



1990

An Analysis of Current Practices in Staff Development in Selected County School Districts in Florida with and Emphasis upon School-Based Inservice

Bonnie Burns
Loyola University Chicago

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burns, Bonnie, "An Analysis of Current Practices in Staff Development in Selected County School Districts in Florida with and Emphasis upon School-Based Inservice" (1990). *Dissertations*. 3147.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3147

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1990 Bonnie Burns

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN
SELECTED COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN FLORIDA WITH AN
EMPHASIS UPON SCHOOL-BASED INSERVICE

by

Bonnie Burns

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the School of
Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Education

January

1990

Bonnie L. Burns

Loyola University of Chicago

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN
SELECTED COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN FLORIDA WITH AN
EMPHASIS UPON SCHOOL-BASED INSERVICE

This study examined current teacher staff development practices in Florida's Teacher Education Centers, legislated structures with mandated collaboration among teachers, administrators and university personnel. Information was gathered through state-wide questionnaires and nine in-depth interviews.

Mandated multiple responsibilities of the TEC's diffused their focuses. Only a minority of TEC's who coordinated individual, school, district and State goals were able to achieve a proactive program with activities which supported each other.

Inservice program design was generally weak, relying mostly on presentation and demonstration within a relatively short time frame. Activities cited as being most successful were enhancement programs for the fine tuning of skills which required few changes in attitudes or district norms. A strong program of varying incentives encouraged voluntary inservice participation, but inclusion in decision making was the strongest incentive. Mandated collaboration promoted greater contact between districts and university faculty but not necessarily collaboration. Mobile student and teacher populations further complicated

the difficulties of evaluation.

School-based staff development was a model powerful enough to produce long term change in behaviors and attitudes and improve school climate, but was seldom successfully implemented due to organizational norms and constraints. TEC's who successfully implemented the model exhibited a majority of the following components: dedication to the model by the director, coordinated goals, adequate funding for released time or supervisory personnel for follow-up, shared decision making, a research base, sufficient time, collaborative planning, trained in-district personnel as presenters who were available for follow-up, complex program design including practice, feedback and coaching, opportunity for peer support, and support by upper administration. There was little reliance on principals for follow-up as they had neither time nor expertise, however their support was necessary to start change and institutionalize the innovation.

District size most influenced practices. Larger districts had weaker program design, less released time, reliance on outside presenters, a shorter time frame, and a district-wide focus, yet aimed for establishment programs.

While TEC's experienced many problems, State mandates forced districts to plan and accomplish inservice goals which they would not have accomplished on their own initiatives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation and deep thanks to Dr. Mel Heller for his steady encouragement and positive attitude during all phases of the study, and to Dr. Max Bailey and Dr. Phillip Carlin for useful criticism and advice.

Gratitude is extended to those directors of the Florida Teacher Education Centers for their willingness to be interviewed and their help with out-of-state travel arrangements. Without their cooperation, this study would not have been possible.

Deep gratitude is given to my family for their steadfast encouragement and patience.

UITA

Bonnie Burns was born in Oak Park, Illinois, in 1946, the daughter of Irene and Albert Zanzi. She was married to Thomas Burns in 1964 and is the mother of Julia.

The author graduated from Ridgewood High School in Norridge, Illinois, then earned a B.A. in 1967 from Northeastern Illinois University in elementary education and Spanish. A Master's degree was awarded in 1976 from Northeastern Illinois in the teaching of reading, and an administrative certificate was earned at Roosevelt University in Chicago in 1981. The Ed.D. degree in educational administration and supervision was awarded from Loyola University in 1990.

Bonnie has taught fourth to eighth grade, remedial and developmental reading in the Chicago metropolitan area. She served as Principal of Waggoner Elementary School in Sauk Village, Illinois, and also spent three years out of state which included teaching in Florida.

