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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The 1980's were years commonly referred to by educators as the decade of reform. National study reports such as "Nation at Risk" and those from the Holmes Group, as well as findings from the Carnegie Forum and the Educational Commission of the States created a general climate of heightened public concern about education during this time. Curriculum issues, student achievement and teacher performance were examined. Comparative data between nations of the world were referenced and it was acknowledged that the general educational system within the United States was generating inferior results. Recommendations for improvement were cited and the demand for strong leadership within the ranks of the educational profession surfaced. The nation, the individual states, and all local school districts were faced with consternation as the need for reform was so poignantly emphasized.

As early as 1981, the Illinois State Board of Education had initiated a comprehensive review of their own state mandates and instructional program requirements.
Thus, when the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its 1983 report entitled "A Nation At Risk," the State of Illinois had a sizeable base of information available for further study, which led to a general reform package addressing the problems affecting schooling in Illinois. In 1985, the Illinois General Assembly enacted legislation that had major impact on the educational system as part of the educational reform movement. Reform Bill 730 and House Bill 1070 were signed into law by Governor Thompson in July of that year.

Within Senate Bill 730 and amid one hundred sixty-nine topics, the need for administrative evaluation and professional development was addressed. As part of the summary report produced by the Illinois State Board of Education, it said that:

... No administrative certificate shall be issued after June 30, 1987, unless the applicant has been required to demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge required to establish productive parent-school relationships, to establish a high quality school climate and promoting good classroom organization, and to provide instructional leadership.

... Recertification requirements must ascertain the degree to which an administrator's knowledge of instructional practice and procedures has kept pace with new knowledge, maintained the basic level of competence required for initial certification, and ascertain their skill and knowledge regarding the improvement of teaching performance. Administrators who do not perform

---

satisfactorily for these recertification requirements shall be allowed a two year period for remediation. Failure to successfully demonstrate administrative competency following remediation will result in a loss of administrative certification.\(^2\)

Administrators were mandated to be recertified every five years, based on demonstration of competency and continued professional growth.

...The Act provides that the State Board of Education will insure the establishment of an Illinois Administrators' Academy to develop programs which provide for development of skills in the area of instructional staff development, communication, public relations, and personnel evaluation. By January 1, 1986, the State Board of Education will establish a schedule by which all administrators must receive training through the academy. Administrators who evaluate staff are required to receive training.\(^3\)

The State Board of Education claimed responsibility for the Academy. It provided uniform direction as well as common operational procedures across the state of Illinois. It became the controlling force in the development of basic curriculum and related training experiences. The educational service centers were, then, given the responsibility for coordinating and delivering the programs in their specific service areas. The local educational service centers were granted leeway in the design of specific activities following review and approval by the State Board.

\(^2\)Ibid., Topic #52.

\(^3\)Ibid., Topic #57.
in order to meet specific needs of local administrators. Advisory committees were established at the state and local levels to "guide the development, coordination, and implementation of academy programs and services."^4

It was the intent of the Illinois Administrators' Academy to promote:

. . . meaningful training experiences which are appropriate to the varying needs and time constraints of administrators. The four strands of training provided a flexible framework for participants. The strands offered a range of opportunities for administrators to: meet legislative requirements (Required), develop or improve a specific skill in a short length of time (Selective), earn professional recognition (Designation), and/or assess instructional leadership skills as individuals or the climate for the instructional leadership in their school buildings or districts (Clinical).^5

A review of the literature identified the principal as the leader of the school and more specifically as the instructional leader. The role of the principal became a major focus and was identified as the critical figure in the life of a school. That personality with all of its characteristics relating to leadership, management and interpersonal relationships was given paramount credit for affecting the life of the school. Being an effective


^5 Ibid., p.3.
school principal involved "most centrally the bringing of one's intellectual and emotional history in contact with the desire to create qualitatively better education for youngsters - and having the skills to do just that."^6

William Greenfield made the point:

...that every person can be his/her own theorist, that one can consider, select, and screen research and advice, in that one can accomplish his/her own goals. In this sense, leadership can be likened to a craft where knowledge, skills, and practices are of little use unless there is a functional purpose to one's work. However, one who aspires to craft or to lead is at a loss if he/she has a functional purpose but lacks the knowledge, skills, or practices to work toward or achieve that end. Therein lies the value of research and experience.^7

Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus defined leadership as "...the marshalling of skills possessed by a majority but used by a minority. But it's something that can be learned by everyone, taught to everyone, denied to no one."^8

For the purpose of this study, professional development was defined as a systematic approach to the design of activities to meet selected goals of administrators with the purpose being to 1) promote and enhance personal


growth, 2) increase one's level of competency, and/or
3) improve the school's organizational effectiveness.

Professional development encompassed those activities that helped an individual to build skills, to acquire new knowledge, and to change one's behavior so as to have a more positive impact on the school's institutional culture. It was noted that instructional leaders were not born into that role, but their skills must be developed and must be improved upon along a continuum.

Roland Barth, who helped to create The Principals' Center at Harvard University, said that:

... the individual school is the critical unit for educational improvement. Within the school, the principal has a powerful influence upon the nature of the school, the conditions under which youngsters and adults learn, and upon what and how much they learn. Yet, for all the agreement about the central role of the principal, surprisingly little is known about characteristics of principals associated with effective leadership and with pupil accomplishment, let alone how these characteristics might be developed.9

There existed an identified need for further study. With the educational reform movement, it was evident that strong leadership must be developed, fostered and maintained in order to bring about the necessary improvements within a school system. The principal was identified as the instructional leader and was acknowledged as having the

greatest impact on the way of the school. Tremendous responsibility, authority, and power was tied to the role of the principal. The professional development of that principal became a major concern within the State of Illinois and the Administrators' Academy was established to promote and enhance that process as a result.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate what effect participation at the Illinois Administrators' Academy had had on the professional development of secondary school principals.

Because of Senate Bill 730, the Educational Service Centers within Illinois established the programming for the regional Administrators' Academies. All secondary school principals, among other administrators, were required to attend specified sessions. This mandate was founded on the belief that participation in these Academy workshops would "improve the professional skills, attitudes, and expertise of their participants," and thus, would improve the administrator's performance within the school building.

---

itself. The documents from the Illinois State Board of Education stated that "through the Illinois Administrators' Academy, practicing administrators with differing needs, interests and schedules may upgrade their knowledge and skills in instructional leadership"\textsuperscript{11} and that "administrators are provided opportunities for professional development."\textsuperscript{12}

At the time of this study, the Academy had been in existence for three years. All current administrators had to have attended at least one, if not two sessions at the Academy as prescribed by law following a biannual cycle.

The effectiveness of the Academy offerings in regard to one's professional development was analyzed from the participants' perspective. Specific objectives of the study were:

1. to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy satisfied one's personal needs for professional development;

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 7.

2. to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy increased one's level of competency as part of one's professional development; and

3. to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy aided one's ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness as a goal of professional development.

Methodology of the Study

The secondary school principals from five Educational Service Centers within northern Illinois were targeted for this study. The Educational Service Centers were only used as a resource to identify an appropriate listing of secondary schools and their respective principals. Each Educational Service Center served high schools that provided a representative population of suburban settings, a location in close proximity to the city of Chicago, a varied socio-economic status of communities, and a diverse set of instructional programs as required by the individual school's clientele.

To obtain the necessary data, a two stage procedure was utilized. First, a thirty item questionnaire was sent
to one hundred one secondary school principals. Each principal was asked to respond as to what effect participation at the Illinois Administrators' Academy had had on one's professional development. Every third question of this survey was categorized by one of the three purposes of professional development as identified in the research objectives. The three purposes were: 1) to satisfy personal needs, 2) to increase one's level of competency, and/or 3) to improve the school's organizational effectiveness.

Each question allowed the subject to respond with varying degrees of intensity on a scale of four to one ranging between the extreme opinions of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Each choice of answer was assigned a numerical value. The scores of each question were summed and averaged to yield an individual's score. Frequencies of the mean scores were calculated and frequencies of those scores within each category of purpose were tabulated.

As a follow-up to the questionnaire, a thirteen percent sampling of the study population were interviewed. The use of a structured interview guide helped to validate the findings of the questionnaire. Those five principals with the highest score and those five principals with the lowest score agreed to an in-depth interview which focused
on the purpose and the perceived effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy as it related to professional development.

Frequencies of common answers were noted, tabulated and referenced to the results of the survey in an effort to provide a measure of consistency and accuracy among the collected data. The answers derived from the interview process were compared to those findings of the questionnaire.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were applied to the terms as used in the study:

1. Administrators' Academy

The Illinois State Board of Education defined the Administrators' Academy as "a process, not a place. Through the Academy process, administrators are provided opportunities for professional development."\(^{13}\)

\(^{13}\)Ibid.
As mandated by the law, program offerings had to provide for the development of skills in the areas of instructional staff development, effective communication skills, public school relations, evaluation of personnel, including documentation of employee performance and remediation of unsatisfactory employee performance.\(^\text{14}\)

2. EDUCATIONAL SERVICE CENTER

Educational Service Centers, under the control of the Illinois State Board of Education, were established to meet school program and population needs geographically. Each center was held responsible for the coordination and delivery of the local academy programs. At the time of this study, there was a network of eighteen Educational Service Centers located throughout the State.

3. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

The instructional leader was identified as the secondary school principal in this study and as the person who should possess the leadership qualities to develop and maintain effective schools; to unite students, faculty and

community members in identifying and accepting a common mission; and to achieve the strategic goals in a cost-effective manner.

4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development was defined as a systematic approach to the design of activities for administrators that would: 1) satisfy personal needs; 2) increase the level of one's competency; and/or 3) improve the school's organizational effectiveness.

1) The satisfaction of personal needs centered on individual needs or personal interest areas within a professional arena that may have or may not have differed from the priorities of the school or district as a collective grouping.

2) The level of competency included the acquisition of knowledge in the cognitive domain of a specific subject area in order to foster the implementation or improvement of an instructional program and/or to provide a better understanding of the educational process.
3) Organizational effectiveness was defined as those characteristics of an institution that foster school improvement with the capacity of teachers and administrators to work together constructively in identifying and solving problems, and setting and accomplishing goals cooperatively.

5. SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

A secondary school principal was recognized as the chief administrator of a high school building serving grades nine through twelve.

Limitations of the Study

Several limiting factors that influenced the study included the following points:

1) This study was limited to the data solicited from one hundred one secondary school principals within the five Educational Service Centers (#2, 3, 4, 5, and 7) of northern Illinois from a population of over eight hundred high school principals in the entire state of Illinois.

2) The principals were identified from within five northern Illinois Educational Service Centers serving the
suburban schools that surround the metropolitan area but excluding the city of Chicago.

3) The study reflected the perceptions of only secondary school principals toward the Administrators' Academy.

4) A questionnaire was mailed to high school principals and limitations of the study were those inherent in the questionnaire method itself. Isaac and Michael recognized that "surveys only tap respondents who are accessible and cooperative"\(^{15}\) and that "surveys are vulnerable to over-rater and under-rater bias - the tendency for some respondents to give consistently high or low ratings."\(^{16}\)

5) The format of a structured interview guide was used to standardize the interview and to gain added measure from the responses to the questionnaire. Limitations were acknowledged that "in the case of interview, biased reactions can be elicited because of characteristics of the


\(^{16}\)Ibid.
interviewer or respondent, or the combination . . . "17

6) The study was based on the assumption that all principals responded with candor and truthfulness.

7) The concept of professional development for secondary school principals was addressed only in regard to one's involvement with the Administrators' Academy.

8) The conclusions of this study were limited to those findings as supported solely by the collected data.

Organization of the Study

As the first chapter provided an overview of the entire study, the subsequent chapters have detailed the research itself.

Chapter II reviewed the related literature and research studies relevant to the topic of professional development. The chapter was divided into five major sections. The first three parts defined professional development, acknowledged the need for professional development and identified the purpose of professional development

17Ibid.
respectively. The fourth category addressed those common characteristics of successful staff development programs and the theories that support such findings. The last section identified current programs available to principals for specific professional development purposes.

Chapter III outlined the methods used for collecting data and the procedures used for analyzing the data. The contents of Chapter IV presented the data and provided the analysis of the collected data as it responded to the specific research questions.

Chapter V, the final chapter, summarized the findings, drew conclusions based on the findings, cited recommendations and offered suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to analyze the effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy in Illinois as it impacted the professional development of secondary school principals. Thus, the questions of what is professional development, who benefits from it, and why promote it became areas of inquiry. The review of related literature and research provided a common definition of professional development, recognized the need for the professional development of administrators as well as teachers, and identified the overriding purpose of professional development.

The research findings substantiated the current movement that supports the continuing education of the principal. The focus of additional research also ascertained those definitive characteristics of effective professional development programs. Various studies helped to evaluate current practices. The degree of direct involvement of the principal in his/her own professional development was a key factor in determining effective programs.
With the increased awareness and focus on principals as a specific entity needing inservice and renewal opportunities, the pragmatic understanding of and appreciation for administrative professional development gave credence to the establishment of a number of academies, leadership institutes, and/or principals' centers across the nation. A review of existent institutes for administrators' professional development was presented to provide a representative sampling of the contemporary programs available, including specific commentary on the foundation of the Illinois Administrators' Academy.

The organization of this chapter accordingly followed the aforementioned subject areas pertaining to professional development: 1) definition; 2) acknowledgement of need; 3) purpose; 4) characteristics of effective programs; and 5) examples of existing programs for administrators' professional development. With summarizing comments regarding the review of related literature and research findings, the basis for application to this study was provided.

Definition of Professional Development

The literature revealed several different definitions of professional development, and yet, a common train
of thought emerged. Professional development was viewed as a series of activities designed for the individual educator that promoted continuous adult learning in an effort to enhance the learning process and/or the educational environment for those students within a school setting.

Throughout the readings it became evident that the term professional development was used interchangeably with the term staff development. Fielding and Schalock noted their preference for the term professional development "because the former highlights the status of educators as professionals, rather than employees." Nevertheless the two terms were commonly used synonymously. Thus, no further distinction was made between the two terms as definitions were presented.

