprised of two to seven members.
Their short-range orientation and their preference for the department
structure would seem to be the reason for their extremely low positive response
to this practice - a practice which emphasizes the sharing and discussing of
learning experiences. Sharing and discussing are longer, more time-
consuming activities.

In practices 27 and 28, the principals reveal that, even though,

they solicit the opinions of the their teachers, at least as members of their respective departments, in designing staff development practices, they are reluctant to turn over to them the leadership and the responsibility for carrying out the directives of the staff development program. This is also reflected in their rejection of practice 24, which states that peers should help to teach one another.

In their responses to the practices in the Training Stage, the principals indicate that they actively support and participate in in-service activities. Yet, when it comes to choosing objectives, they are reluctant to allow the teachers to do this. Their comments reveal that they, alone or through their department chairpersons, still prefer to direct and control the actual carrying out of the staff development activities.

Some key conclusions which can be drawn from their comments to the practices in the Training Stage are:

1) principals do participate in staff development activities;

2) staff members are not allowed the choice of their own in-service activities;

3) principals and their department chairpersons retain leadership and responsibility for staff development activities.

Stage Four – The Implementation Stage – Focuses on insuring that the training becomes part of the ongoing professional behavior of teachers and administrators in their own work setting.

In the Training Stage, the principals respond below the essential level on practice 24, which refers to the concept of peers teaching one another. In this stage, they respond far below the essential level in practice 32, which refers to the use of peer supervision – implementing

new work behaviors. Their reluctance to support more positively the use of peers seems to reflect again their preference to maintain control of staff development implementation.

As far as resources are concerned for implementation, there is a strong positive response that indicates that these resources will be provided. Since the principals and their department chairs have the major role in determining what the objectives of the in-service program are, it can be concluded that they would be able to provide the necessary resources for implementation. In practice 13 of the planning stage, the principals indicate that they budget for staff development activities. With this budget in hand, they then would be able to provide whatever resources are needed. Implied throughout this analysis is that there would not be any extra resources available if they should be seen as needed by the teachers. The principals keep a sufficiently tight rein on these in-service activities, so that they are most always able to direct the teachers efforts away from any extra expenditures which could result from unforeseen outcomes of in-service activities.

It is surprising to note the principals' less-than-essential positive response to practice 30 (reward or recognition). If they are truly desirous of attaining a positive school climate and since they allow the teachers little leadership and responsibility for the implementation of staff development outcomes (which would foster a positive school climate) it would seem that they would at least be very attentive to the needs of teachers for being recognized and rewarded for what they do.

In concluding this analysis of the implementation stage, certain points can be highlighted.

1) teachers are not being recognized and rewarded;

2) principals do not encourage peer supervision and peer instruction;

3) the only resources available are those which have already been budgeted.

<u>Stage Five - The Maintenance Stage - Begins as new behaviors are integrated</u>

<u>into daily practice. The aim of this final stage is to ensure that once</u>

<u>a change in performance is operational, it will continue over time.</u>

In practice 38, the principals strongly recommend that the responsibility

for maintaining new work behaviors be shared between themselves and the

teachers. Yet, in practice 36, they show that this responsibility is, in

fact, not shared. They do not want their teachers to self-monitor their

efforts nor do they foster the use of student feedback as a monitoring device.

According to their comments to practice 35, they want supervision to be

done by themselves or by their department chairs.

There is real inconsistency between their responses to practice 38

and other practices throughout the inventory. They say that sharing

responsibility is very important yet they contradict this by favoring

administrative and department chairperson supervision only.

<center>Further Analysis - By topic</center>

Various topics about staff development permeate all the various stages.

Additional comments to these topics follow:

<u>Topic One - The concept of peer supervision and peer helping -</u> The

research indicates that peer helping is a constructive and successful

approach for implementing any change under the umbrella of staff development.

The response in practice 24 (slightly under the essential 70%) and the

response on practice 32 (very much under the essential 70%) indicate that

principals may not be aware of, or refuse to consider the importance of, the

effective role that peer helping can play in staff development activities.