Mrs. Burns has participated in planning and presenting staff development programs in reading in the content areas, inservice for administrators, a mentor-protege program, and in writing in response to reading. She is a member of Illinois Women Administrators.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
VITA.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES.....	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose, Scope and Procedure of the Study.....	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	13
Staff Development in Florida.....	15
The Purposes of Staff Development.....	29
The Focus of Staff Development.....	40
Needs Assessment.....	55
Adult Learners in the Workplace.....	62
Program Design.....	81
Personnel Responsible for Staff Development.....	101
Cost and Time.....	111
Evaluation of Staff Development.....	119
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	132
Purpose of Staff Development Activities.....	133
Needs Assessment.....	151
Focus of Staff Development Programs.....	160
Program Design.....	195
Incentives.....	219
Time.....	233
Program Content.....	249
Mandated Collaboration with the Universities.....	265
Evaluation of Staff Development.....	277
Financing Staff Development.....	291
Adapting to State Mandates and Impediments to Staff Development.....	300

TABLE OF CONTENTS -- CONTINUED

IV. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES.....	314
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	326
APPENDIX A.....	334
APPENDIX B.....	341
APPENDIX C.....	344
APPENDIX D.....	347
APPENDIX F.....	349

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I-1	Distribution of All Districts..... 8
I-2	Distribution of Representative Sample for Interviews.....8
II-1	Level of Impact from Training.....83
II-2	Evaluation Instruments.....129
III-1	Purposes of Staff Development.....135
III-2	Needs Assessment Developers.....153
III-3	Sources of Data for Needs Assessment.....154
III-4	Triggers for Awareness of Staff Development Needs.....156
III-5	Focus of Staff Development Activities.....163
III-6	School-Based Inservice.....165
III-7	Elements of Program Design.....196
III-8	Frequency of Follow-up to Inservice.....203
III-9	Types of Follow-up to Inservice.....204
III-10	Personnel Responsible for Follow-up Activities.....207
III-11	Presenters of Staff Development.....211
III-12	Ranking of Presenters by District Size.....214
III-13	Availability of Presenters for Follow-up.....215
III-14	Incentives to Attend Inservice.....220
III-15	Incentives for Staff Development.....222
III-16	Inservice Time Logistics.....234
III-17	Length of Staff Development Activities.....237

LIST OF TABLES -- CONTINUED

III-18	Staff Development Programs Directed Toward Maintenance.....	250
III-19	Staff Development Programs Directed Toward Enhancement.....	253
III-20	Staff Development Programs Directed Toward Establishment.....	254
III-21	Are University Presenters Perceived as Practical?.....	266
III-22	Effect on Student Achievement.....	279
III-23	Effect on Teacher Behaviors.....	282
III-24	Effect on Student Attitudes	284
III-25	Effect on Teacher Attitudes.....	285
III-26	Informal Evaluation of Staff Development Programs.....	286

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A Questionnaire Sent to TEC Directors.....	334
APPENDIX B Listing of All Florida Teacher Education Centers.....	341
APPENDIX C TEC's Returning Surveys.....	344
APPENDIX D TEC's Not Returning Surveys.....	347
APPENDIX E Structured Interview Questions.....	349
APPENDIX F Breakdown of Questionnaire Items by District Characteristics.....	357

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The words "Friday is an inservice day" are apt to be met by teachers with groans and negative comments. They often say, "I'd rather spend the day in the classroom than sitting through that!" Staff development has a bad reputation among many teachers, and as it is often practiced, it has well earned its poor reputation.

McLaughlin and Berman comment on the status of staff development:

Teachers, administrators, researchers, and bureaucrats all agree that current staff development or inservice programs are irrelevant, ineffective, and generally a waste of time and money. To make matters worse, most staff development programs lack any solid conceptual model. Instead, "staff development" within school districts typically appears to be a hodgepodge of incompatible workshops and courses. (1)

Howey and Vaughan echo the opinion of McLaughlin and Berman. (2) Inservice activities appear to be irrelevant and an incompatible hodgepodge. They say the

(1) Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and Paul Berman, "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment." Journal of Teacher Education 34 (December 1977) : 191.