The following definitions for professional development/staff development as gleaned from the literature illustrated the prevalent thought:

1. Professional development was viewed "as a deliberate effort to alter the professional practices, beliefs, and understandings of school persons toward an articulated end."2


2Ibid.
21

2. . . . Staff development is first and foremost an attitude, a commitment to help individuals grow personally and professionally in a supportive climate. Staff development involves a broad range of activities designed to promote staff self-renewal and, indirectly, more effective learning for youngsters. Staff development activities are long-range in orientation and place the individual staff member at the heart of the growth-planning process.3

3. The professional development of teachers included the act of "engaging them in a wide variety of opportunities for growth and for acquiring knowledge and skills within the education profession."4

4. Dian Castle defined staff development as:

. . . a systematic approach to the design of activities to meet selected goals for the enhancement of an institution through the promotion of the personal and professional growth of administrative and instructive staff of that institution.5

5. In the ASCD 1981 Yearbook, Betty Dillon-Peterson recognized staff development as:

. . . a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive, }


positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students and continuous, responsible self-renewal for educators and schools.\textsuperscript{6}

6. Fenstermacher and Berliner defined staff development "as the provision of activities designed to advance the knowledge, skills, and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behavior."\textsuperscript{7}

7. Charles Nevi acknowledged a change in staff development practices and defined it as a process.

. . . Today's staff development is beginning to be viewed not as staff workshops or classes, but as the day-to-day process of fostering growth. A staff development effort may begin in a collegial discussion of values and philosophy, move to training in specific skills, continue into feedback and coaching on those skills, and then return again to philosophy.\textsuperscript{8}

Based on the aforementioned definitions, the consensus of definition for professional development emphasized a process and a goal directed program of activities. Indi-


vidual needs were coupled with the goals of the educational institution. Each definition spoke to a purposeful end as it combined the common features of a systematic approach and a variety of activity with an established objective.

Acknowledgement of Need for Professional Development

As professional development was defined in the literature, there was consistent comment expressed for the need of programs that articulated the needs of principals specifically. In recent national reports and in the recent research, the principal was identified as the instructional leader of a school. This concept had dominated the recent educational research.

As the improvement of schools was addressed in the research, Sergiovanni, Murphy and others supported the importance of the principal as leader and as the one having a direct influence on the educational quality. Brookover's and Edmonds' studies of schools' effec-


tiveness underscored the importance of the role of principal as the instructional leader of the school. As Boyer, Lightfoot, and Sizer studied high schools, it was found that the principal was critical in creating school conditions that lead to higher student academic performance.

Daresh and Liu examined the relationship between specific characteristics of principal leadership and school conditions for academic improvement. Blumberg and Greenfield's research helped to define and describe the characteristics of effective school leadership. The leadership role was identified as a complex and problematic position - one that required support, appropriate training, and continuous learning opportunities.


Leadership can be an elusive concept as described from different perspectives, but the need for a leader to constantly avail oneself to the learning process continued to surface as a key attribute. In Bennis and Nanus' book, ninety leaders in the business world were asked to identify personal qualities that were needed to run their organizations.

...They talked about persistence and self-knowledge; about willingness to take risks and accept losses; about commitment, consistency, and challenge. But, above all, they talked about learning. Leaders are perpetual learners.18

They went on to say:

...Learning is the essential fuel for the leader, the source of high octane energy that keeps up the momentum by continually sparking new understandings, new ideas, and new challenges. It is absolutely indispensable under today's conditions of rapid change and complexity. Very simply, those who do not learn do not long survive as leaders.19

John Goodlad emphasized that principals should be provided with time "for continually updating their knowledge and skills."20 The agenda for inservice must include, "the concept of hearing drummers whose beat may convey deviant messages."21 Time to meet with other colleagues


19Ibid.


21Ibid.
and time to explore divergent thinking was emphasized as a necessary practice.

Rolf Blank's study drew the following conclusion:

...The current trend in school effectiveness and school improvement programs is to look to principals for greater leadership in more areas. The findings of this study show that some crucial areas are typically not receiving leadership from principals. Programs to improve the educational performance of schools should first examine the areas of leadership that are expected and encouraged within the district organizational structure and policies. Efforts to develop leadership skills by principals need to involve the consideration of specific areas in which principals might exert leadership and examine how district policies can help develop the leadership role of principals.22

In the AASA Critical Issues Report, Madeline Hunter, a well-known consultant on effective school practices, was quoted as saying:

...Most preservice (administrative) programs are still back in the dark ages... The nature of a principal's job in a constantly changing environment requires that the principal receive inservice training continuously.23

Inservice training of school principals in the skills and behaviors required for effective leadership had been identified as probably the most neglected aspect of


school improvement efforts, according to administrators and authorities in the field. Unikel and Bailey recognized that "despite general agreement about the importance of principals, little help or support is available to assist principals in their professional growth."24 That need grew as the emphasis on instructional leadership surfaced as the central mission of principals. Because many principals were educated before the educational reform movement took hold, the need to retrain and relearn was emphasized. Effective school research made important advances in identifying those factors contributing to an effective school climate and ascertaining effective methods of instruction and, in turn, principals were required to maintain an understanding of the current trend in research in that direction.

Staff development programs have predominantly focused on the needs of teachers. Spencer H. Wyant noted that:

```
. . .Inservice education for administrators lags far behind what is available for teachers. There is growing agreement that the basic need is for an effective delivery system to convey the new knowledge and practices that contribute to effective schools and the principal's role in that process.25
```


It is now evidenced that:

... of all educators, principals may have greater need for renewal than anyone else. For better or ill, the bulk of educational improvements rests on the shoulders of the principal, the very person who has been neglected for so long.26

In an interview with Dennis Sparks, Boyer said:

... I think principals need their own staff development. They can't be out on the firing line every day without occasionally having an opportunity to inquire about where they are going, to test their ideas with colleagues. In building a school, staff development needs to involve both the teachers and the principal.27

William Rutherford did a comparative study of the proposed and actual changes in high schools that followed as a result of the national commission reports. He noted that professional and personal performance was the target of approximately thirty-two percent of the recommended changes, but only a little more than six percent became actual changes. He noted that few changes, proposed or actual, were directed at improving administrators' performance.28

26Ibid.
A void was, also, recognized between research and practice. In Sergiovanni's book, Kenneth Sirotnik from the University of Washington identified that the:

... linear model of research, development, diffusion, and evaluation essentially pits experts against practitioners. Those "in the know" are the scholars that generate the research and the experts that package and disseminate the findings in usable form and evaluate the use of these packages in practice. Those "in need of knowing" are the practitioners, the workers in schools, the consumers of new knowledge once it is appropriately distilled into inservice programs. School based educators are seen as deficient in one or more skill areas and in need of retraining, rather than as professionals who reflect upon their work and upon ways in which they might do their work better.29

The need for professional development opportunities among principals was identified.

... The time has come to get serious about management training for building principals to prepare them (as opposed to criticizing them) for a leadership role that is becoming more complex and crucial to the success of American public education.30

Pinkney continued to criticize:

... those who mandate, plan, prepare, and administer training programs for principals instead of with them. Thus far, school districts and universities have used and perhaps wasted much of the principal's valuable time under the guise of staff development training. Such training programs have been steeped in tradition and have tended to ignore change and the real need of


the principal as a leader, developer, and motivator of human resources.31

The numerous writings exposed the demand for appropriate administrative professional development opportunities. Much attention had been given to teachers' inservice needs, but little attention had been afforded the principals. The implications to provide for appropriate professional development programs for principals was evident.

Purpose of Professional Development

This study capitalized on the premise that professional development had three broad categories of purpose. As the literature was reviewed, the concept that professional development fulfills one's personal and individual needs, increases one's competency and basic knowledge, and/or seeks to improve the school's organizational effectiveness was supported. The written commentary revealed that many professional development activities tended to serve more than one purpose, but that the purpose(s) of any activity should be clearly described.

31Ibid.
It should be noted that a shift in the emphasis of defined purposes had occurred within the last decade.

...Traditionally, discussions of staff development have focused on (the promotion) of individual development. The research conducted during the past decade on school effectiveness and improvement however has caused many people to ask how staff development can be designed to benefit not just individuals but school programs in the school environment generally.32

Changes in staff development practices were noted by programmatic shifts from topics meeting certification requirements to topics generated from individual needs.

...In the new training movement, greater emphasis is placed on helping the administrators generate tools for ongoing improvements. In the traditional programs, content is developed primarily in response to certification demands. In the new approaches, participants exercise considerably more influence in the selection of the content. In short, we find that programs in the new era of training are based to a large extent on the identified needs of participants. Skill development and the implementation of new practices are also heavily stressed in this emerging era of professional development for school administrators...significant effort is devoted to establishing linkages among knowledge, skill development, and implementation.33


Snyder and Johnson emphasized that school improvement focused on the role of the principal. The principal was identified as a key factor in bringing about educational reform. It was recognized that principals assumed a major responsibility for leading and managing the school improvement process, that which behooves the title of instructional leader. Snyder and Johnson developed an "administrators-for-change training" (ACT program) in instructional leadership tasks. Following a survey of needs, principals identified that:

...skills necessary for 1) effective collaboration 2) organizational assessment and analysis and 3) a knowledge of how personal characteristics influence leadership all appear to be important to the successful implementation of instructional leadership tasks.

Snyder and Drummond developed an effective job performance model. "Effective performance occurred when there was a match among (a) the job's demands, (b) the nature of the organizational environment, and (c) the individual's competencies." Much attention had been

---


35 Ibid.

given to the evaluation of principal's competencies. As part of professional development activity, principals were provided opportunities to acquire and develop skills/competencies as part of their job, but the level of competency was intertwined with other factors of purpose.

It has been documented that the role of the principal is a complex, interactive position. Russell Joki recognized that "successful principals possess three types of interrelated leadership skills: instructional skills, personal skills, and managerial skills." Personal leadership skills included adaptability, self-evaluation, a healthy self-image, creativity, spontaneity, and maturity. Instructional leadership skills were those needed to be a child advocate, a competent teacher, a research resource, a competent supervisor, and a person dedicated to results. Managerial leadership skills included a goal-orientation, policy enforcement, a decision-making process, management by exception, delegation, and a keen perception of people and task. These three categories of skills were recommended as the focus of professional development activities.37

The need to enrich one's personal life, the individual need to acquire new skills and new knowledge, and the need to improve schools with accent on the organizational effectiveness was reinforced by Joyce as he discussed staff development. In the 1981 ASCD Yearbook Joyce was quoted as having identified that:

...The primary task in staff development is to develop the professional growth-oriented ecology in all schools. The purposes are three:

1) to enrich the lives of teachers and school administrators so that they continuously expand their general education, their emotional range and their understanding of children.

2) to generate continuous efforts to improve schools. School faculties, school administrators, and community members need to work together to make their schools better and acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to bring those improvements into existence.

3) to create conditions which enable professional skill development to be continuous. Every teacher and administrator needs to be a student of learning and teaching and to engage in a continuous process of experimentation with their behavior and that of their students. Each education professional needs to study alternative approaches to schooling and teaching, to select ones which will expand their capabilities and to acquire the understanding and skills necessary to make fresh alternatives a part of their ongoing repertoire of professional competence.38

Ryan and Crowell drew heavily on the work of Roy Edelfelt as they summarized the differentiation of staff development programs. Again, three major categories of purpose surfaced:

**Personal Development:** Almost all staff development programs lead to personal development, but clearly some activities, such as stress workshops, pre-retirement programs, job change seminars, fitness and health workshops, etc., are designed primarily to meet personal needs. Such programs may be extremely useful to teachers as persons, but are not directly related to the individual's role or function in the school, or to the school's curriculum or instructional needs, or to student effects.

**Professional Development:** Activities are defined as those focused on the participant's specific role or function within the school. Program objectives are most often aimed at such targets as improving an individual's instructional techniques, developing classroom management skills, or expanding the participant's knowledge base in a particular area of the curriculum.

**School Improvement:** The purpose of these activities is organizational or system development and change. Where the staff development activity is directed at groups of teachers working together on agreed-upon school goals, it is possible to evaluate long-term teacher and student outcomes, but it is a complex and difficult process, requiring multiple measures and necessitating controlled procedures and careful analysis.

From the review of literature and research, it was evident that staff development practices have changed over the years with different emphasis on different topics. Intended audiences have broadened to include administrators.

---

as well as teachers. Shifts from the individual to include the organizational needs have been documented. Increased skill levels and competency levels were touted as being needed for school improvement. As assimilated from the readings, professional development was defined for this study as a systematic approach to the design of activities for educators with the three purposes being:

1) to satisfy personal needs;
2) to increase the level of one's competency; and/or
3) to improve the school's organizational effectiveness.

Characteristics of Effective Programs

As in any learning situation, the research made clear that the principal must be an active learner and an active participant in the process of professional development. In Ernest Boyer's book, Mortimer Adler, who wrote Paideia Proposal, concluded that "all genuine learning is active, not passive. It involves the use of the mind, not just the memory. It is a process of discovery in which the student is the main agent, not the teacher." 40 Effective programs of administrative professional development de-

manded direct and active involvement of the participants at all stages in the process.

According to the research, effective professional development activities had several common characteristics. These characteristics were described and grouped into ten primary representative categories. Study upon study identified that viable programs of professional development possessed several of the following components:

1. **Autonomy**

The term autonomy included the concept that learners were given the freedom and flexibility to direct their own growth. The studies of Prosise, MacDonald, and Barth recognized that professionals were responsible for their own professional development.

---


Saludades identified professional growth activities as a growth-oriented model. Principals identified their own needs in this model.

Because adults tend to be self-directed learners, the content of inservice programs was best defined primarily by those who were supposed to learn from them. This involvement was favored by Wildman, Olivero, and Wood et al, whose studies responded directly to the adult learners' need for control over their own learning.

Ted Sizer embraced the concept of autonomy as he said:

...Excellent schooling requires excellent teachers and principals. Excellent people have self-confidence and self-esteem, and respect reasonable autonomy. Therefore, if we want excellent schools, we must give

---

44 Rosario T. Saludades, "A Theoretical Staff Development Model Based on the Staff Development Needs of Teachers as Perceived by Teachers, Principals and Supervisors of Manila Public Elementary Schools" (Ed. D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1983).


more power to the teachers and principals in any decision-making process.48

2. Neutral setting

Several studies advocated the need of a neutral setting for learning to take place. MacDonald surveyed fifty-seven Texas principals and concluded that research and practice was better achieved in a neutral setting, a place away from the school itself.49 An appropriate climate for renewal, one that is non-threatening, must be established.50 Participants should, also, be allowed to express an interest in the time of day for professional development activities.51


Barth and Van Der Bogert concluded from their studies that, "The main missing element in principal's professional growth has been a sympathetic, non-punitive, non-judgmental, helpful resource and support system.\textsuperscript{52}

3. Personalized Needs Assessment

An individualized needs assessment proved to be of benefit in establishing priorities as professional development programs were planned. The ranking of needs according to personal values and individual appropriateness was found to be an effective practice by Purcell,\textsuperscript{53} Daresh,\textsuperscript{54} Duchene,\textsuperscript{55} and Wood with colleagues.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{52}Roland S. Barth and R. Van Der Bogart, "What is a Principal's Center?" \textit{Educational Leadership} 42 (April 1984): 91-93.

\textsuperscript{53}Larry Olemuel Purcell, "A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Opinions of the Quality of Staff Development Activities" (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1987).


\textsuperscript{55}Darlene M. Duchene, "An Analysis of Secondary Teachers' and Principals' Mind-Sets Regarding Conceptualization, Delivery and Responsibility of Staff Development" (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1986).