Their responses also indicate that they might not be willing to give over

the "leadership" of staff development implementation to teachers. The

comments provided by the principals reveal, at least in part, two opposite

opinions:

1) teachers are reluctant to serve as models or leaders;

2) teachers love doing this.

The difference between practices 24 and 32 is based on the idea of

IMPLEMENTING which is found in practice 32. Principals believe in the

concept of teachers helping teachers yet, according to the response on

practice 32, do not want to give over to the teachers the role of

IMPLEMENTING the new work behaviors which are the result of the staff

development activities. This conclusion can be drawn from the principals'

responses to practices 2, 8, 31, 34, and 38. Principals want and actively

seek out the help of teachers during the planning stage of staff development

activities. After the in-service effort has been implemented, they again

want and seek out the help of teachers in maintaining the new work

behaviors. However, no where is it indicated that principals want the

help of teachers during the implementation stage of the staff development

process. In fact, the principals clearly indicate that they and their

assistants will direct the implementation and not the teachers.

Topic Two - Objectives of staff development activities - The principals

support strongly (83.3%) the staff development objectives of increased

knowledge and skill development. They support, only minimally, the

objective of attitude development. There seems to be much more support

for the cognitive domain than for the affective domain. Perhaps principals

should initiate staff development activities totally unrelated to

instruction, and instead, to very informal social activities in order to improve that affective area. In the October, 1982 issue of <u>Educational Leadership</u>, Ann Murray told of her experiences at the Merrimack Education Center in Chelmsford, Massachusetts. She organized a staff development day consisting, not of heavy educational concerns, but of physical fitness activities. "The end result was a positive mood and a very enjoyable day along with a tremendous positive increase in the climate of the school."[59] Here is a perfect example of concern for the affective domain and the important role that it plays in the development of a positive school climate.

<u>Topic-Three - Resources</u> - Most principals indicate that resources, whatever they may be, are looked at prior to the initiation of staff development activities. They then indicate that these resources are allocated to support the implementation of these activities. The amount of money available for in-service activities ranges from as low as $300.00 to as high as $10,000 for the 1983-84 school year. There is no difference between the public and the private schools. All schools, with the exception of one <u>public</u> school, have funds allocated for staff development activities. It appears that money is available for inservice activities. The money is not limitless, however. Careful planning must precede the staff development activity so that its proper development would occur.

<u>Topic Four - The element of time and staff development activities</u> - The lowest positive response on the entire survey is in answer to practice 12. Of the other practices which specifically referred to time, practices 3 and 14, practice 3 was responded to at the essential level while practice 14 was responded to at far below the essential level. Why do two of the three practices referring to time receive extremely low positive ratings

---

[59] Ann Murray, "Staff Development: Fine and Fit," <u>Educational Leadership</u> (October, 1982), 57.

and why does the other one receive an essential rating?   It is possible

to explain this difference by carefully reviewing the wording of the

practices. Practice #3 states that there exists a written list of goals

for staff development activities while practices #12 and #14 state that

there exist plans and objectives for staff development. An analysis of

these statements indicates that it is easy to have a written list of

goals (new statements of proposed actions) whereas plans and objectives

would infer the presence of intended actions to accomplish these goals.

The principals are revealing that there should be long-range goals.

However, specific plans and objectives are much more short range. Perhaps

this attitude or outlook, on their part, is one indication why in-service

activities so often fail. The research indicates that staff development

programs, in order to succeed, must be based upon a foundation of long

range planning and implementation and a commitment thereto.

This analysis of the 38 practices of the RPTIM model has uncovered

many differences between the principals involved in this survey and the

practitioners who responded to the initial validation survey of 1981.