(2) Kenneth R. Howey and Joseph C. Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press, 1983) p.97.

content of staff development activities is often impractical or not suitable for the specific students, schools, or classrooms. There is little continuity in the offerings, and "participants [are unable] to see how apparently unrelated inservice activities will in any basic way allow them do do a more effective job of helping their students learn." (3)

Howey and Vaughan state that most current staff development is not well-supported financially, not frequently engaged in on a continuing basis, poorly regarded by those in the profession, and rarely assessed in terms of teacher behavior and student learning outcomes. Teachers seldom receive feedback when they try to make use of inservice ideas because there is little or no evaluation in terms of changed student or teacher behaviors. "In most cases, classroom follow-up is nonexistent in staff development activities." (4)

Howey and Vaughan continue. Little or no differentiation is made for the learning style or stage of development of the teacher. Inservice activities are often presented as a remedy for teacher deficiencies in an undifferentiated group approach. These activities focus solely on the teacher as the responsible party, with

(3) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns", p. 98.

(4) Ibid., p. 98.

insufficient attention to other organizational, social, or political factors or to interaction with other teachers, principals, aides, or parents.

Thus, participants frequently leave staff development activities with a false impression of their own independent importance in determining instructional practices and become increasingly frustrated and disillusioned when that independent action is insufficient to accomplish the intended outcome. (5)

Howey and Vaughan conclude that perhaps the most serious criticism that could be leveled at staff development today is that it generally fails to consider much of what has been learned about effective teaching and the content and processes of effective staff development.

If staff development as currently practiced is a hodgepodge, what should it be if done correctly? The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development defines it as follows:

It is a learning 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." (6)

Griffin states more simply, "Staff development efforts involve efforts in people in interaction with one

(5) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Practices", p. 99.

(6) Angela Carrasquillo and Frances Segan, Staff Development : From the Bilingual Schoolroom to Beyond the Walls of the University (Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 265 736, 1986) , p.4.

another in particular contexts to accomplish professional growth and school improvement goals." (7)

Staff development as it is actually practiced must fall somewhere between the two extremes of a fragmented and unevaluated hodgepodge and a supportive positive process that fosters personal and professional growth. The purpose of this paper is to investigate current practices in staff development programs in Florida, a state that has made a considerable effort to make its inservice activities meaningful and effective.

(7) Gary A. Griffin, ed., "Toward a Conceptual Framework for Staff Development," in Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press, 1983), p.229.

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze current staff development practices with an emphasis on school-based inservice in Florida's Teacher Education Centers in relation to frequently reported components of staff development as defined from the literature.

The questions that guided the study were

1. What do authorities say are appropriate means for planning, executing, and evaluating staff development programs?
2. What do authorities say are appropriate procedures for school-based inservice and when is this procedure appropriate to use?
3. What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for planning, executing, and evaluating staff development programs?
4. What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for conducting school-based inservice?
5. Are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers consistent with the components frequently reported by the authorities?

The Procedure and Scope of the Study

The procedure was to define frequently reported components of staff development from a review of the literature with an emphasis on school-based inservice. A questionnaire was constructed, using the frequently reported components as a format, with an emphasis on school-based inservice and sent to all Florida Teacher Education Center Directors. Descriptive criteria for each component were defined so that the survey could be used to classify practices currently implemented by the TEC's in their teacher staff development programs.

The questionnaire was four pages long and asked for identification data and for information about current practices in teacher staff development. The areas included purpose, focus, logistical information, program content and needs assessment. It also included questions on presenters, follow-up to inservice, incentives and evaluation. A sample of the questionnaire is located in Appendix A.

The questionnaire was mailed in November of 1988 to all forty-eight Teacher Education Centers. A second request was mailed three weeks later and follow-up phone calls were made in December to request surveys still not

returned.

Thirty-eight of forty-eight were finally sent to the researcher. Of those not returned, most were small districts in the Northwest. The complete listing of districts and of those districts which returned the survey may be found in the appendices B, C, and D.