Prosise emphasized the need to individualize the program to meet specific individual needs. Purposes must be linked to the expected outcomes as identified by the intended audience to be most effective.

4. Linkage between School and District Goals and Objectives

As individual needs were assessed, it was emphasized that the identified topics be incorporated into the district level staff development plans and programs. Loucks, Earhart, and Daresh all purported that professional development activities should be directed toward local school needs and interrelated with district goals. They should be long-term and on-going as opposed to


a "one-shot" type of approach. The activities should provide for continuity and should be developed thematically and/or have a link to an organized plan.

As principals were to be active in the school district's goal-setting process, time for cooperative planning and for the setting of mutual expectations was found to be necessary through Killion's,61 Sparks',62 and Wood's63 research. The fact that districts must provide enough time and financial support for professional development activities to be effective was supported by Duttweiler,64


Wildman,65 and Loucks.66 The professional support of superintendents, as well as board members, helped to legitimize the time and effort that principals spent in professional development activities.

5. Collaborative Effort in Planning

Findings favored a collaborative, cooperative and collegial effort in the design and selection of inservice offerings as evidenced by the work of Hyland,67

---


Sanders, 68 Wood et al, 69 and Rogus and Shaw. 70 Kring's work 71 and Earhart's study 72 emphasized that the participant be involved in planning a personalized program relevant to one's individual situation. Studies by Dillon-Peterson 73 and Fielding and Schalock 74 accented the need

68 Mina Loree Sanders, "The Role of Elementary School Principals in Staff Development Programs for Teachers" (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1986).


71 Toni Rae Kring, "First Grade Writing: A Case Study of the Effectiveness of Personalized Staff Development as a Means of Implementing Change in the Instructional Program" (Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1985).


for direct involvement by the participant in the planning stages.

Most staff development for principals had been something done to principals by others and the agenda for inservice had commonly been prescribed from outside the school building, which often proved to be ineffective in meeting the principal's desired goals for professional development. Resistance and resentment were common by-products.75

Effective practices included those principals who were to be involved in creating and implementing their own professional development activities. Encouragement to design one's own program, from the selection of pertinent topics to the choosing of appropriate presenters was helpful in acquiring desired outcomes.

6. Strong Subject Facilitator and Challenging Content Matter

Hyland's study acknowledged that an excellent facil-

erator and a qualified presenter with public speaking ability and extensive knowledge of the subject matter was essential to an effective program. The activity itself must have a clear purpose with objectives overtly stated. Goals should be specific and somewhat difficult in that the participant should be challenged intellectually.

7. Variety of Activities

Any effective program for professional development should have a variety of activities. The program should provide for maximum diversified learning experiences. There should be differentiated individualized experi-


ences. The principals should be immersed in a well-structured learning experience and be involved in an active learning process rather than be audience to only lecture as a passive technique. As was advocated for classroom instruction, the use of a variety of instructional strategies was, also, advocated for adult learners.

Research suggested that adults learn best when they understand where a course or curriculum is going to lead them and how it will get there. The need to practice what was learned was recognized. One tended to learn best through study, apprentice and experience.

---


8. Collegial Support Group

John Goodlad believed that "A change in individual behavior requires a supportive environment." Shared experiences and a building of trust with open communication provided support. Administrative professional development activities allowed colleagues to become an acquired resource for each other. Principals learned from each other as found by Hyland and Kiernes-Young.

Knowledge generated through observation, interaction, and self-interpretation was deemed important.

---


Effective programs allowed knowledge to be drawn from personal experience and the knowledge of others. Time for discussion and reflection was helpful.\textsuperscript{88} A sharing of ideas, an exchange of intelligent thought, a dialogue among peers, etc., was believed to be reinforcing to the learning process. Feelings of isolation were disbanded when a base for encouragement and support was established. Providing a forum to express oneself as well as an opportunity to learn from others should be a goal.\textsuperscript{89} Collegial feedback was an important factor in effective professional development activities.

9. On-going Evaluation

Any professional development program needs to be


evaluated in terms of its objectives. The assessment of results was recognized as often being an on-going process. A continuous review of the program and changing needs was emphasized as the participant focused on school improvement.

It was found that professional development activities were interrelated. The activities could serve several purposes: personal, skill-building, and/or school improvement. As results were assessed, "principals learned best through self-reflection and self-critique." The participant became the best evaluator of individual and school-oriented goals.

10. Recognition

Professional recognition was found to be an impor-

---


tant factor in effective programs. The studies of Kiernes-Young\(^93\) and Sanders\(^94\) found that recognition could be an incentive for participating in staff development activities. Greenfield's book cited Daresh's and Plant's work that found that rewards and incentives, both intrinsic and extrinsic, should be evident to program participants.\(^95\) Recognition helped foster the self-esteem needed in successful professional development.

**Existente Program Examples**

The established organizations and/or foundations that were specifically dedicated to meet the needs of school executives were becoming more common across the states within our nation in the early 1980's. Programs

---

\(^93\)Barbara Jean Kiernes-Young, "The Principal as an Agent of Change" (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1984).

\(^94\)Mina Loree Sanders, "The Role of Elementary School Principals in Staff Development Programs for Teachers" (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1986).

were found to be predominantly initiated through a university based orientation or that of a state legislated requirement. A sampling of programs that had been developed for administrators, specifically principals, were examined.

With so much having been written regarding the staff development of teachers, more recent literature and research had poignantly targeted the principal as the recipient in need of inservice activities. The literature emphasized that principals need opportunities to learn and to grow and that these opportunities be responsible to the needs of the individual as well as the job performance demands within the school itself.

...They welcome nurturance, attention, instruction, support and rewards. If most principals are ill-prepared for their roles when they begin principaling, they are even less equipped to assume leadership once they have learned to get by as good managers.96

As noted in the recent studies of effective schools by Brookover and Lezotte, Edmonds, Cohen, and/or Goldhammer, the role of the building principal was central in determining the quality of a school. The complex nature of the role of a principal was underscored and the need for professional development became the primary purpose and focus of program offerings.

Back in 1975, NASSP provided a plan to assist school districts in identifying and developing "highly skilled school leaders." This plan started the Association's


Assessment Center Project. This was the result of four years of research and development and a formal three year validation study that was completed in 1981 by a team from Michigan State University. The Assessment Center was found to be a content valid procedure for the selection of school administrators. Out of this concept grew a long-term developmental component called "Springfield" and in conjunction with the Assessment Center selection program, it was designed to provide effective methods for training school leaders. "The principles of rehearsal, modeling, and reinforcement can lead to rapid skill development, participant enthusiasm, and effective transfer of skill to on-the-job performance."\(^{102}\)

Not only were programs put in place to select and train principals, but there was a movement under foot to establish principals' centers. In 1985, Barbara Unikel provided an analysis of principals' centers in the United States regarding their organization and operation. One of the questions that was asked in her study was, "For what

purposes are principals' centers organized?" Forty-one organizations were surveyed and the answers to similar questions fell into four main categories:

1) to provide opportunities for personal and professional development; 2) to provide opportunities for sharing with colleagues; 3) to develop a network of mutual support, and; 4) to identify the needs of the principals.

Clearly, the most frequently stated purpose (eighty-eight percent of the respondents listed this as one of their organizations' major purposes) was to provide opportunities for personal and professional development.103

Many of the principals' center models were crafted after the teachers' center model. This model encouraged practicing teachers to take an active role in identifying and determining their own professional training needs as well as being actively involved in providing a significant portion of that training. "The "grassroots" teachers' center and the humanistic psychology movement provide the philosophical premises that have influenced the establish-

ment of principals' centers." Self-initiated and self-directed programs were preferred among colleagues. Programs that addressed specific, individual needs within a collegial environment were cited as a priority.

In 1981 Harvard University established the first such principals' center. The program capitalized on individuals' strengths as opposed to weaknesses and the need for remediation.

...The Principals' Center at the Harvard Graduate School of Education is a membership organization dedicated to the personal and professional development of school principals and of the many others—teachers, counselors, department chairpersons, house masters, and parents—who influence the character and quality of a school.

...The Harvard Principals' Center... is interested in what principals want to know and do, and in what others think principals should know and be able to do.

Harvard's Center emphasized voluntary attendance, professional recognition, a protected setting for reflective thinking and conversation among colleagues, a diverse population of professionals having different backgrounds

---


and experiences, a variety of activities and topics, and an active participation in the decision-making process regarding each workshop.\textsuperscript{107} The inservice setting and activities sought to create conditions where principals were likely to become active lifelong learners.

Harvard researchers recognized that principals needed time to reflect upon their work, talk about their work, and analyze the complex situations of running a school. The principals served as resources to other principals. "The Center is committed to school improvement from within. By replenishing the lives of school leaders, we believe the school experiences of their students will be enriched."\textsuperscript{108}

Another university-based approach was The Silver Center For Reflective Principals, housed at Hofstra University. The Center was sponsored in cooperation with the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). As a professional development organization, it was designed to enhance educational leadership in the principalship. "Towards this objective, utilizing the expertise of principals and university faculty, the Center will gather and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{107}Harvard University, \textit{The Principals' Center Summer Institutes} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1989), p. 2.
\item \textsuperscript{108}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
share information regarding administrative practice at the building level." 109

The Silver Center focused on the use of case records. Information that described the daily actions and efforts through which goals are achieved were maintained and shared. It is believed that emphasis on reflection among colleagues increases the informational base and enriches the possibility of meaningful communication and collaboration among practitioners and academicians.

. . . As the emphasis on administrative leadership continues to grow, the collaborative public school - University Leadership Academy concept - may provide schools with new opportunities to improve the delivery of educational services through varied and enriched preservice options. 110

The need to develop leadership schools among aspiring administrators as well as tenured principals was recognized. An additional program for professional development that was established by the Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development in San Francisco, California dealt with Peer-Assisted Leadership (PAL). The PAL program


encompassed a year-long professional development process with four major goals specified:

1) to help principals develop skills that they can use to analyze their own and other principals' management behaviors,

2) to give participants opportunities to learn how other principals lead their schools,

3) to enable principals to gain support from colleagues, and

4) to help principals integrate into their own school settings our general framework of instructional leadership.111

This program evolved from four years of research on the instructional management role of the principal. The researchers shadowed principals on a daily basis for part or all of the school day. Principals' activities, interactions, and even conversations were recorded. Principals were asked to comment on or clarify understandings about their actions.

Three important findings were tied to this research:

1) . . .effective principals engage in "higher-order thinking" as they assess their school environments, their own limitations and strengths, and the kinds of programs and outcomes they desire for their students.

2) ... many principals feel isolated, and they welcome opportunities to talk with and learn from colleagues.

3) ... principals reported that the reflective interviews cause them to engage in self-evaluation.

... These findings suggested that the research methods of shadowing and reflective interviewing might prove useful as professional development activities for practicing administrators.\textsuperscript{112}

The PAL program was designed to allow principals to learn from one another. New skills were learned for collecting and analyzing information about themselves and their own schools. A goal of the program was to improve instructional leadership performance through a process of non-evaluative peer observation and reflection.

As a result of the nation-wide school reform movement, individual states had provided for academy training/instructional programs in addition to or in conjunction with programs affiliated with institutions of higher education. The state agency was often following a legislative mandate with budgeted monies earmarked for a long-term project. For the state to be involved, usually there were several assumptions that had been made:

\textsuperscript{112}Ibid.
1) There is a body of management knowledge and skills that school leaders should acquire.

2) Such knowledge and skills make a positive difference in the performance of school leaders.

3) Such knowledge and skills can be presented through an Academy program offered by the state education agency.

4) School leaders will be motivated to attend Academy programs and will benefit from this training.\textsuperscript{113}

Examples of Academy programs at the state level are represented by the following descriptions:

Florida Academy for School Leaders

In 1978 the Florida legislature created the Florida Academy for School Leaders (FASL) through its Management Training act. This legislation envisioned a comprehensive plan to improve the management skills of school leaders and was to supplement the traditional preparation programs offered by colleges and universities. Participants were funded by individual school districts from their staff development monies in order to attend. Only travel and lodging was charged. The rest of the workshop and/or facility fee was paid for by the state.

The curriculum for Florida's Academy was outlined by a counsel made up of executive officers from public agencies, school administrators, and business executives. The counsel was mandated to: 1) identify competencies that characterize high performing principals, 2) identify standards and procedures for measuring and evaluating performance of those competencies, 3) identify the training process required for principals and other managers to acquire those competencies, 4) develop training materials not otherwise available, 5) identify procedures necessary to implement a program of competency certification for school managers, 6) develop policies and procedures necessary to implement a compensation program for principals and other managers that is based on successful performance of the identified competencies, and 7) identify criteria for screening, selecting, and appointing principals and other managers.114

The Academy had developed a series of fourteen different programs which were offered several times each year in the ten regional locations serving sixty-seven Florida school districts. This Academy was mandated to provide inservice training for school managers at all levels of the public school system.

114Ibid., p. 14
Maryland Professional Development Academy

The Maryland Professional Development program offerings focused more on curriculum areas rather than management skills. Individual participants were expected to develop a project that would be implemented within their local district. Teachers as well as administrators were involved in this professional development program.115

Pennsylvania Executive Academy

Participants in this program enrolled as individuals or as part of an administrative team. The format of each workshop was much like a seminar. The Academy provided thirty-five to forty seminars each year to one thousand executive-level personnel.116

South Carolina Administrators' Leadership Academy

The South Carolina Administrators' Leadership Academy (SCALA) was cooperatively supported by the State Department of Education, the University of South Carolina, and a local school district. The program offered administrative

115Ibid., p. 15.
116Ibid., p. 16.
training in management skill development, seminars on current issues, and programs on problem-solving. 117

Illinois Administrators' Academy

As mandated by the state legislature, the State Board of Education established an Illinois Administrators' Academy for the development of skills in 1) instructional staff development, 2) effective communications, 3) public school relations, and 4) evaluation of personnel. The Academy claimed the intent to incorporate the training needs and interests of practicing administrators at all levels of instructional leadership. Different levels within the state organized the implementation of said goal.

...At the state level, the Academy is administered by the State Board of Education staff who lend statewide direction, determine the guidelines for operation, and provide leadership for the development of a basic curriculum and related training experiences. A state advisory committee, appointed by the State Superintendent and representative of administrators, teachers, professional associations, and higher education, provides recommendations for the development and implementation of Academy activities. The committee's diverse perspectives contribute to the planning of a wide range of training opportunities.

...At the Regional level, Academy programs and services are coordinated and delivered through the network of eighteen Educational Service Centers located throughout the state. ...Educational Service Centers have primary responsibility for designing training

117Ibid.
experiences which meet the needs and interests of administrators in their service areas.\textsuperscript{118}

Four "strands of participation" categorized inservice activities. (See Figure 1.) Administrators became involved in the Academy as a result of having to choose to participate in one or more of the following four strands: a) training as required by law (Required); b) learning experiences which are single purpose and of limited duration (Selective); c) programs which result in Academy recognition (Designation); and, d) an assessment process and subsequent design of an individualized improvement plan (Clinical).