Several key points brought out in this analysis are:

1) during all stages of staff development activities, the principals

   view the role of the department chairperson as extremely vital and place

   less emphasis on the individual staff member's role;

2) the principals actively support staff development activities but

   allow individual staff members little leadership and responsibility

   for their implementation;

3) principals view staff members, not so much as individuals, but as

   members of instructional units;

4) the maximum length of time devoted to in-service activities is

one to three years.   There also seems to be a short range

orientation on the part of the principals activities;

5) there is apparently an inconsistency between a principals' verbal

desire for a positive school climate and his staff development

actions toward that end.

6) these principals prefer staff development activities which deal with

more easily measured objectives such as increased knowledge and

skill development rather than objectives that are concerned with

attitude development.

CHAPTER FOUR

I. SUMMARY

The purpose behind writing this dissertation was to find out whether

the principals of the high schools in DuPage County employ the staff develop-

ment practices of the RPTIM model of Steven Ray Thompson and Fred Wood.

Thompson and Wood's model, consisting of thirty-eight practices of designing

staff development programs, was validated in 1981. Practitioners in

staff development throughout the country responded to the thirty-eight

practices and ten assumptions contained in the RPTIM model. Their

responses, on each and every item, indicated that, if utilized, these

practices and assumptions would yield effective staff development programs.

A School-Based Staff Development Practices Inventory, an adaptation of

the original RPTIM inventory, was mailed to all high school principals –

public and private – in DuPage County, Illinois. The principals were

asked whether or not they employed the thirty-eight practices of RPTIM

Model. Additionally, they were asked to what degree they agreed or

disagreed with the ten basic assumptions of the model.

83% of the principals returned a completed inventory. Based on

this return, it will be possible to draw conclusions regarding their

utilization of these practices in designing staff development programs.

II. CONCLUSIONS

In this section, the conclusions are drawn from the answers to the

five questions contained in chapter one.

QUESTION 1:

Are the effective staff development practices (as identified by the

RPTIM model) acceptable, as essential, by the principals of the high schools

of DuPage County?

In general, the most effective practices are in the Readiness and

Implementation Stages. The principals rate all the practices of the
Readiness Stage, except practice #6, as, at least, essential. Practice
#6 - Current educational practices not yet found in the school are examined
to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for
improvement before staff development activities are planned - received a
positive response of only 58.3%. Approximately 25% of the principals
surveyed are not looking at practices outside the school.

Among the Implementation stage practices, only practices 30 and 32
fell below the essential level, and then, practice 30 was just barely
below at 66.6%. The principals agree that all other practices in this
stage are, at least, essential. Practice #32, regarding the use of peer
supervision as a tool for implementing new work behaviors, was rated a
very low 41.6%. The principals are hesitant or reluctant to turn over to
the teachers too much autonomy over the implementation of staff development
program outcomes.

Stage III, the Planning stage, contained eleven practices. The average
positive response was 62.8%, a response below the 70% essential level.
Averages are deceiving, however. Seven of the eleven practices received
at least an esential positive response, whereas only four practices had
positive responses below the essential level. Practices 11, 12, 14 and 15,
had responses very much below the essential level, with practices 11 and
12 garnering two of the lowest responses on the entire inventory. The
responses to practices eleven and twelve - dealing with the time period
of staff development objectives and the necessity of knowing about the
learning styles of adult learners - indicate that not much is known nor
has much research been done into the learning styles of adults by the
principals.

Wilsey and Killian have shown that adults do learn in many different ways and that learning progresses through many different stages. Very little attention has been paid or is now being paid to this fact. Also, staff development objectives are not being planned for periods up to five yours in the future. Thompson and Wood determined that, in order to be effective, staff development practices should include objectives covering this period of time. In DuPage County, this is not being done.

In the Training stage, the average positive response was 58.7%, the lowest among the five stages. Of the nine practices in the stage, only two were rated at the essential level or above - seven were rated below the essential level, with Practice 20 receiving an extremely low positive response of 25.0%.

Individual school staff members do not have the opportunity to choose their own objectives for professional improvement nor are small learning teams utilized. After the in-service activities are finished, individual school staff members are not given increased responsibility.