A representative sample of approximately 20%, or 9 of 48 districts was chosen for follow-up interviews. Teacher Education Center Directors who were responsible for the teacher staff development programs in their jurisdictions were interviewed. Questions that guided the interview sessions may be found in Appendix E. The cross sample was determined by the following factors.

1. Does the TEC serve a single district or multiple districts?
2. Does the Director serve on a full or part-time basis?
3. Does the TEC serve teachers only or administrative and noncertified staff as well?
4. Is the district size small, medium or large?

Small districts had 150-1200 teachers and 2,700-20,000 students.

Medium districts had 1201-3300 teachers and 20,001-51,000 students.

Large districts had 4000-14,200 teachers and 64,000-262,000 students.

5. Where is the district located within the state?

Geographical divisions were defined as northeast, northwest, central, and south.

6. Has the TEC Director served three or more years in

his position?

Table I-1

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL DISTRICTS

SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DISTRICTS	FULL OR PART TIME	TCHRS ONLY OR OTHERS	SM MED LG	LOC
S=44 M= 4	F=16 P=32	TO=20 O= 28	S=26 M=14 L= 8	NE=10 NW=14 C =19 S = 5

Table I-2

DISTRIBUTION OF REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE FOR INTERVIEWS

S=8 M=1	F=3 P=6	TO=4 O =5	S=5 M=3 L=1	NE=2 NW=2 C =4 S =1
------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	------------------------------

Although some Florida Teacher Education Centers also provided programs for the inservice needs of administrators and support school staff such as lunchroom workers and custodians, and involvement in pre-service training, the scope of this study was limited to analysis of current practices of staff development programs for teachers.

Data from the questionnaires and interviews were presented following the frequently reported components format with emphasis on school-based inservice. The current practices were compared and contrasted with each other and with the frequently reported practices and an analysis made

concerning their consistency or lack of consistency. This study concluded with conclusions drawn from the data, recommendations for Florida TEC's, and suggestions for further study.

Descriptions of the Districts Which were Interviewed

Nine TEC directors were interviewed. The nine districts were representative of Florida TEC's as judged by size, full or part time directors, TEC's which served teachers only or also served administrators and noncertified personnel, whether they were single or multiple district TEC's and by location within the state.

TEC 1 is a single district TEC with a part-time director who serves teachers only. It is located in the southern part of the state and has 700 teachers and 10,000 students. The director has served in his position for three years.

TEC 2 is a single district TEC with a part-time director who serves teachers only. It is located in the central part of the state and has 2,100 teachers and 27,000 students. The director has served in his position for three years.

TEC 3 is a single district TEC with a full-time director who serves all personnel. It is located in the

central part of the state and has 5,200 teachers and 90,000+ students. The director has served in his position for six years. This TEC was the second district to voluntarily pilot the TEC program prior to 1973.

TEC 4 is a single district TEC with a part-time director who serves all personnel. It is located in a high growth area in the central part of the state and has 1900 teachers and 31,000 students in 39 schools. The director has served in her position for three years. There is a wide range of socio-economic status within the district.

TEC 5 is a single district TEC with a part-time director who serves all personnel. It is located in a high growth area near Disney World in the central part of the state and has 920 teachers and 16,000 students. The director has served in his position for four years.

TEC 6 is a single district TEC with a full-time director who serves all personnel. It is located in the northeast part of the state and has 2300 teachers and 42,500 students in 53 schools. The director has served in her position for eight years. The district has a wide variety in socio-economic status including quaint beach towns, a college town, and a highly transient population of produce and fern pickers.

TEC 7 is a multiple district TEC with a full-time director who serves teachers only. It is located in the northeast part of the state and serves nine mostly rural,

relatively poor and understaffed counties. Although there are 2,500 teachers and 50,000 students, this is classified as a small TEC because each of the districts served is small, with the smallest only having two schools. The director has served in his position for ten years.