**FIGURE 1**

**ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATORS' ACADEMY**

**STRANDS OF PARTICIPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>SELECTIVE</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>CLINICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Commitment</td>
<td>Must participate in training</td>
<td>May participate as interested</td>
<td>May participate to earn designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Foundation</td>
<td>Based on requirements of law</td>
<td>Based on local needs</td>
<td>Based on local or statewide needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Evaluation of personnel</td>
<td>Identified by need or interest</td>
<td>Identified by ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Completion Measured by</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Achievement of outcomes</td>
<td>Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation by</td>
<td>ESC/ISBE</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by</td>
<td>ISBE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local &amp; ISBE/State Advisory Committee &amp; Local Governing Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All supervisory personnel, including Superintendents, Principals, Program Directors, Coordinators, Department Chairpersons and other administrators, were required to attend twenty-four hours of inservice within the first two years from the date of the passage of the bill regarding the evaluation and supervision of faculty members. This need was identified by the Illinois state legislature. Subsequent programs allowed for more choice of program topics within the established, legislative framework that each administrator/supervisor must attend eight hours of inservice biannually as offered through the Academy exclusively.

The above five examples of state-supported academy programs all reflected program offerings that appealed to a broad range of "school leaders." The myriad of topics catered to teachers, middle managers, school building administrators, and/or district level administrators alike. The literature revealed that most of the programs were developed by a council or a committee with sessions established throughout the year for participation. The professional development needs were broadly defined in an effort to meet a broad spectrum of differentiated colleagues.
The following state-supported programs for professional development also stemmed from the legislature, but observed a narrower focus. The following examples described programs of the Academy concept as related specifically to principals.

California School Leadership Academy

The California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) was formed in 1984 following the passage of a massive school reform act. The charge to the state was to help school administrators strengthen their leadership skills and strategies in order to improve student achievement in California. The founders of the Academy narrowed the program's scope with the support of the State Superintendent into "...a highly-structured three-year curriculum that consists of twenty-one sequential courses, all aimed to promote instructional leadership among principals."¹¹⁹ (See Figure 2.)

THE CALIFORNIA SCHOOL LEADERSHIP ACADEMY PROGRAM

MISSION
To help aspiring and practicing school administrators strengthen their instructional leadership skills and strategies in order to improve student learning in California.

Analyzing the Instructional Program
YEAR I
- Increasing Your Leverage as an Instructional Leader - I
  (3.5)
  - Creating a Vision
    (7.0)
  - Shaping the Culture
    (10.5)
- Developing Instructional Skills
  (28.0)
- Using Student Performance Data
  (17.5)

Strengthening the Instructional Program
YEAR II
- Increasing Your Leverage as an Instructional Leader - II
  (3.5)
  - Taking Stock of Yourself as an Instructional Leader
    (10.5)
  - Increasing Staff Effectiveness through Accountability
    (28.0)
  - Promoting Positive School Climate
    (21.0)
- Helping Staff to Grow Professionally
  (28.0)
- Involving Parents as Partners
  (14.0)

Leading School-Site Reform
YEAR III
- Increasing Your Leverage as an Instructional Leader - III
  (3.5)
  - Determining an Appropriate Intervention for School Improvement
    (10.5)
  - Improving the Quality of a Content Area Program
    (14.0)
- Implementing School Improvement Projects
  (45.5)
- Monitoring and Adjusting Plans
  (7.0)
- Overcoming the Inevitable Resistance to Change
  (7.0)
- CSLA Convocation
  (10.5)
- Marshalling Your Resources
  (7.0)
The modules were written by selected members of the central office staff at CSLA. The curriculum was intended to change the professional behavior of principals, "not just present them with a catalog of concepts."\textsuperscript{120}

North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals

The curriculum for the North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals provided for two different directions: 1) training for effective instructional leadership as promulgated by the effective schools' research; and 2) programs based on yearly needs assessments of principals as perceived by the principals themselves. The courses were divided into "knowledge" courses, "skill" courses, and "application" courses. Instructional leadership was broadly defined as evidenced by the scattered curriculum offerings.\textsuperscript{121}

West Virginia Principals' Academy

The West Virginia Principals' Academy was started in 1984. The intent of the Academy was to improve schools by

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid., p. 19.
\textsuperscript{121}Ibid., p. 10.
improving professional development opportunities for practicing principals. Effective schools' research was used extensively and trained principals how to use that research to improve their schools.

... Training for the improvement process covers collecting, disaggregating and analyzing student achievement data; setting school-wide goals; building consensus; and analyzing the correlates and developing a three-year improvement plan.122

Without attempting to elucidate on the evaluation of different academy programs, Wells and Gendler acknowledged that in general:

... Professional development programs for principals are a potentially powerful lever for influencing schools. As administrators, principals are intimately involved with the day-to-day conduct of schools, and as the bridge between the nation's two million teachers and its seventeen thousand districts, they comprise a potent and accessible task force whose capacity to improve schools is considerable. 123

Summary

Professional development was defined as a process with a goal-directed program of activity. Within the last

122Ibid., p. 12.
123Ibid., p. 22.
decade the focus of program activity broadened its scope to include and address the needs of administrative professional development. Staff development had predominantly focused on the needs of teachers, whereas the need to direct attention to include the professional development needs of principals specifically was recognized.

The purposes of professional development were categorized by the need to fulfill one's personal and individual needs, to increase one's competency and basic knowledge, and to improve the school's organizational effectiveness. Different programs revealed the intricate intertwining of specific purposes. Defined categories of purposes overlapped within program offerings.

The research documented that effective professional development programs provided for several of the following dominant characteristics of merit: 1) autonomy; 2) neutral setting; 3) personalized needs assessment; 4) linkage between school and district goals and objectives; 5) collaborative effort in planning; 6) strong subject facilitator and challenging content; 7) variety of activity; 8) collegial support groups; 9) on-going evaluation; and/or 10) professional recognition.

The enhanced concept of the principal being the instructional leader of a school was documented through
extensive research and caused the establishment of numerous institutes, centers, or programs as prescribed by state legislatures and/or through university initiation. Current programs were exemplified and formats ranged in scope from addressing the needs of all members of the educational community to principals only.

Specifically, the Illinois Administrators' Academy identified its intent to incorporate the training needs and interests of practicing administrators at all levels of instructional leadership. The Academy was established for the development of skills in 1) instructional staff development, 2) effective communications, 3) public school relations and 4) evaluation of personnel.

The increased interest in and study of the professional development of principals was evident through the review of related literature and research. The 1980's resulted in years of school reform research with needed measures of accountability identified and renewed emphasis on the role of the principal as the leader of a school, as the instructional leader of the school. The need for professional development activities for administrators was highlighted.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter's objective was to outline the methods used for the collection of data and to specify the procedures employed for the analysis of data in order to answer the research questions of the study. The research questions were listed and the techniques of investigation that were used described the following methods for collection of data: 1) the pilot study, 2) the composition of the target population, 3) the questionnaire content, 4) the administration and scoring of the questionnaire, and 5) the interview guide. The methods used for the scoring of the questionnaire, the interpretation of the interviewees' answers, and the treatment of data used for the analysis of the findings completed the chapter.
Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated in this study:

1) Did participation at the Administrators' Academy meet one's personal needs for professional development?

2) Did participation at the Administrators' Academy increase one's level of competency as part of one's professional development?

3) Did participation at the Administrators' Academy aid one's ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

Methods for Collection of Data

The collection of data was a two stage process involving a mailed questionnaire and a structured interview schedule. The questionnaire was designed to be a systematic and quantifiable instrument that yielded data in an efficient manner from a limited, but representative popula-
tion. The structured interview schedule was a follow-up to the questionnaire in order to qualify and better validate the findings of the survey. The interview process allowed the principal to answer questions in greater depth and allowed the interviewer to probe the answers in order to obtain more complete data. It was recognized that "many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing, and therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire." The interviewer was, also, able to interpret meanings from the respondents' gestures, expressions, tone of voice, and/or environmental factors that could not have been gleaned from only the written replies.

Pilot Study

The original questionnaire was sent to a panel of experts as selected in cooperation with university professors. The panel of experts consisted of five administrators not included in the sample. (See Appendix A.) Each was asked to complete the questionnaire so as to help spot ambiguous or redundant items, to help insure clarity and


comprehensiveness of the instrument and to help arrive at a format leading to efficient and simplified data tabulation and analysis. The administrators were, also, asked to verify the categorization of each statement according to the three identified major purposes of professional development.

Each administrator provided minimal feedback regarding suggestions for changing the instrument and acknowledged that the directions were clear, that the questions were easily understood, and that the categorization of each question was appropriate. As a result of this pilot study, no major changes were made in the research instrument.

Target Population

Subjects for this study were secondary school principals. One hundred one high school principals were identified through five selected Educational Service Centers that surrounded the metropolitan city of Chicago. (See Table 1.) The five Educational Service Centers that provided a representative population have been listed in Appendix B.
Table 1

NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS PER ESC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESC 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each Educational Service Center had an established Administrators' Academy program of offerings that functioned as a separate and distinct entity from other regional Administrators' Academy programs, but each remained under the umbrella guidelines of the State's control and direction. Every secondary school principal, as well as other administrators, was required to attend the Administrators' Academy at least once every two years.

Questionnaire Content

The format of the questionnaire included six questions for collecting demographic information and thirty items to be rated on a modified Likert scale ranging in values from 4.0 to 1.0. (See Appendix D.) The requested
demographic data included: 1) the name of the principal, 2) the name of the high school, 3) the enrollment of the high school, 4) the total number of years of experience as a principal, 5) the number of years as principal of the respective high school, and 6) the highest level of education attained by each principal.

The item responses were weighted so that a value of 4.0 represented the highest possible rating, and a 1.0 represented the lowest possible rating. Each principal was asked to indicate the answer that most closely reflected one's own perception of each statement about the Administrators' Academy. The options for response included the categories of "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." Principals were encouraged to indicate some agreement or disagreement with each statement by using this 4.0 scale. A category for "undecided" or "unsure" was deliberately omitted.

Brevity of response time was a major consideration in the construction of the instrument. The actual time to complete the instrument took no more than fifteen minutes.

Each survey item was designed to correspond to one of the three purposes of professional development as delineated by the research questions. The three major purposes of professional development were categorized as follows:
I. Personal Needs

Personal growth as part of professional development included the personal fulfillment or the satisfaction of personal needs. (See Table 2.) Examples of topics in this category for workshops at the Administrators' Academy included those dealing with building self-esteem, identifying one's leadership style, integrating values and attitudes, promoting interpersonal relationships, etc.

Table 2

SURVEY ITEMS CORRESPONDING TO PERSONAL NEEDS

1. The Academy provides the support I need to be effective.
4. The Academy provides professional recognition of my efforts as a Principal.
7. Communication from the Academies is frequent and informal.
10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.
13. The Academy provides adequate time to meet with colleagues and reflect upon the job itself.
16. The Academy maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with principals.
19. The Academy is receptive to my suggestions.
22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.
25. The Academy cares about me as a person as well as my professional needs.

28. The Academy provides opportunities to work on challenging tasks.

II. Increased Levels of Competency

Professional development included the enhancement of levels of competency as demonstrated by the acquisition of a new skill or the understanding of new knowledge. (See Table 3.) Topics presented at the Academy in this category have included workshops dealing with the development and application of clinical supervisory skills, a synthesis of effective school research, plans for increased student achievement, or the implementation of a new instructional program, for example.

Table 3

SURVEY ITEMS CORRESPONDING TO LEVELS OF COMPETENCY

2. The Academy asks me to fill out a professional needs assessment survey on a regular basis.

5. The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.

8. The Academy helps me learn how to model creative thinking for staff and students.
11. The Academy workshops focus on my techniques and my needs for improvement in the supervision of certified personnel.

14. The Academy makes available to me current research findings regarding the learning process.

17. The Academy provides me with inservice on varied instructional methods.

20. The Academy provides me with workshops on the legislation regarding student rights and responsibilities.

23. The Academy provides me with the opportunity to review methods for appropriate budget development and evaluation.

26. The Academy helps me to identify major functions and characteristics of school public relations programs.

29. The Academy helps me in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.

III. Organizational Effectiveness

Professional development addressed the goals of the institution for school improvement in this category. (See Table 4.) The Academy dealt with topics that addressed the organizational culture in general and identified techniques for producing an effective school climate, or promoting
cooperative decision-making skills, or the need to restructure a school's managerial framework.

Table 4
SURVEY ITEMS CORRESPONDING TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

3. The Academy helps me to establish clear guidelines for policy and procedure within the school building.
6. The Academy provides me with adequate inservice regarding the development and assessment of school climate.
9. The Academy provides me with new ideas, procedures, and strategies for student behavior management.
12. The Academy provides me with help in the design and implementation of school improvement plans.
15. The Academy meets my need to provide inservice on measurement and evaluation to include test construction, integration or selection.
18. The Academy workshops help me to focus on school goals in curriculum development.
21. The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement.
24. The Academy helps me to review fit between curriculum objectives and achievement testing.
27. The Academy trains me in staff development activities such as needs assessment, formulation, and evaluation.

30. The Academy models group facilitation skills and processes in the team management process.

Questionnaire Return

The questionnaire was mailed to one hundred one secondary school principals and yielded a response from eighty-three principals. (See Table 5.) A letter accompanied the survey to explain its purpose and to ask for a response within ten days. (See Appendix C.) There was a high percentage of return (82.3%) within the prescribed time frame. A total of seventy-six returned questionnaires (75.2%) was used as the base for all data analysis. Each of the seventy-six questionnaires was completed as requested which provided all demo-graphic data and a response to every statement.
### Table 5

#### QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's Orientation</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage Returned From Each ESC</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESC 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 (94.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15 (75.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22 (84.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC 7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17 (65.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned, but incomplete.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83 (82.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interview Guide

Ten principals, a thirteen percent (13%) sampling, were selected to be interviewed. Those principals to be interviewed were identified by the five highest averaged total scores and the five lowest averaged total scores. The principals were not selected by one's respective orientation to a specific educational service center, but only by the mean rating itself. Coincidentally, a fair distribution of principals among the five educational service centers was achieved. All ten identified principals agreed to be interviewed. (See Appendix E.)
At the beginning of the interview, a brief explanation of the study was offered to each principal and each category of purpose for professional development was defined. A structured interview schedule was used consisting of six major questions. (See Appendix F.) The interview took no more than one hour in length and was taped for accurate transcribing purposes.