In Stage V, the Maintenance stage, the average positive response was 64.5%, under the essential level. However, again, averages are deceiving. Practices 35 and 38 are at least, essential, with practice 38 receiving a positive response 91.6%. Practices 36 and 37 were rated much below the essential level, with 45.8% and 50.0% respectively.

The principals favor the concept of supervision to monitor new work behaviors but the monitoring would not be self-monitoring nor would it be done through the use of student feedback. The monitoring would be done, based on the data, by the principal, an assistant principal, or by a department chairperson.

Question 2:

What are the common barriers to effective staff development practices?

Based upon the data in the inventory, some of the common barriers to effective staff development practices (according to the RPTIM model) are:

1) lack of interest in research;

2) lack of a research-based orientation on the part of the chief administrator within the high school;

3) failure to trust the staff members of a high school to implement their own staff development outcomes;

4) inadequate knowledge about the conditions of teaching and learning;

5) a static organizational structure (strict adherence to the department chairperson structure).

6) insufficient time devoted to the staff development process, from initial planning to the maintenance of newly acquired work behaviors.

Question 3:

What are the commonly held assumptions about staff development practices (are they in agreement with the assumptions of the RPTIM model)?

The principals in this inventory are in agreement with the practitioners of staff development on the initial inventory. On the initial inventory, 90% of the practitioners agreed or strongly agreed with all of the assumptions, except #8. The principals, on this inventory, respond likewise. On the initial inventory, only about 50% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with assumption #8, while 45.8% of the principals agreed or strongly agreed with this assumption on this inventory.

Question 4:

Are there differences between public and private high schools in the design of their staff development practices?

The data gathered indicate that there are no general differences between the public and the private high schools in their design of staff development practices. The private school principals are in general agreement with the public school principals on all practices in the inventory.

Question 5:

Are there any differences in the design of staff development programs based upon the size of the school (number of teachers); the staff development experience of the principal; the budget allotted for staff development programs; or the age of the principal?

No definite conclusions can be reached concerning question 5. Perhaps an item analysis would yield results which would have direct bearing on this question. The procedure utilized in this dissertation did not include an item analysis because the focus of the analysis of responses was qualitative and not quantitative. The information contained in Appendix B is provided solely as a broad overview of certain demographic factors represented by the sample population.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based upon the conclusions of the inventory:

1) It is recommended the the principals of high schools become more familiar with the research available in the field of staff

development. The research indicates that principals have the greatest need for in-service. This study indicates the very same fact. Some principals indicate that they do not even consider the learning styles of adults in their in-service planning. Principals must also revise their short-range orientation to the staff development process. They tend to think in terms of one and two years whereas the research has indicated that a three to five year period is necessary.

2) It is recommended that the principals of high schools attend and participate in more in-service activities. Reading current literature in the field is only one way to keep abreast of the research being conducted. Attendance at in-service programs with related experiential activities is another way which should be considered.

3) It is recommended that the principals of high schools become more acquainted with the elements of adult learning. There is little doubt, according to the research, that adults pass through several stages in their learning. Principals must know how adults learn in order to design effective adult learning experiences. Teachers will not be able to implement new work behaviors unless they learn them first themselves.

4) It is recommended that the high school principals become more familiar with the concept of change and how people accept it. Change is a constant. It is always occurring . Staff development is change, and often it is radical change. Principals must know how to structure inservice activities so that they are accepted as growth and not as remediation.

5) Teachers should be given more leadership roles in the implementation

stage of new work behaviors. The research clearly indicates that
if teachers feel "ownership" over staff development activities,
the opportunity for successful implementation will increase.
The research also reveals that those closest to the implementation
of new work behaviors should have considerable responsibility.

6) Staff development objectives must be more long-range with phases
   of implementation to stretch out over at least a 3 year period.
   Throughout this entire inventory, the principals expressed short
   range orientation, shorter than the research indicates is desir-
   able. Much more careful, well thought-out, long-range designs
   should be utilized by the principals to enhance the chances of
   effective implementation of in-service programs.