TEC 8 is a single district TEC with a part-time director who serves all personnel. It is located in a rural area in the northwest part of the state and has 250 teachers and 5000 students. The director has served in his position for four years.

TEC 9 is a single district TEC with a part-time director. It is located in a rural area in the northwest part of the state with a relatively stable population and has 152 teachers and 2300 students. The director has served in his position for eleven years.

The classification of part-time directors was misleading. Most often, part-time directors who served teachers only in the TEC, spent the other portion of their day as staff development directors for administrative and non-instructional staff for the district. The director might also be involved in the direct training of teachers, or in the training of trainers, or in two cases was in charge of community and adult education as Florida school districts were charged with those responsibilities. In all but one follow-up case, the director dealt with staff development on a full time basis. The one who did not was

from TEC 9, the smallest district in the state. The part-time standing was generally only for charging a percentage of the director's salary in state bookkeeping.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The shelves of libraries and the pages of journals swell with staff development articles but much of the literature tends to be subjective. This subjectiveness is supported by both James Lytle and an ERIC Research Action Brief. Lytle says:

There is a dearth of comprehensive research on inservice; most studies take the form of program evaluations. The literature on inservice training and staff development tends to reflect the 'accumulated wisdom' of leading pedagogues rather than empirical findings from controlled studies. (1)

Lytle's opinion is echoed in an ERIC Research Action Brief:

A majority of publications are evaluation reports rather than real research. In these reports, usually administrators or teachers write up a program used in their school... Measurement techniques are often subjective opinions or tests made up by the participants. Results sections report fuzzy findings like teachers felt the program helped them improve their classroom questioning techniques. (2)

(1) James H. Lytle, "Investment Options for Inservice Teacher Training," Journal of Teacher Education 34 (January-February 1982) : p.28.

Nevertheless, there are recurrent themes reported both subjectively and empirically that point toward more effective inservice training. These frequently reported components focus on those "hints of predictability" about effective inservice training and on the "growing body of evidence to suggest that certain approaches to professional development are...more potentially powerful than others" that were cited in Chapter I by Griffin. (3) These components are: purposes of staff development, focus of staff development, needs assessment procedures, "adult learners in the workplace, program design, personnel, evaluation in terms of teacher behaviors and student achievement, and evaluation in terms of perceptions of effectiveness and satisfaction. The related research also includes a background of Teacher Education Centers in Florida.

(2) ERIC Research Action Brief: Staff Development (Arlington, VA : Eric Document Reproduction Service, ED 189 679, 1980), p. 2.

(3) Gary A. Griffin, "Toward a Conceptual Framework for Staff Development," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 234.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN FLORIDA

Teacher Education Centers are the vehicles which govern and are responsible for providing inservice activities throughout Florida. Teacher Education Centers, or TEC's, were established by the Legislature in 1973 and were subject to a ten year review for refunding under Florida Sunset Laws. That review was conducted by the Education Standards Commission in 1982, and the following information was taken from the report. (4)

Establishment of TEC's by Statute

The legislation that established the Teacher Education Centers was considered innovative in 1973 because it mandated a collaborative inservice procedure. Responsibility for operating both preservice and inservice programs was given jointly to the colleges and universities, to the district school boards, and to the teaching profession.

The mechanism that was to handle the coordination of these three groups was the TEC, headed by a TEC

(4) Constance C. Bergquist, Mary Ellzey and Deborah S. King, An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers (Tallahassee, FL : Evaluation Systems Designs, Inc. [1983]). p. 57.

Director and guided in policy by a collaborative TEC Council in much the same way that a school board guides the administrator of a district.

Colleges and universities were assigned primary responsibility for operating preservice programs. The school districts were assigned primary responsibility for operating inservice programs, and the teaching profession was assigned the responsibility of making each institution's program meaningful and relevant. Teachers were recognized as the focus of the legislation although they were not given primary responsibilities.