**Procedures for Analysis of Data**

**Scoring of the Questionnaire**

Each survey item had a possible score of 4, 3, 2, or 1. The higher score indicated a higher degree of agreement with the statement at hand, which indicated a greater degree of satisfaction with the Administrators' Academy as it affected one's professional development. The scores of each item were summed to yield a possible raw score within the range of 120 points, as the highest score, and 30 points, as the lowest score. The total raw score was divided by the total number of questions answered out of 30 items to yield a mean score for each respondent. The distribution of frequencies of the mean ratings were charted and presented in Chapter IV as part of the analysis of the data.
The demographic data was, then, correlated with the mean scores of the questionnaire for each principal. Statistical significance was determined by using the Spearman rank correlation coefficient.

Because each question was specifically related to one of the three purposes of professional development, the raw scores of each item were also summed and averaged according to the respective category. The mean scores by category sought to indicate those areas within the total concept of professional development that the Academy addressed most effectively.

Interpretation of the Interview Data

The interviews received a qualitative analysis. The respondents' answers to each question were briefly summarized and presented. Each principal's interview was interpreted individually and then, the collective data was used to identify commonalities of answers or references. Similar concepts were defined and combined as the data was reduced and delimited.

The frequencies of answers as categorized by the purposes of professional development were tabulated and compared to the frequencies of answers identified by the data collected from the questionnaire. Comparisons and contrasts of data from both collection methods were noted.
Summary

The data for this study were collected in two phases. A thirty item questionnaire was mailed to one hundred one secondary school principals in northern Illinois and yielded an eighty-two percent (82%) response from eighty-three principals. Based upon the recorded scores of the questionnaire, ten principals were selected for an in-depth interview. This constituted a thirteen percent (13%) sampling of the study group.

The data from the questionnaire were scored in two ways. An averaged total score was calculated for each individual and response scores of each statement as categorized by the three identified purposes of professional development were calculated. Thus, a mean score for each category of professional development was derived as well as an individual's mean score for each returned questionnaire.

Of the individuals' scores, the five highest mean scores and the five lowest total mean scores identified ten principals to be interviewed. The high and low scores directly related to the participant's perception regarding the effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy on one's own professional development.
The data collected from the questionnaire were compared to the data from the interview process.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The compiled data obtained from the questionnaire and the interviews were presented and analyzed in this chapter. Implications of such findings were cited and discussed.

The information presented was categorized by the two methods of data collection: 1) questionnaire results and 2) interview responses. Appropriate tables were utilized in this chapter to efficiently depict the findings. Data from the questionnaire identified categories of demographic information, the raw scores of the replies, the mean scores and the frequencies of grouped scores. The interview responses followed the interview guide of six questions. Answers from each of the ten principals interviewed were indicated accordingly. Each section reviewed all of the collected data. Responses derived from the questionnaire and the interview process were compared and contrasted with the common answers being evaluated and analyzed in further discussion.
Questionnaire Data

The questionnaire used in this study asked one hundred one secondary school principals in the suburban Chicago area to provide one's perception of the effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy as the program offerings related to one's own professional development. The thirty item questionnaire had each of the respondent statements tied to one of the three defined purposes of professional development as identified within the research questions of the study. Demographic data were also requested to identify the high school by name, the enrollment of the school, the principal by name, the number of years of experience as principal, and the highest degree of education attained by each principal. Of the one hundred one principals surveyed, eighty-three principals responded (82.3%) and seventy-six returned questionnaires (75%) were deemed appropriate for data analysis.
Demographic Information

Demographically, the five educational service regions selected in this study provided for a representative sample of existing high schools within the state of Illinois. The variation in the size of schools was exhibited as schools with fewer than five hundred students to schools with six times that enrollment were represented. Principals' administrative backgrounds included beginning experiences to well tenured positions of twenty or more years of experience. The high school principals, also, possessed different degrees of higher education as well as a myriad of cited graduate studies. The ranges of data were then used to determine any correlation that was statistically significant between the demographic information and the survey scores.
The size of the high schools ranged in enrollment figures from four hundred eighty-five (485) students to three thousand (3,000) students. Forty-six of the seventy-six schools (60.6%) fell within the middle ranges of housing approximately twelve hundred (1,201) students to twenty-one hundred (2,100) students. Fifteen smaller schools (19.7%) were represented and fifteen larger schools (19.7%) provided responses to the questionnaire. (See Table 6.)

Table 6
SIZE OF SCHOOL BY ENROLLMENT FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 - 900</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901 - 1200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 - 1500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 - 1800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 - 2100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101 - 2500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principals listed their total years of experience as a secondary school principal which identified the beginning principals (4%) through the gamut of individuals who had twenty or more years (7.9%) of tenure in that position. (See Table 7.) The survey revealed that the majority of respondents (67.1%) had ten or fewer years of experience as a secondary school principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This targeted population of secondary school administrators, also, revealed a background of extensive schooling and a sophisticated level of accumulated higher education as delineated by the cumulative data. (See Table 8.) All of the surveyed principals had earned at least a Master's degree and twenty-eight individuals (36.9%) had earned a doctorate.

Table 8
LEVELS OF EDUCATION OF THE PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF HIGHER EDUCATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.S.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D./Ph.D.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that all public secondary school principals are required to have a valid Illinois Administrative Certificate and that the state of Illinois mandates a Master's degree from an accredited institution of higher education before an administrative certificate will be issued.
Survey Scores

The secondary school principals were surveyed as to their personal perceptions of how the Administrators' Academy had impacted their own professional development. All items on the survey were declarative sentences phrased to evoke a rated reaction regarding one's agreement or disagreement with the statement at hand.

The questionnaire had thirty statements that provided for possible raw scores ranging from one hundred twenty (120) down to a raw score of thirty (30). Mean scores were calculated which corresponded to the answers of "strongly agree" for a score of 4.00, "agree" for 3.00, "disagree" for 2.00, and "strongly disagree" for 1.00. The mean scores were then ranked on an ordinal scale from 4.00 to 1.00. The frequency of mean scores was reflected in Table 9 with all score units listed in one column and the number of individuals receiving each score listed in the "total" column.
Table 9
FREQUENCIES OF QUESTIONNAIRE MEAN SCORES BY INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score of Questionnaire</th>
<th>ESC #2</th>
<th>ESC #3</th>
<th>ESC #4</th>
<th>ESC #5</th>
<th>ESC #7</th>
<th>Principals (N)</th>
<th>Total by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean scores represented general agreement or general disagreement. For example, if a principal's mean score was 2.86, this indicated that the principal generally agreed with the concept that the Administrators' Academy had augmented one's professional development. If a principal's mean score was 1.46, the score indicated the principal's strong disagreement with the concept that the Administrators' Academy had benefitted one's professional development.

The mean of all of the questionnaire scores was 2.279 which indicated general disagreement with the statements that the Administrators' Academy had satisfied one's professional development needs. The most frequent score indicated disagreement as well with the mode of the averaged scores as 2.23 with five principals having received such a score.
Due to the large number of individual score units, the mean scores were grouped in Table 10 and the frequency distribution was displayed.

Table 10
GROUPED MEAN SCORES
OF QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE OF QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50 - 4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.50 - 3.49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.50 - 2.49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequent grouped score coupled with the remaining lower scores indicated that approximately sixty-five percent (64.5%) of the respondents or forty-nine principals generally disagreed with the statements that the Administrators' Academy was effective in providing for professional development.

Not one principal received a score of 4.00 which would have indicated "strong agreement" to all thirty statements. Thus, not one principal indicated strong agreement that the Illinois Administrators' Academy had substantially benefitted one's professional development.

A score of 2.50 and above would have indicated general agreement with the majority of the statements in the survey that the Administrators' Academy was effective in meeting an individual's professional development needs. Only thirty-six percent (35.5%) of the principals or only twenty-seven of the principals demonstrated overall agreement with the survey statements.
In addition to tabulating the frequency of grouped averaged scores, calculations were made to determine any correlation between the obtained scores and the size of the high school, between the obtained scores and a principal's administrative experience and/or between the obtained scores and a principal's level of education. It should be noted that a correlation does not necessarily reflect causality. The variables might in fact be causally related, but that has not been established in this research. The investigated correlations were techniques for quantifying relationships. The formula for calculating the Spearman rank correlation coefficient provided a nonparametric procedure for measuring the strength of the relationship between two variables. The data for each category were rank ordered and scaled on less than an interval level.

The mean scores of the questionnaire as obtained by the principals were compared with the sizes of schools as referenced by student enrollment. These data were depicted in Table 11. The Spearman coefficient was computed at
The strength of the correlation between these two variables was not substantiated. The size of the school had not directly affected the principal's perception of the Illinois Administrator's Academy as reflected by the mean score on the questionnaire.

Table 12 showed the comparison of the frequency of scores with the number of years of experience of each principal. No direct correlation or statistically significant generalization could be made regarding the findings. The Spearman coefficient was computed as a negative .0125.

The data displayed in Table 13 correlated the frequency of scores with the level of education each principal had attained. Again, a scattering of results focused within the middle class interval of scores with little significance being noted. The Spearman coefficient was computed at .0303. But, a simple observation was that the seven principals that disagreed most with the statements of the questionnaire, thus indicating that the Administrators' Academy was not effective in providing for professional development, were all doctorate degree holding respondents.
### Table 11
FREQUENCY OF SCORES
BY
SCHOOL ENROLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score of Questionnaire</th>
<th>&lt;600</th>
<th>601-900</th>
<th>901-1200</th>
<th>1201-1500</th>
<th>1501-1800</th>
<th>1801-2100</th>
<th>2101-2500</th>
<th>&gt;2500</th>
<th>Total by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 (35.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50-2.99</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
<td>5 (6.6%)</td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.00-2.49</td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
<td>9 (11.8%)</td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
<td>6 (7.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 (55.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.50-1.99</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>8 (10.5%)</td>
<td>5 (6.5%)</td>
<td>16 (21.0%)</td>
<td>19 (24.9%)</td>
<td>13 (17.1%)</td>
<td>11 (14.4%)</td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
<td>76 (99.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rank
Correlation Coefficient = $1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{n(n-1)}$

= .1008

$Z = r_s \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{5}}$

= .8729
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score of Questionnaire</th>
<th>0 - 3</th>
<th>4 - 6</th>
<th>7 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>20+</th>
<th>Total by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50-2.99</td>
<td>6 (7.97)</td>
<td>3 (3.97)</td>
<td>5 (6.62)</td>
<td>3 (3.97)</td>
<td>1 (1.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.00-2.49</td>
<td>8 (10.57)</td>
<td>8 (10.57)</td>
<td>7 (9.2)</td>
<td>4 (5.3)</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td>3 (3.97)</td>
<td>42 (55.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.50-1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (5.3)</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.37)</td>
<td>3 (3.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td>3 (3.97)</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.37)</td>
<td>1 (1.37)</td>
<td>7 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14 (18.47)</td>
<td>19 (24.7)</td>
<td>18 (23.67)</td>
<td>8 (10.57)</td>
<td>11 (14.37)</td>
<td>6 (7.87)</td>
<td>76 (99.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rank
Correlation Coefficient = $1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{n(n-1)}$

$= .0125$

$Z = P_s \sqrt{n-1}$

$= - .1082$
**Table 13**

**FREQUENCY OF SCORES**

**BY**

**PRINCIPALS' LEVELS OF EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Levels of Education</th>
<th>M.A./M.S.</th>
<th>C.A.S.</th>
<th>Ph.D./Ed.D.</th>
<th>Total by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>27 (35.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50-2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (11.8%)</td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
<td>9 (11.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.00-2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (21.1%)</td>
<td>7 (9.2%)</td>
<td>9 (11.8%)</td>
<td>42 (55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.50-1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (9.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (9.2%)</td>
<td>7 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 (44.7%)</td>
<td>14 (18.3%)</td>
<td>28 (36.7%)</td>
<td>76 (99.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spearman Rank**

**Correlation Coefficient**

\[
R = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}
\]

\[
R = .0303
\]

\[
Z = P_s \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}
\]

\[
Z = .2624
\]
The three specific research questions of this study identified three different purposes of professional development within the context of each research question respectively. Each of the thirty survey statements corresponded to one of the three defined purposes and the survey responses to each category of purpose were charted. Ten statements of each questionnaire were identified for each purpose. Thus, a total of two thousand two hundred eighty responses were fielded from seventy-six principals responding to ten statements in each of the three categories of purpose of professional development: 1) meeting personal needs, 2) increasing levels of competencies, and 3) improving school/organizational effectiveness.

**Personal Needs**

Responses to those statements designed to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy had satisfied one's personal needs for professional development reflected an approximate even split between agreement and disagreement. Seventy-six respondents answered ten questions regarding personal needs for a total of seven hundred and sixty responses. Forty-eight percent (48.4%) of the responses indicated agreement that one's personal needs of professional development had been satisfactorily accommodated; whereas fifty-two percent (51.6%) indicated disagreement with that perception. (See Table 14.)
Table 14
RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION OF
SURVEY STATEMENTS RELATING TO PERSONAL NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Response</th>
<th>Survey Statement Number</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Percentage by Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>#1 #4 #7 #10 #13 #16 #19 #22 #25 #28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 6 8 2 3 9 24 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>#1 #4 #7 #10 #13 #16 #19 #22 #25 #28</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 25 26 10 25 46 36 33 37 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>#1 #4 #7 #10 #13 #16 #19 #22 #25 #28</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 40 35 37 41 18 18 14 19 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>#1 #4 #7 #10 #13 #16 #19 #22 #25 #28</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 9 9 21 8 9 13 5 15 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statement on the survey gathered the most positive feedback within this category:

#22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.

The next statements yielded the most disagreement:

#4. The Academy provides professional recognition of my efforts as a principal.

#10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.

#13. The Academy provides adequate time to meet with colleagues and reflect upon the job itself.

Levels of Competency

The second research question asked if participation at the Administrators' Academy increased one's level of competency as part of one's professional development. The responses to those corresponding statements showed forty percent (39.8%) in agreement and sixty percent (60.2%) expressing disagreement with the idea that inservice at the Academy had expanded one's professional competency level. (See Table 15.)
Table 15
RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION OF
SURVEY STATEMENTS RELATING TO COMPETENCY LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Response</th>
<th>Survey Statement Number</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Percentage by Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>#2 1 7 4 19 8 8 0 1 1 4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>#5 33 20 30 39 25 14 24 15</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>32.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>#8 46 29 38 21 28 24 40 42 38 44</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>46.07%</td>
<td>60.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>#11 10 7 14 6 10 5 11 19 13 13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>100.07%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses of agreement predominantly focused on the statement that described the content of the mandated inservice activity.

#11. The Academy workshops focus on my techniques and my needs for improvement in the supervision of certified personnel.

The greatest disagreement registered with the following statements:

#1. The Academy provides the support I need to be effective.

#23. The Academy provides me with the opportunity to review methods for appropriate budget development and evaluation.

#29. The Academy helps me in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.