7) There ought to be an introduction of small group participatory
   management teams, such as Quality Circles. There is much infor-
   mation available on the Quality Circle form of participatory
   management. There are also many workshops available in these
   kinds of activities. The Association for Supervision and
   Curriculum Development, itself, sponsors institutes on Quality
   Circles. Authors, such as William Ouchi, Sud Ingle and Donald
   Dewar have written extensively on the subject.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Further research is suggested in the areas of:

1) participatory management − a participatory form of management needs
   to be developed and implemented to determine its effect on staff
   development programs.

2) implementation of the RPTIM model: The RPTIM model needs to be
   applied to actual school situations and the results need to be studied

and evaluated.

3) implementation of the RPTIM model - what is really required to implement the five stages (such as personnel, time, and funds).

4) the duration of staff development activities - time appears to be a real concern of the principals. The appropriate amount of time required for the successful implementation of in-service activities, needs to be investigated further.

5) teachers teaching teachers - further investigation should be undertaken to determine the benefits of peer observation and peer helping in structuring staff development activities.

6) organizational structure - the traditional department chair-person structure should be studied to determine whether or not it is the most effective structure for the successful implementation of staff development programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakalis, Michael J. A Strategy for Excellence. Hamden, Connecticut:
    Linnet Books, 1974.

Boyer, Ernest L. "High School: A Report on Secondary Education in
    America." The Education Digest (January, 1984), 36-41.

Byrne, Robert. "Inservice Programs - What Are the Essentials for
    Making Them Effective?" NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461
    (March, 1983), 1-7.

Dale, E. Lawrence. "What is Staff Development?" Educational Leader-
    ship, (October, 1982), 31.

Davis, Keith, Ph.D. Human Relations At Work - The Dynamics of Organi-
    zational Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Dempsey, Richard A., and Smith, Rodney P. Differentiated Staffing.
    Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Fessler, Ralph, and Burke, Peter J. "Interaction: An Essential in
    Developing Professional Growth Programs." NASSP Bulletin,
    Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 43-49.

Goodlad, John, "Educational Leadership: Toward the Third Era."
    Educational Leadership (January, 1978)

Griffin, Gary, ed. Staff Development. Chicago: The University of
    Chicago Press, 1983.

Howey, Kenneth R., and Vaughan, Joseph C. "Current Patterns of
    Staff Development". Staff Development. Edited by Gary
    Griffin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

InService Education - Current Trends in School Policies and Programs.
    Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations
    Association, 1975.

Jensen, Darrell; Betz, Loren; and Zigarmi, Patricia. "If You are
    Listening to Teachers, Here is How You Will Organize In-
    service." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 417 (April, 1978),
    9-14.

Johnson, D. J. Teachers In-Service Education. New York: Pergamon
    Press, 1971.

Joyce, Bruce, and Showers, Beverly. "Improving Inservice Training: The Message of Research." Educational Leadership (February, 1980), 379-385.

Joyce, Bruce, and Showers, Beverly. "Power in Staff Development Through Research in Training". Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Kaping, Russ, and McKeag, Robert. "Brown Bag Seminars: An Answer to the Persistent Inservice Problem. NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 39-42.

Kelley, Edgar A., and Dillon, Elizabeth A. "Staff Development: It Can Work For You." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 417 (April, 1978), 1-8.

Kozoll, Charles E., and Ulmer, Curtis, ed. Inservice Training: Philosophy, Processes, and Operational Techniques. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Lemley, Raymond E. "Evaluation: The Key to Effective Learning." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 115-118.

Lovell, John T., and Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983.

Mangieri, John N., and Kemper, Richard E. "Administrators: The Keys to Successful Inservice Programs." NASSP Bulletin , Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 26-31.

Mitchell, Donald P., and Hawley, Anne. Leadership in Public Education Study - A Look at the Overlooked. Academy for Education Development, Inc., 1972.

Moffitt, John Clifton. In-service Education For Teachers. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe L.; Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983.

Murray, Ann. "Staff Development: Fine and Fit." Educational Leadership (October, 1982), 57.