Teachers can best assist with improving education when they participate in identifying needed changes and in designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating solutions to meet the identified needs. (5)

Specific purposes of the TECs were to include:

- augmenting existing college and university teacher education programs,
- augmenting existing school district inservice teacher education programs, and
- providing time and opportunity for preservice and inservice teachers to interact with faculty and staff of the colleges and universities and school districts in their search for the most beneficial educational experiences for students.

To accomplish these purposes, each TEC program

(5) Arthur J. Collier. Florida's Teacher Education Centers: Determining If They Make a Difference, cited from the 1973 Teacher Education Center Act. (Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 230530, 1983) p. 7.

was to include at least:

1. assessment of inservice training needs as perceived by classroom teachers, school district personnel, university personnel, and other concerned agencies;
2. development of programs based on identified inservice needs;
3. provision of human and material resources for inservice training by agents best prepared to deliver the training;
4. assessment of needs and provision of resources and experiences for clinical preservice teacher training;
5. facilitation of the entry or reentry of educational personnel into the teaching profession;
6. facilitation of the use of training processes which are based on assessment of needs, the development of experiences to meet those needs, and evaluation of the extent to which the needs were met; and
7. facilitation of internal and external evaluation which would include at least data gathering, process evaluation, product evaluation and validation of teaching competency.

Between 1973 and 1977, forty-six TEC's were voluntarily established in Florida but in 1977 an Attorney General's opinion made the TEC's mandatory. Due to cooperatives reforming, forty-eight TEC's were in operation in 1989. Five of these centers were multi-district centers providing services to as many as ten districts. The other 43 TEC's were single district centers. Appendix B provides further information concerning types of directors employed, the service population for the TEC, and the geographical distribution.

Dual Legislation Concerning Inservice

The population served by the TEC's differs, with some serving only teachers and others serving teachers, administrators, counselors, and all noncertified staff. When the Teacher Education Center Act of 1973 was enacted, there was already legislation in existence ammended in 1968 that mandated a properly funded "comprehensive program of staff development." That previous legislation was not stricken, for TECs were still voluntary in 1973. The 1968 regulations required a needs assessment, a master plan for inservice based on a needs assessment, and an operational plan that was based on developing an inservice program for all employees. Divisions of opinion in comprehensive inservice districts forced some districts to choose separate funding and administration for teacher inservice and administrator - noncertified inservice.

Currently, these two systems operate within overlapping jurisdictions. In some districts, the TEC serves as the governing body for all inservice education. In other districts, the TEC directs training only for teachers, with administrative and support staff inservice administered by a district staff development director.

The TEC Council

The governing structure of each TEC is the TEC Council. By statute, it consists of at least nine members

with classroom teachers constituting the majority. In 1983, administrators represented 23% of Council memberships; university faculty members less than 10 %; parents, collective bargaining agents, community members, and community college members were also represented in some Councils. The number of Council members ranged from 11 to 45 with a median of 20. In multi-district TEC's, members were appointed proportionately according to the number of teachers in each district.

The school board appoints the teacher members. Some districts make appointments according to recommendations from the superintendent or the bargaining agent, and in other districts the teachers are elected.

The duties of the governing council are to:

1. recommend policy and procedure for the TEC;
2. develop goals and objectives for the center within the policies as determined by the local school board;
3. recommend employment of appropriate TEC staff members; and
4. recommend an appropriate budget.

The duties and responsibilities of school districts are to act upon the TEC Council recommendations and to provide appropriate and adequate facilities for the operation of the center. Staff development activities may take place anywhere, and the majority are not in the building called the Teacher Education Center. Florida TECs are a concept rather than a specific location.

Collaboration between Universities and Districts

The 1973 statute stated that TECs be jointly planned, financed, and staffed by one or more school districts and by one or more colleges or universities. The TEC Council was considered the main collaborative body which represented the school board, the superintendent, classroom teachers, universities, community agencies and other interested groups.