School Effectiveness

School improvement and organizational effectiveness was the third identified purpose of professional development. The responses showed thirty-six percent (35.5%) agreement with those survey statements that listed activities that aided one's ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness. Sixty-five percent (64.5%) of the responses disagreed with such statements. (See Table 16.)
Table 16  
RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION OF  
SURVEY STATEMENTS RELATING TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Response</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#12</th>
<th>#15</th>
<th>#18</th>
<th>#21</th>
<th>#24</th>
<th>#27</th>
<th>#30</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Percentage by Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statements that scored most favorably among the high school principals, even though the agreement was not strong agreement, in this category included:

#27. The Academy trains me in staff development activities such as needs assessment, formulation, and evaluation.

#30. The Academy models group facilitation skills and processes in the team management process.

Principals expressed the strongest disagreement with the following statements:

#3. The Academy helps me to establish clear guidelines for policy and procedure within the school building.

#9. The Academy provides me with new ideas, procedures and strategies for student behavior management.

#15. The Academy meets my need to provide inservice on measurement and evaluation to include test construction, integration or selection.

#24. The Academy helps me to review the "fit" between curriculum objectives and achievement testing.
Overall, an individual's survey score reflected a mind-set or prevailing attitude about the Academy in general and how it contributed to or did not contribute to one's own professional development. The three categories of purpose were not overtly distinguishable as perceived by the principals in the sense that one purpose of professional development was not better served or better met than the other categories. One's perception of the Academy as it enhanced one's professional development was more fairly represented by an individual's total mean score as the majority of responses in all categories aligned predominantly with either statements of agreement or statements of disagreement. The responses reflected more disagreement than agreement with the survey items and in turn, negated much of the benefit of inservice activities at the Illinois Administrators' Academy as referenced for individual professional development.
Interview Data

Of the seventy-six survey respondents, ten principals or 13% were identified for interview purposes from their mean survey score. Five principals with the highest averaged score and five principals with the lowest averaged score were contacted for an interview.

Looking specifically at the survey scores of those principals selected to be interviewed, there was not a significant depicted difference between the total mean score and the scores of the three different outlined purposes of professional development. The categories suggested in the research questions did not significantly separate themselves by the scoring. The categorical mean scores were relatively flat as calculated in part for the total mean score. (See Table 17.) For example, a total mean score of 3.23 had been derived by categorical mean scores of 3.40, 3.10 and 3.20 respectively. Only a maximum of a three-tenths point difference between categories was indicated. The results have indicated a lack of a distinct perception that the Academy's offerings had better met the individual's personal needs versus the other categories of competency levels and/or school effectiveness. No major difference among the categorical mean scores and between the total mean scores was evident. The interviews with each of the ten principals helped to confirm this finding.
### Table 17
PURPOSES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH CATEGORICAL MEAN SCORES OF INTERVIEWED PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals Interviewed (N)</th>
<th>Personal Needs</th>
<th>Professional Competency</th>
<th>School Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six specific questions served as a guide to the interview with other comments being noted. The questions were open-ended so as to allow the respondent a frame of reference within which to react, without placing any constraint on the reaction. Open-ended questions also allowed for the unexpected responses which revealed significant information not necessarily anticipated by the specific research design.

Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed for the accurate reporting of each principal's comments. The responses to each question were analyzed, compared for similarity, and synthesized into summary concepts. Direct quotes from the principals supported each summarizing statement. This section was organized accordingly by the six structured questions.
Interview Question #1:

What activities or workshops did you engage in and/or attend for professional development within the last three years at the Academy?

Summary Response:

All of the principals were required to attend a three-day (24 hours) workshop entitled The Training Module on Teacher Observation. This was the first inservice offering at the Administrators' Academy and attendance of all supervisory personnel was mandated by the legislature. Several principals believed that much of the prescribed curriculum was a duplication of previous learnings.

Other sessions were elective in nature. Only three of the ten principals had elected to attend more than the minimum of one additional eight hour session in any two year cycle.
Supporting Quotes:

Workshop Topic 1
The Training Module on Teacher Observation

...Theoretically, it's right on target - keep current, practicing administrators involved in self-improvement activities.

...It (the quality of the program) really depends a lot on who the presenter is and who the discussion leader happens to be. Also, it depends on the makeup of the group that's there.

...The negative, initial reaction was that we're (the State) going to have you go over material that you've already done... but, instead it just dovetailed with what we (the district) were working on together for improvement of instruction and the improvement of the process of working with people.

...Some people that were forced into this are going to be resistant, and there are going to be people like that until the day they retire.

...No concern was made as to what expertise the people had already. You look around that room and there is a tremendous amount of money represented as salaries are considered. There are fifty people - all highly paid people and they have to stay there until 3:00 o'clock - no matter what. Now I see that they're (the State) coming around more to saying, "Let's really determine what the needs of the people are and go from there."

...districts that didn't even have a teacher evaluation instrument, and districts that did not evaluate teachers on a regular basis (may have needed this) but we had had a program in place for years.

...I just felt that they were trying to present a "canned" program to me which was developed by somebody else. I knew much more than they did.
So, by the time the administrator academy programs came into being, we'd been in our program for four years. I just didn't feel that I learned very much at all from the Academy that could benefit me.

I was presented with virtually no new information.

If you get downstate, or in smaller areas where they don't have the resources available to them, then it's probably worthwhile for them.

was designed statewide to bring all principals or administrators up to a certain level of competency in regard to evaluation with little regard for differences between where principals currently are. It's the very worst of what we've all been accused of as educators - teaching to the middle of the group.

I wish I was not so negative about them, it seemed to be a very great expenditure of my time to accomplish very little.

What I would wish is that they wouldn't make me go back to any more sessions.

Workshop Topic 2
Learning Styles and Teaching Methodologies:

was really quite good.

very well prepared and brought practical application of the current learning style research into the practical classroom experience.

Workshop Topic 3
Assertive Discipline:

Deans and teachers went to the same workshop at the same time and I saw the development of a more cooperative, collegial approach to discipline.
Workshop Topic 4
Evaluation of Auxiliary/Ancillary Personnel:

. . .I thought it would tell me how to supervise the Cafeteria Manager, the Bookstore Manager, and the Head of the Custodians, but, it turned out to be a counselor evaluation. The topic wasn't clarified. In fact, the presenter told us that he was so frustrated with the material that he tried to make it the best he could. He probably had two hours worth of material that he had to make last one day. So we had a lot of breaks and a long luncheon, which was really kind of sad.

. . .It was all those things not in the teaching act.

. . .Again, it was poorly presented. Quite honestly, the reason I attended that one was that it fit into my time schedule of summer activities and it was a time when I could go...I have no particular interest in the area.

Workshop Topic 5
Data Collection

. . .The observation and data gathering strategies were good for us and we got some new ideas. We had been on a Madeline Hunter type model for ten years. Our forms and procedures got adjusted a little bit.

. . .It was a day and a half and it dealt a lot with what you observe in a classroom and how you go about collecting data. I didn't find it very worthwhile because it was so tunnelled into one particular way of doing things - Madeline Hunter's style. That is not a process or procedure we use in this building or in this district.
Interview Question #2:

How did participation at the Administrators' Academy workshops meet your personal needs for professional development?

Summary Response:

The majority of principals could not cite individual experiences that specifically met one's personal needs for professional development stemming from activities at the Administrators' Academy. More comment was fielded in regard to what was gleaned at meetings of other professional organizations, national conventions, university workshops, local collegial groups, etc. - meetings or workshops of the individual's own choosing. Personal needs were not specifically identified as being met through attendance at the Academy.

It was echoed by six of the ten principals that even the positive collegial group feeling at the Administrators' Academy was somewhat stifled by the prescribed, inflexible programs.

Several principals felt their personal needs were met as the result of their own initiative and/or involvement in activities versus a direct link to an Academy program.
Supporting Quotes:

...Our school has fostered self-improvement. So, I guess I would have done it with or without the Academy.

...I don't know if it's as much the Academy as it is me. I think that people go to these meetings either with an open mind or without one.

...They weren't so much as saying that there was only one way to do something, because they presented several ways you can do a better job by working with your people and sharing ideas. That was key for me personally.

...The purpose of the Administrators' Academy in meeting my needs may not be as dramatic as it could be, or should be. It may be greater for some other administrators whose schools have not provided these (self-improvement) opportunities for them.

...I don't think that the Academy has in any way affected or enhanced or pushed me to different directions. I think everything we have done, I have done or have been a part of because of working in the district or being a part of something that we have internally decided to do - not at the behest of the Academy.
Interview Question #3:

How did participation at the Administrators' Academy workshops enhance your professional competency as part of one's professional development?

Summary Response:

Most of the sessions attended by the principals dealt with the skills associated with the supervisory/evaluation process. The level of professional competency was an individual's self-assessment.

Some comments were favorable and some comments were definitively unfavorable. Some principals accepted the material and tried to refine their ingrained skills and some principals rejected the material as being redundant. Nine of the ten principals had commented that the material presented at the required workshop on evaluation and supervision of personnel was repetitive. Each had had similar inservice previously. The voluntary comments varied greatly within the limits of the spectrum.
Supporting Quotes:

... I was in a group that was just tops and the lady who was running it, I thought, did a fine job. The group I was in was just excellent. We were able to share what each of the schools was doing in the areas of supervision and evaluation. Our district happens to have been one of the forerunners in supervision and evaluation as far as observing teachers. We were on merit and the session on supervision and evaluation, I thought, was a skill-polishing session.

... Basically the Academy builds some strengths for walking into a classroom, making some judgments at the classroom level. That's where I think it's effective.

... We had implemented an instructional improvement program for our staff in 1982 with a two-year cycle. So, by the time the Administrator Academy programs came into being, we'd been in our program for four years ... I just didn't feel that I learned very much at all from the Academy that could benefit me.

... Since February of 1985, I've been teaching a class on supervision. The Academy program did not help me. ... The presenters ... I felt that they were really at a low level of understanding both supervision and conferencing. I wondered if they'd had any experience in those areas at all ... What was given to them was "Mickey Mouse." And then, when trying to present a concept, when asked questions, or when you wanted the presenter to go a little bit further with more examples of experiences, it was clear that the individual really didn't know where to go.

... These people came off as bureaucrats trying to implement another mandate which they had little or no knowledge about.

... This, to me, is a remediation program. The Administrators' Academy is built on the premise that all administrators need remediation. I think a fair number of them do, but for those who don't need remediation, there ought to be a support system and a stretching system in place.
Interview Question #4:

How did participation at the Administrators' Academy workshops meet your needs for implementing new and/or different strategies and techniques in the improvement of the effectiveness of a school?

Summary Response:

It appeared that not many Academy programs were geared to look at school effectiveness and/or improvement plans. As the school reform bill would continue to impact the tasks of administrators, it was expected that more inservice regarding school improvement plans would become available.

Only two principals commented specifically on how the Academy programs had enabled them to look at the gestalt of the school through effective group interaction techniques and to implement ways to address the school climate through organizational goal setting plans.

Supporting Quotes:

...I think one of the things it (the Academy) has done is to make administrators a little more sensitive to some of the problems that come up in schools. For example, we've done more surveying of both staff and parents and students regarding our school climate.

...I became principal here five years ago. We spent a lot of time in those first couple of years working as an administrative unit. My assistant principal for instruction and I were the training leaders for our own staff. So, in effect, we ran our own Administrative Academy at our high school and did the training. Now we've come up with some things that are consistent, I think, with what was advocated in an Academy general workshop, but it didn't happen because of that workshop.
Interview Question #5:

What do you feel was the purpose of the Administrators' Academy?

Summary Response:

Purposes were defined in terms of what individual principals believed was needed. All of the interviewed principals believed and agreed that colleagues benefitted from the sharing and exchanging of ideas, but the administrators varied in how such an agenda should be formatted. The joining together of colleagues for professional educational discussion purposes was highlighted in different ways.

The purpose of the Administrators' Academy as perceived by the different principals ranged in ideas from narrowing the focus of programs to address the needs of principals only to facilitating the needs of teams of individuals from specific schools; from enlarging groups to include colleagues outside of one's individual district to developing smaller groups within a school building for more active interplay among individuals; from formal presentations by renowned experts in the field to informal gatherings for networking purposes.

The Academy was viewed as a viable resource of information and contact of experts for districts; or at least had the capability of being such. To have the Academy be a provider of services was a key concept, yet individuals stressed the point that they, the school personnel, should determine the services needed.
Supporting Quotes:

...I think we need an Administrators' Academy devoted to causing divergent thinkers and creative problem solvers and providing a haven for them to go to and get revitalized so that they can come back and encourage that.

...They are not just looking at administering schools. They have chosen not to be so narrow to deal with only concerns of administrators. They get into some of the more theoretical and the new things that are coming up and they are fostering some of these things through the program offerings.

...It is interesting - the approach that was taken in developing the content for the programs. The Illinois Academy assumed that there was a set of administrative abilities or capabilities that ought to exist and that one could structure a curriculum through the Academy that would update and modify the level of competence that people had in those areas.

...It makes the State Board of Education more active in terms of school improvement plans, minimum achievement standards, and good communication with all the school districts.

...I think the purpose is probably to get at least the lowest common denominator on a number of things for the schools. From what I heard in the beginning, at least, was that a lot of the schools just weren't doing things that they should have been doing in terms of staff development and teacher evaluation.

...There should be some sort of on-going program for administrative development.

...Have a stronger commitment to keeping on the cutting edge of education. ...Interested in how we can improve not only our school programs or ourselves but how we can keep our teachers attuned to what's going on most often.

...We're going to work together to help each other do a better job.

...Theoretically, it's right on target - keep current, practicing administrators involved in self-improvement activities.
Bring in a consultant, provide our people with a number of training sessions and allow us to eventually take care of the training ourselves. Sessions could be tied into school philosophy and school procedures within a particular system.

Provide me with some insights and some opportunities and send me off on tracks that I could follow, pursuing much of it independently.

I think it's (the Academy) a very good idea. . . . the State ought to pursue professional development for administrators in different ways. . . . I think we should be free to select people we want to hear in our own intellectual interests. If you're going to make us go to something, then pay the dollars and bring in somebody who can offer some substance to us or offer a new vision to us, or someone who's done some recent work in the field.

We need breadth of thinking; we need divergent thinking; we need creative ideas; we need to be stretched and pulled in other ways rather than how to run the budget more efficiently or how to keep people from blowing up your school.

Being a person who enjoys the challenge of learning independently, and bringing that to bear in a real situation, I feel the need for the opportunities to exchange ideas, but, when somebody tries to structure a program, I think that it creates problems for me.

It means we have a unique set of needs and in my judgment this Academy is not meeting those needs. A literary club would much better serve this group.

but I'm critical of the whole concept which is that everybody gets the same dose whether you need it or not.
Interview Question #6:

If you could make one recommendation to improve what the Administrators' Academy offers or how it meets your needs in respect to your professional development, what would that recommendation be?