Peters, Thomas J., and Waterman, Robert H. In Search of Excellence New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Rogus, Joseph F. "Building an Effective Staff Development Program – A Principal's Checklist." NÁSSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461 (March, 1983), 8-16.

Romberg, Thomas A., and Price, Gary G. "Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development as Cultural Change." Staff Development. Edited by Gary Griffin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Sergiovanni,Thomas J. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling" Educational Leadership (February, 1984), 4-13.

Smyth, W. John. "Educational Leadership and Staff Development: Stop the Train(ing), I Want to Get Off." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 67, No. 461, (March, 1983), 60-67.

Squires, David A; Huitt, William G; Segars, John K. "Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective." Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

"The Number One Problem." Personnel Journal, April 1966.

Wilsey, Cathy, and Killion Joellen. "Making Staff Development Programs Work." Educational Leadership (October, 1982), 36-43.

Wood, Fred, and Thompson, Steven R. "Guidelines for Better Staff Development." Educational Leadership (February, 1980), 374-378.

Wood, Fred H.; McQuarrie, Frank O. Jr.; Thomson, Steven R. "Practitioners and Professors Agree on Effective Staff Development Practices." Educational Leadership (October, 1982), 28-31.

Wood, Fred H.; Thompson, Steven R.; Russell, Sister Frances. Designing Effective Staff Development Programs." Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

A SCHOOL-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES INVENTORY
(adapted from the School-Based Staff Development Inventory
by Steven Ray Thompson)

PART I: PRACTICES

Listed below are a number of statements that
could be used to describe various practices in
school based staff development programs. Next
to each statement are two columns.

In these columns, please indicate whether the
practice exists in the school system where you
work, now, by circling yes or no. Under each
statement, in the space provided, please comment.

1. A positive school climate is developed before other
    staff development efforts are attempted. (A positive
    climate is characterized by open communications,
    trust, and supportive relationships.)   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

2. Goals for school improvement are written collabora-
    tively by teachers, parents, building administrators,
    and central office administrators.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

3. The school has a written list of goals for the
    improvement of school programs during the next
    three to five years.   YES   NO

Comment:

4. The school staff adopts and supports goals
    for improvement of school programs.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

5. Current school practices are examined to deter-
   mine which ones are congruent with the school's
   goals for improvement before staff development
   activities are planned.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

6. Current educational practices not yet found
   in the school are examined to determine which
   ones are congruent with the school's goals
   for improvement before staff development
   activities are planned.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

7. The school staff identifies specific plans
   to achieve the school's goals for improvement.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

8. Leadership and support during the initial stage of
   staff development activity is the responsibility
   of the principal and central office staff.   YES   NO

Comment:

9. Differences between desired and actual practices
   in the school are examined to identify the
   inservice needs of the staff.   YES   NO

If yes, how do you do this?

10. Planning of staff development activities relies,
    in part, upon information gathered directly from
    school staff members.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

11. Inservice planners use information about
    the learning styles of participants when
    planning staff development activities.   YES   NO

Comment:

12. Staff development programs include objectives
    for inservice activities covering as much as
    five years.   YES   NO

Comment:

13. The resources (time, money, and materials)
    available for use in staff development are
    identified prior to planning inservice
    activities.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

14. Staff development programs include plans for
    activities to be conducted during the following
    three to five years.   YES   NO

Comment:

15. Specific objectives are written for staff
    development activities.   YES   NO

Comment:

16. Staff development objectives include
    objectives for attitude development
    (new outlooks and feelings).   YES   NO

Comment:

17. Staff development objectives include
    objectives for increased knowledge (new
    information and understanding).   YES   NO

Comment:

18. Staff development objectives include objectives
    for skill development (new work behaviors).   YES   NO

Comment:

19. Leadership during the planning of inservice
    programs is shared among teachers and
    administrators.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

20. Staff development activities include the
    use of learning teams in which two to seven
    participants share and discuss learning
    experiences.   YES   NO

Comment:

21. Individual school staff members choose objectives
    for their own professional learning.   YES   NO

If yes, how is this accomplished?