Summary Response:

All of the principals interviewed offered at least one recommendation for improvement of the Administrators' Academy. Several of the principals felt that the scope of the program was too large. The broad area covered by a given activity or subject matter thwarted the opportunity to function effectively. As an example, four of the ten interviewees voluntarily commented that they believed the needs of administrators in downstate Illinois were different than those in the urban setting of Chicago or those in the suburban environment surrounding a metropolis. Financial resources, proximity to university programs as well as accessibility to travel arrangements were noted as being different in different parts of the state and thus, program development was or should be impacted differently. Each of the principals accented the need to have a variety of programs based upon the needs identified locally. To assess the needs of the participants in any professional
development activity was deemed to be a priority item of importance. Based on those needs, the program should be developed at a local level versus a state level of orientation. Two principals asked that the focus of attention be narrowed to include the needs of principals only and then allow for further differentiation between well-tenured principals and inexperienced principals. One principal emphasized that the content areas, including the humanities as well as math and science, should be at the center of activities. All agreed to the needed variety in programming and all expressed the need to be involved in the planning.

The consensus of opinion revealed that the quality of professional development activity should be improved. Stimulating topics, current trends and challenging tasks were emphasized. Only two of the ten principals had been presenters at an Academy inservice. Six other principals indicated their preference for speakers of national recognition as opposed to a reliance on local administrators' viewpoints. It was believed that the state funds could be used to bring in renowned educational researchers and experts to present when local districts were often unable to afford that cost.
Eight of the ten principals interviewed specifically recommended that compliance with the mandate for continued professional development among administrators be met in other ways beyond attendance at the Administrators' Academy. The Academy offered such a structured format. More flexibility was advocated. Six principals noted that the time constraints of the sessions were emphasized more often than the process of group dynamics. All of the principals acknowledged that they participated in other programs or activities for professional development in addition to the Academy. In turn, it was recommended that an approval process be established to allow for different inservice activities that would comply with the state's intent of purpose.

Supporting Quotes:

...It can't be all things to all people ... offer a wide variety of things that will help me grow or will offer me direction.

...I think too much is made of saying you need two or eight hours a day, or whatever that time element is, and restricting the trainer to meet that time requirement as opposed to letting the trainer assess the strengths and weaknesses of the audience, the amount of material and length of time it takes for him to cover it. Let's talk about the development of competence as opposed to worrying about the requirement of length of time.

...The Illinois Administrators' Academy may get better with even more control places than the E.S.C.'s. The differences (across the state) are just too great.
I don't think that every single program has to be done by the Administrators' Academy. I have no problem if they feel we should submit a program for their approval, and I think they should give us the parameter to operate within (beyond the Academy). They should have the opportunity to review what we want to do but they should also project the faith in us that we can determine programs that are good for ourselves, too.

I hope they'll do more work with the School Board Association and perhaps the I.P.A., especially in finding out what it is people want to know. Other districts, other schools have different things in mind, but do whatever they can to find out what the schools need to work on and provide for it.

My biggest complaint about the Administrators' Academy is structure. It's just a factor that's inherent in trying to do something for the general good of the whole population of school administrators. Once you begin to do that on a statewide basis, then there's no way that you can be flexible enough to tailor a program to the needs of either individual school districts or groups of schools.

Encourage them to move away from the highly structured format that they use. They feel the need to incorporate a heavy sense of accountability for what they're doing, and I think that it overstructures and really reduces the amount of benefit that can be gained from encouraging the informal, problem-solving discussion approach.

No concern was made as to what expertise the people had already. Let's really determine what the needs of the people are and go from there.

Offer a wider selection of topics for the sessions. I know that can be a problem from the standpoint that they have to have personnel and finances to offer a wider variety of topics.

This is the information age. We need information regarding content areas. And information that good high school principals don't need is how to evaluate teachers. If the principal doesn't know anything about the subject matter, can he or she effectively evaluate the teacher's performance?
Have it concerned less about what administrators do on a daily basis and cause it to be more of a stretching agenda rather than a confidence building agenda. This (present program) is a remediation program. The Administrators' Academy is built on the premise that all administrators need remediation, but for those who don't need remediation, there ought to be a support system and a stretching system in place.

I really don't know what process they follow in identifying topics and needs as far as these meetings they offer. They follow certain themes, of course, that are state priorities.

**Analysis and Implications**

The survey scores and the interview responses led one to believe that the Administrators' Academy had not effectively met the professional development needs of administrators. Concerns were noted from the specific survey data with appropriate interpretations and clarifications from the interviews having been sought.

The goals of the Academy appeared to be appropriately stated and firmly implanted by the verbiage within the legislative bill. The Illinois Administrators' Academy was identified as a vehicle to provide training to administrators across the state in order to improve their performance within the school itself. The process was to be result-oriented with eventual improvement of student achievement being noted.
As delineated in the review of literature and research, three common purposes of professional development were identified. These three purposes of professional development became the foci of the three specific research questions of this study. The survey instrument was constructed specifically relating to those three purposes. It was the intent of the study to identify which purpose, if any, was better served by attendance and participation at the Administrators' Academy inservice.

The collective survey response revealed that sixty-five percent (64.5%) of the high school principals in northern Illinois or approximately two-thirds of the study population (49 principals) disagreed with the concept that the Academy had effectively accomplished any of the three identified purposes of professional development.

The first of the three purposes of professional development included the personal fulfillment or the satisfaction of personal needs. The survey items spoke to building self-esteem, establishing good rapport, providing a caring attitude, supporting individual accomplishments, and/or promoting interpersonal relationships. Of the seven hundred sixty responses tallied in this category, approximately half (48.4%) of all the responses revealed agreement that personal needs were satisfied by the program offerings of the Administrators' Academy.
Conversely, fifty-two percent (51.6%) of the responses revealed disagreement. It should, also, be noted that there were more responses revealing strong disagreement versus strong agreement. This was an important factor that was recognized as it helped to define the level of agreement versus disagreement as the purposes of professional development were delineated. There was approximately a two to one ratio between the categories of strongly disagree and strongly agree.

As the next category of purpose, which related to increased competency, was reviewed, a similar ratio of two to one was seen between those responses of strongly disagree and strongly agree. The overall percentages of the responses weighed heavily toward disagreement that participation at the Administrators' Academy had increased one's level of competency as part of one's professional development. Sixty percent (60.2%) disagreed; whereas forty percent (39.8%) showed agreement.

The programs designed to increase one's level of competency included workshops that provided opportunities to develop specific skills, to learn new techniques, to acquire new knowledge about the profession itself. The first mandated requirement of the Illinois Administrators' Academy was meant to do just that. The first twenty-four hour workshop that was required of all administrators
within the state of Illinois meant to train supervisors of certified personnel in techniques that would enhance the process of teaching within the classroom. This specific category was targeted by the Illinois State Board of Education yet fell short in meeting the expectations of the participants. Administrators attended inservice with the intent of learning something new and/or improving upon one's present skill level. Many comments from the survey results as well as from the interview responses indicated that this in fact, did not provide the participants with an increased knowledge base from which to perform their job more effectively.

Because the first session at the Academy was mandated with a prescribed curriculum, there was wide belief that the mandate adopted the premise that all administrators needed training in the evaluation and supervision of personnel. A lack of knowledge regarding this subject was assumed, as a formal needs assessment had never been solicited.

According to the principals, the material was basic and repetitive in nature and a three-day workshop was too much time for the learning activity. The state had not adequately assessed the competency levels of principals before implementing the prescribed curriculum. Thus, the participants brought varying levels of understanding of the
process of teacher evaluation to the workshop, but such was ignored as "teaching toward the middle" prevailed.

Principals went to the Academy hoping to acquire skills that they didn't previously have but, it became obvious that individual skills varied greatly with little differentiation in the training accommodating such. There was a consensus that the sessions didn't offer administrators many of those expansive skills and techniques that were going to allow one to function in an improved way after one got back to the school building. It was felt that the Academy didn't understand the individual, didn't respect prior experience and prior training, and in essence that the Academy inflicted punishment by taking up one's valuable time and forcing individuals to repeat things from prior learnings.

School improvement and organizational effectiveness was the third identified category of professional development. The amount of disagreement was even greater in this category than in the other two categories. Thirty-six percent (35.5%) of the responses indicated agreement; whereas sixty-five percent (64.5%) indicated disagreement. Also, the difference between those responses of strong agreement and those responses of strong disagreement increased with the ratio being four to one. The level of strong disagreement was pronounced. Principals provided negative feedback to the question of whether the Academy
had aided one's ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness.

During the interviews, several principals excused the Academy from serving this purpose presently, as they expressed that this topic would be explored at greater length in the near future. As part of the school reform bill, each district would be required to establish school improvement plans based upon student achievement scores. Thus, this topic or category was expected to receive much more attention on behalf of the Academy at a later date. For the purposes of this study, it was recognized that this singular purpose of professional development received the strongest adverse comments.

The Academy, in general, was not well received by the participants involved. The goals of the Academy were supported by the principals but the execution of the plan was deplored. The first encounter with the Illinois Administrators' Academy received negative feedback.

Principals identified the beginning of the Academy from a negative base. It was viewed that the State had attempted to standardize excellence but the standardized curriculum of the first session was geared toward the average. Professional development needs were perceived to be different across the state by the principals and thus, there was a strong feeling that it was a poor presumption
to mandate that all administrators be trained through identical means. The consistency in technique and curriculum helped to breed mediocrity and resentment.

The basic tenets of good staff development programs were ignored: a needs assessment among local administrators was not conducted; attendance was mandated; agenda and curriculum were preplanned; standardization became the norm; decisions were dictated in contrast to participative planning; autonomy was prohibited and time was prescribed. As previous research identified those characteristics of effective professional development programs, this research underscored the negative feelings and perceptions of the principals as they described the level of effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators' Academy when such basic elements were missing.

The Academy was established as part of a legislated reform bill. The State, in essence, told the principals what they needed for professional development without soliciting their input. This implication belied trust and cooperative feelings and diminished the effectiveness of many desired outcomes. The state believed in providing professional development opportunities for administrators and the principals supported the concept that professional development activities were good and a necessary component
to being an effective administrator, but it was recommended that a stronger bridge be built between the intent and the resultant program.

The Illinois State Board of Education can assume a certain level of competency among and for all of the public school administrators, especially after all administrators have complied in meeting the initial demands of state certification. That level of competency should be of such a high level, that the need to keep administrators on the leading edge of current educational thought and research should become a priority. The State Board must convey a vision for the future with opportunities to learn more and to explore new findings as opposed to providing scenes from the past with redundant learning.

Presently, so many different programs of professional development exist. For the Academy to restrict one's administrative growth by narrowing it to the confinement of only those programs within the Academy was a concept that was received with repugnance. With a focus on the individual, Educational Service Centers could be instructed to help individuals develop personalized programs of professional development and could provide the needed assistance in monitoring such. A collegial, cooperative and supportive environment should be implied. Concern for the individual with varying needs would register as opposed to the
strict adherence to arbitrary programmatic bounds as set forth by a legislative mandate.

Legislators should now allow the affected professionals to take a more active role in developing the future of the Academy. Administrators should be allowed to take ownership of their own professional development and be allowed the flexibility to develop appropriate programs in order to meet one's own individual needs.

The State Board of Education could provide the flexibility for administrators to pursue different avenues of professional development. Principals come from different backgrounds with different experiences from different schools of thought, and thus, require different dispositions relating to professional development. The different programming possibilities could be further explored.

Several states have academies in place for their respective administrators. The concept of a national consortium of interstate academies is an area needing investigation and coordination. The need to benchmark one's programs against other programs could only enhance program offerings in Illinois.

Professional development was defined to be an individual's task, but the concept related to how such development affects the institution itself. Perhaps professional
development and goals ought to be tied to job performance evaluation. The goal to produce an effective educational program for the students cannot be lost. Professional development should be goal oriented and result accountable. In turn, there is a need for district personnel to support the activities required of effective professional development so as to bring about better student achievement.

Local boards of education could be made more aware of and become more cognizant of the demands of a schedule for professional development. Recognizing that the principal is the instructional leader of a school, the awareness of local school boards could be heightened so as to afford the principal appropriate time and space in order to maintain effective leadership with the educational trends. Inservice for school board members may be deemed appropriate in raising this level of awareness. Superintendents could only benefit from a willingness to provide the time necessary needed to accomplish the goals of principals' professional development which would affect the district's program in general.

More university resources could be investigated and be better utilized with a more advantageous relationship being established. Research emanates from the academic collegial environment and such research findings could be better linked to the school building itself.
Without immediate change, this study made clear that the Academy will continue to falter due to its own lack of functional purpose. This study did not align the Academy's present function with any one of the specifically identified three categories of purpose as delineated within the literature and previous research. The principals' perceptions recognized the organization to be ineffective as the needs of professional development were not presently being fulfilled.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Due to the perceived need for increased professional development of educational administrative personnel in the State of Illinois, a legislative mandate was passed in 1985 as part of an extensive school reform bill that established the Administrators' Academy. This mandate was founded on the belief that participation in Academy workshops would improve the professional skills, attitudes, and expertise of their participants and thus, would improve the administrators' performance within the school building itself.

The purpose of this study was to investigate what effect participation at the Illinois Administrators' Academy had on the professional development of secondary school principals. The effectiveness of the Academy offerings in regard to one's professional development was analyzed from the perspective of high school principals within the northern Educational Service Center regions of the state. Specific objectives of the study were:
1. to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy satisfied one's personal needs for professional development;

2. to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy increased one's level of competency as part of one's professional development; and

3. to determine if participation at the Administrators' Academy aided one's ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness as a goal of professional development.

To obtain the necessary data, a two-stage procedure was utilized. First, a thirty-item questionnaire was sent to one hundred one secondary school principals. Each survey item was related to one of the three identified purposes of professional development. Principals were asked to agree or disagree to the statement at hand following a Likert-scaled response format. Seventy-six of the returned surveys (75%) were used for the compilation of data.

Mean scores were calculated for each individual respondent and using the Spearman rank coefficient, the
scores were correlated with the demographic data provided. The categorical averages of all responses as they related to the purposes of professional development were computed and percentages of the total number of responses were identified.

In the second phase of investigation, those five principals having the highest mean score and those five principals having the lowest mean score were selected for interview purposes. A set of six specific questions guided each interview. The interviews were qualitatively analyzed.

The scores of the surveys were then compared and contrasted with the data from the interviews. Common findings were cited which led to overriding conclusions.

Conclusions

The findings of this study did not support the concept that participation at the Illinois Administrators' Academy benefited one's individual professional development. As perceived by the principals, the personal needs of professional development were not satisfactorily accommodated; the levels of one's competency were not increased; nor was the ability for one to improve the schools' organizational effectiveness enhanced. The principals registered
predominant disagreement to survey statements and interview questions regarding the effectiveness of inservice activities and/or programs for administrators as conducted at the Academy. Negative feelings categorically accounted for the high school principals' perceptions of their participation at the Administrators' Academy and it was summarily disclosed that the Academy was presently ineffective in meeting the professional development needs of secondary school principals in northern Illinois.

The investigation led to specific conclusions relating to the purposes of this study as outlined by the research questions which provided a focus for discussion. The following conclusions were based upon the survey questions and the data collected in the interviews.

1. The principals believed that the Illinois Administrators' Academy had not accommodated the administrators' individual professional development needs effectively. Sixty-five percent (64.5%) of the survey respondents indicated overall disagreement with scores ranging from 1.00 to 2.49 that the Administrators' Academy had benefited their professional development. Nine percent (9.2%) of those forty-nine principals registered strong disagreement with scores ranging from 1.00 to 1.49. Only thirty-six percent (35.5%), or twenty-seven of the principals, demonstrated overall agreement with the survey statements with
scores ranging from 2.50 to 4.00, of which, not one principal's score indicated strong agreement (3.50 to 4.00). The level of disagreement was much more strongly stated than the relative agreement.

The majority of the interviewed principals responded with strong negative comments as well. Even the principals who attempted to be positive only offered polite comments of agreement. Not one interviewee offered enthusiastic endorsement and support of the Academy programs. This perception corresponded to the survey results. The inservice workshops were not seen as expansive experiences nor did they generate the desired interest or intent on the part of the principals to return for more.

Negative feelings from the first required sessions carried over and caused resistance and skepticism regarding future inservice. Subsequent attendance did, in fact, substantiate initial doubts and underscored the perception that the Administrators' Academy had not effectively met the individual needs of administrative professional development.

2. Overall, the category of personal needs received more positive responses than either of the other categories, but only about half of the responses indicated agreement that personal needs had been met.
Forty-eight percent (48.4%) of the total number of responses indicated agreement that personal needs of professional development had been satisfactorily accommodated; whereas fifty-two percent (51.6%) disagreed with that perception. One of the purposes of professional development was to satisfy one's personal needs, which included topics regarding leadership, self-esteem, net-working, and confidence-building agendas, to name a few.

With ambivalent feelings toward the actual inservice, many of the positive residual aspects of bringing colleagues together were thwarted and often lost as noted by comments during the interviews. Required attendance, prescribed time commitments, and relegated curriculum topics all negatively impacted the fulfillment of a personalized professional development program. The personal need for control and ownership of choice in attending activities was diminished.

3. The principals expressed general disagreement that their level of competency was increased through participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy.

The responses to the competency statements in the survey showed forty percent (39.8%) in agreement and sixty percent (60.2%) expressing disagreement with the idea that inservice at the Academy had expanded one's professional competency level. As principals were interviewed, the majority of comments reflected that the Academy had indeed
provided inservice regarding the supervision of certified personnel, as indicated by the survey results but, comments also reflected a strong displeasure with the quality of the program. The interview responses helped to support and to qualify the survey responses.

The principals did not perceive the inservice activities as providing them with new material and new techniques and new skills with which to do a better job as the instructional leader of the school. The principals' prior knowledge and training were not taken into account as the programs were planned. Active learning was described to be frustrated in many instances.

4. The principals disagreed that the Academy training had aided their ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness.

The total responses showed thirty-six percent (35.5%) agreement with those survey statements that listed activities that aided one's ability to improve the school's organizational effectiveness. Sixty-five percent (64.5%) of the responses indicated disagreement with such statements. This, therefore, reflected the strongest disagreement with the statements.

The principals acknowledged that few workshops had been offered regarding school improvement and organization-
al effectiveness. In turn, that purpose of professional development had been largely ignored by the Administrators' Academy at the time of this study.

5. The principals believed that the Illinois Administrators' Academy in its present mode of existence needed immediate change and amelioration in order to effectively meet the needs of administrative professional development now and in the future.

Principals recognized the need for administrative professional development and supported collegial activities as being necessary. The principals believed that an Academy for school leaders was a viable concept but did not agree that the Illinois Administrators' Academy had effectively met the needs of administrators' professional development.

As a part of professional development activity, the principals valued the collegial interchange within a collaborative environment. It was deemed important to allow time for principals to reflect upon the job's daily activities and functions with colleagues. Presently, most interaction occurred informally as opposed to being part of a program's agenda. The need for a neutral setting, one that is non-threatening and non-evaluative was emphasized to increase the sharing opportunities.
Principals viewed professional development as a long-term process. Continuity among program offerings should be afforded. Programs from the Academy have moved from topic to topic with little connection being articulated.

Learning was viewed as a process and principals identified themselves as being active learners. The intellectual stimulation among colleagues was recognized as a valuable asset to professional development and it was necessary to have quality personnel facilitate that growth process. The Academy had predominantly drawn on peers to be presenters following only a three to five day training session at best. The colleagues offered global perspectives to the material as opposed to bringing recognized expertise. Challenging subject matter and forceful methods of instruction or delivery were identified as critical to an effective learning process.

The principals believed that professional development should be a personalized activity. Any needs assessment should be individualized which would give way to collaborative effort in planning inservice activities. Principals accented the need to provide programs as identified by the individual participants. It was suggested that Educational Service Centers should provide forums for
input. More time was needed to spend in cooperative planning with more participative decision-making with the hopes of the expected results of the workshops proving to be more effective.

Principals strongly believed that the Illinois Administrators' Academy was territorial in nature and that the powers of jurisdiction were restrictive. Every interviewed principal made comment regarding the Academy's restrictive confines. The principals advocated that other professional development activities outside of the Academy offerings be allowed to count toward the legislative mandate that required administrators to attend Academy offerings on a biannual cycle. Principals identified their own attendance at numerous meetings, conferences, conventions, workshops, and/or summer institutes on a routine basis. Concern was registered because only those activities conducted through and approved by the Academy would fulfill the legislative mandate. It was strongly recommended that an expanded approval process be reviewed in order to accommodate attendance and participation at other professional development activities outside the Illinois Administrators' Academy. State monitoring and/or state approval of various activities was supported.
Recommendations for Action

The following recommendations are offered as a result of the findings of the study and with the intent to provide suggestions for improvement of the present implementation of the Administrators' Academy concept within the State of Illinois:

1. Narrow the focus to address principals' needs specifically. Make provisions for a segment of the Academy to address the distinguishing needs of the principal as instructional leader.

2. Conduct an individualized and personalized needs assessment of administrators across the state.

3. Give maximum opportunity for participants to be actively involved in selecting, planning, implementing, and evaluating professional renewal activities.

4. Encourage principals to set goals for and to coordinate one's own professional development.

5. Allow for discriminating choice and varying time constraints by the participants in selecting those programs for attendance.

6. Provide for personal on-going evaluation to include a written log or journal of activities. Help to establish the structure or framework for such.
7. Provide continuity of programs to support the definition that professional development is a long-term process.

8. Tie professional development activities with performance evaluation. Identify learned skills.

9. Hire better presenters. Bring in renowned speakers, those individuals who are on the leading edge of educational practice. Seek the national experts to work with the administrators of Illinois.

10. Allow other professional development activities outside of the Academy to count toward the legislated mandate.

11. Affiliate with and utilize the resources of higher educational institutions.

12. Coordinate program planning with other disciplines such as business, psychology, social sciences, etc.

13. Seek federal grant monies to conduct more research and to support the programmatic needs for the professional development of school leaders.

Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are presented to researchers as implications for further study.
1. Replicate the study by gathering the perceptions of other administrators such as superintendents, elementary school principals, department supervisors and/or program coordinators in an effort to assess the benefits of participation at the Administrators' Academy programs in regard to professional development.

2. Replicate the study in different parts of the state so as to broaden the understanding of different regional programs and different administrative needs if it is determined that any exist.

3. Conduct a needs assessment of secondary school principals' professional development activities and correlate such with the Administrators' Academy offerings.

4. Replicate the study at a later date after the Academy has grown in tenured status. This study assessed perceptions of a relatively new concept in Illinois.

5. Do a comparative study of Administrators' Academy inservice benefits as related to other inservice activities and their respective benefits.

6. Examine the principals' involvement in inservice planning and decision-making regarding inservice activities.
7. Study professional development as it relates to job performance and thus, as it is reflected in administrative evaluation.

8. Compare and contrast other state academies or leadership institutes with the Illinois Administrators' Academy in relation to purpose, structure, implementation and evaluation of program.
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Panel of Experts

Superintendent
Dr. Robert Metcalf
Lake Forest High School
1285 North McKinley Road
Lake Forest, Illinois 60045
(312) 234-3600

Assistant Superintendent
Dr. Walt Celusta
Libertyville Community High School
708 West Park Avenue
Libertyville, Illinois 60048
(312) 367-3100

Principal
Dr. Ron O'Brien
Joliet West High School
401 North Larkin Avenue
Joliet, Illinois 60435
(815) 727-6940

Principal
Mr. Jerry Pius
Lincoln-Way High School
Route 30
New Lenox, Illinois 60451
(815) 485-7631

Assistant Principal
Ms. Sharon Laviolette
Round Lake High School
800 North High School Drive
Round Lake, Illinois 60073
(312) 546-2128
APPENDIX B

Educational Service Centers

Educational Service Center 2
19525 West Washington
Grayslake, Illinois 60030
(312) 223-3400
(Lake County - 17 High Schools)

Educational Service Center 3
2701 Central Road
Glenview, Illinois 60025
(312) 998-5065
(North Cook County - 20 High Schools)

Educational Service Center 4
421 North County Farm Road
Wheaton, Illinois 60187
(312) 682-6955
(DuPage and Kane County - 26 High Schools)

Educational Service Center 5
8201 West Fullerton Avenue
Elmwood Park, Illinois 60635
(312) 453-0856
(West Cook County - 12 High Schools)

Educational Service Center 7
800 Governors Highway, Box 69
Flossmoor, Illinois 60422,
(312) 798-660
(South Cook County - 26 High Schools)
COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 115
LAKE FOREST HIGH SCHOOL

December 6, 1988

Dear _______

I am conducting a research study for a doctoral dissertation on the topic of the professional development of secondary school principals. This study is under the chairmanship of Dr. Max Bailey, Associate Professor at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois.

The purpose of this study is to determine what effect participation at the Illinois Administrators' Academy has had on the professional development of secondary school principals. The impact of such will be explored through the gathering of the perceptions of the participants - the high school principals, thus, your input is urgently requested. The effectiveness of the Academy offerings in regard to one's professional development will be analyzed from the participant's point of view.

All information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for academic purposes only.

I have provided a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. Please return this completed questionnaire on or before Friday, December 16, 1988.

Your assistance is appreciated and I thank-you in advance.

Respectfully,

Marilyn A. Howell
Principal

MAH/ks
encl.
APPENDIX D

Questionnaire

School: ___________________________ Enrollment: _______________

Principal's Name: ____________________________________________

Number of years of Experience as a High School Principal: ________

Years in Present Position:_____

Years in Other High School Principalships:_____

Highest Degree in Higher Education: ____________________________

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

PLEASE CIRCLE THE RESPONSE THAT MOST CLOSELY REFLECTS YOUR THINKING REGARDING EACH ITEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Academy provides the support I need to be effective.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Academy asks me to fill out a professional needs assessment survey on a regular basis.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Academy helps me to establish clear guidelines for policy and procedure within the school building.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Academy provides professional recognition of my efforts as a principal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Academy provides me with adequate inservice regarding the development and assessment of school climate.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication from the Academies is frequent and informal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The Academy helps me learn how to model creative thinking for staff and students.

9. The Academy provides me with new ideas, procedures, and strategies for student behavior management.

10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.

11. The Academy workshops focus on my techniques and my needs for improvement in the supervision of certified personnel.

12. The Academy provides me with help in the design and implementation of school improvement plans.

13. The Academy provides adequate time to meet with colleagues and reflect upon the job itself.

14. The Academy makes available to me current research findings regarding the learning process.

15. The Academy meets my need to provide inservice on measurement and evaluation to include test construction, integration or selection.

16. The Academy maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with principals.

17. The Academy provides me with inservice on varied instructional methods.

18. The Academy workshops help me to focus on school goals in curriculum development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. The Academy is receptive to my suggestions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The Academy provides me with workshops on the legislation regarding student rights and responsibilities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The Academy provides me with the opportunity to review methods for appropriate budget development and evaluation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The Academy helps me to review fit between curriculum objectives and achievement testing.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The Academy cares about me as a person as well as my professional needs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Academy helps me to identify major functions and characteristics of school public relations programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The Academy trains me in staff development activities such as needs assessment, formulation and evaluation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The Academy provides opportunities to work on challenging tasks.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. The Academy helps me in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. The Academy models group facilitation skills and processes in the team management process.
APPENDIX E

Principals Interviewed

Dr. Timothy Brown
Principal
Andrew High School
171st & 90th Avenue
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477
(312) 532-7300
(ESC #7)

Dr. Marvin Christensen
Principal
Buffalo Grove High School
1100 West Dundee Road
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60090
(312) 541-5400
(ESC #3)

Mr. Donald F. Ciner
Principal
J.S. Morton High School West
2400 Home Avenue
Berwyn, Illinois 60402
(312) 656-2300
(ESC #5)

Mr. Walter C. Hornberger
Principal
Libertyville Community High School
708 West Park Avenue
Libertyville, Illinois 60048
(312) 367-3112
(ESC #2)

Dr. Alan C. Jones
Principal
Community High School
326 Joliet Street
West Chicago, Illinois 60185
(312) 231-0880
(ESC #4)
Mr. Douglas F. McKenzie  
Principal  
Zion-Benton High School  
3901 21st Street  
Zion, Illinois 60099-2387  
(312) 746-1202  
(ESC #2)

Dr. Roger K. Miller  
Principal  
Hinsdale Central High School  
55th & Grant Streets  
Hinsdale, Illinois 60521  
(312) 887-1340  
(ESC #4)

Mr. R. Bruce Morrow  
Principal  
Jacobs High School  
11111 Randall Road  
Algonquin, Illinois 60102  
(312) 658-2501  
(ESC #4)

Dr. William Schreiner  
Principal  
Glenbrook South High School  
4000 West Lake Avenue  
Glenview, Illinois 60025  
(312) 729-2000  
(ESC #3)

Mr. Donald H. Trimble  
Principal  
Rich South High School  
5000 Sauk Trail  
Richton Park, Illinois 60471  
(312) 747-5500  
(ESC #7)
Interview Guide

1. What activities or workshops did you engage in and/or attend for professional development within the last three years at the Academy?

2. How did participation at the Administrators' Academy Workshops meet your personal needs for professional development?

3. How did participation at the Administrators' Academy Workshops enhance your professional competency as part of your professional development?

4. How did participation at the Administrators' Academy Workshops meet your needs for implementing new and/or different strategies and techniques in the improvement of the effectiveness of your school?

5. What do you feel is the purpose of the Administrators' Academy?

6. If you could make one recommendation to improve what the Administrators' Academy offers or how it meets your needs in respect to your professional development, what would that recommendation be?
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