22. Individual school staff members choose the
    staff development activities in which they
    participate.   YES   NO

Comment:

23. Staff development activities include experi-
    mental activities in which participants try
    out new behaviors and techniques.   YES   NO

If yes, what kind are they?

24. Peers help to teach one another by serving as
    inservice leaders.   YES   NO

Comment:

25. School principals participate in staff
    development activities with their staffs.   YES   NO

Comment:

26. Leaders of staff development activities
    are selected according to their expertise
    rather than their position.   YES   NO

Comment:

27. As participants in staff development
    activities become increasingly competent,
    leadership behavior becomes less directive
    or task-oriented. (re: whoever is the
    leader of the staff development program).   YES   NO

Comment:

28. As participants in staff development
    activities become increasingly confident
    in their abilities, the leader transfers
    increasing responsibility to the partici-
    pants. (re: whoever is the leader of
    the staff development activity).   YES   NO

Comment:

29. After participating in inservice activities,
    participants have access to support services
    to help implement new behaviors as part of their
    regular work.   YES   NO

Comment:

30. School staff members who attempt to implement
    new learnings are recognized and rewarded
    for their efforts.   YES   NO

If yes, how do you do this?

31. The leaders of staff development activities
    visit the job setting, when needed, to help the
    inservice participants refine or review previous
    learning.   YES   NO

Comment:

32. School staff members use peer supervision to
    assist one another in implementing new work
    behaviors.   YES   NO

Comment:

33. Resources (time, money, and materials) are
    allocated to support the implementation of
    new practices following staff develpment
    activities (funds to purchase new instructional
    materials, time for planning, etc.).   YES   NO

Comment:

34. The school principal actively supports efforts
    to implement changes in professional behavior.   YES   NO

If yes, how do you do this?

35. A systematic program of instructional super-
    vision is used to monitor new work behavior.   YES   NO

Comment:

36. School staff members utilize systematic techniques
    of self-monitoring to maintain new work behaviors.   YES   NO

If yes, how do they accomplish this?

37. Student feedback is used to monitor new practices.   YES   NO

If yes, in what form?

38. Responsibility for the maintenance of new school
    practices is shared by both teachers and
    administrators.   YES   NO

Comment:

PART II: BELIEFS

Listed below are ten beliefs that
could shape staff development practices.
Next to each statement are four columns
of numbers.

Please indicate the degree to which
you agree with each statement by
circling the number beneath the appro-
priate descriptor.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. All school personnel should be involved in professional development throughout their careers to stay current and effective.	1	2	3	4

Comment:

2. Significant improvement in educational practice takes considerable time and is the result of systematic, long range staff development	1	2	3	4

Comment:

3. Inservice education should focus on improving the quality of the school program.	1	2	3	4

Comment:

4. Educators are motivated to learn new things when they have some control over their learning and are free from threat.	1	2	3	4

Comment:

5. Educators vary widely in their professional competencies, readiness for learning, and approaches to learning.	1	2	3	4

Comment:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Professional growth requires committment to new performance norms.

      1   2   3   4

Comment:

7. Organizational health, including factors such as social climate, trust, open communication, and peer support for change in practices, influences the success of professional development programs.

      1   2   3   4

Comment:

8. The school is the most appropriate unit of change, not the district or the individual.

      1   2   3   4

Comment:

9. School districts have the primary responsibility for providing the resources and training necessary for a school staff to implement new programs and improve instruction.

      1   2   3   4

Comment:

10. The school principal is the "gate-keeper" or key element for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school.

      1   2   3   4

Comment:

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Robert F. Jerrick has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. M. P. Heller
Professor and Director of Administrative Services
Loyola University

Dr. Phillip M. Carlin
Associate Professor and Chairman
Loyola University

Dr. Karen S. Gallagher
Assistant Professor
Loyola University

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.

May 14, 1984
Date

Director's Signature