Wu explains how universities participate in the TEC system. The university appoints a TEC contact person who is a faculty member directly responsible to the Dean of the College of Education. This one person with sole responsibility for communications avoids conflicts among the academic departments and funnels information directly to the Dean's office. Wu recommends a regular employee with a terminal degree be appointed to this position to insure continuity and a respected standing among university members and that he also be someone with prior public school teaching experience to insure a respected standing among the teachers. Wu recommends that this person have exceptional communication and human relations skills. (6)

This contact person receives requests from the

(6) P.C. Wu. Facilitating University-School District Inservice Collaboration: Principles of Communication (Arlington, VA : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 212 594, 1982), p. 4.

districts and matches them to qualified faculty consultants who eventually provide the services. Selection of the faculty member is based upon expertise, prior experience, interest of the faculty member, approval of his chairman, and past performance of TEC service. It is the duty of the contact person to insure that there is a clear understanding between the faculty consultant and the school district's desires for a specific workshop and that the workshop be keyed to the district's master plan.

All communications regarding TEC workshops go through the TEC Director and the university contact person. The TEC Council representative is the university faculty member appointed to the TEC Council, who may or may not also be the university contact person.

In the 1983 evaluation report, TEC directors indicated that public universities were involved in all major aspects of TECs, including needs assessment, program planning, program development, program delivery, and evaluation, although when faculty members were surveyed, they reported that of the total time spent on TEC activities in the past two years, the most time had been spent in program delivery. The least amount of time had been spent in needs assessment and evaluation, with one-half of the faculty reporting that they had spent no

time in these areas. (7)

In the 1983 report, each public university reported that it had a faculty representative on two or more TEC Councils. Matches between TEC's and universities were made primarily by request, but physical distances between the university and workshop locations were troublesome in some areas of the state. It was noted that university faculty members were the group most often absent from the TEC Council meetings, but the majority of TEC directors indicated that when the university faculty members did participate, they were considered valuable contributors to TEC council governance. (8)

Private colleges and universities, community colleges, community agencies, private consultants, educational consortium staff, Department of Education consultants, union leaders, and publishing company representatives were also involved with TEC collaboration, but on a smaller scale than the public universities. Community colleges appeared to be more involved in the needs assessment process than private consultants, and private consultants appeared to be slightly more involved in program delivery. (9)

(7) Bergquist, An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers, pp. 21-22.

(8) Ibid., p. 21.

(9) Ibid., p. 23.

The participating university must allocate faculty hours and support services to the contracted TEC in the same proportion as they would to on-campus students. This allotment is based on the total number of student credit hours earned by individuals participating in TEC programs. Participation in TEC activities by faculty is to be considered the equivalent of participation in on-campus activities for faculty rewards, including salary and promotion.

Although the 1973 statute planned for preservice collaboration between universities and TEC's, it has been varied, loosely structured, and of low intensity. It consists mainly of placements for student teachers.

Certification and Recertification

Florida's Teacher Education Centers were closely tied to the recertification program. State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.71 made provision for each school district to establish an inservice program by which teachers may extend their certification. The program must be described in a Master Inservice Plan for approval by the district school board and by the Commissioner of Education and must include the specifics of a point system.

In order to extend a certificate through inservice participation, a teacher must earn 120 inservice points

during the last validity period of the certificate. Half of the points must be earned in the area in which the teacher is assigned or certified or is seeking assignment or certification. One inservice point equals one clock hour of TEC activities. Recertification points may also be earned through completion of university courses. Twenty inservice points are earned through completion of one semester hour credit. Thirteen and one-half inservice points are equivalent to one quarter hour credit.

Teacher Education Centers were not legislated responsibility for developing the Master Inservice Plans through which recertification is possible. The responsibility remains with the district. However, TEC's were provided authority for participation in facilitating the entry or reentry of educational personnel into the teaching profession. Thus, they have indirect rather than direct authority for recertification through inservice. No State Board of Education Rules are identified which directly address TEC involvement in the certification/recertification process. (10)

Many Florida teachers take advantage of inservice activities offered through the TEC's toward certificate renewal because of their low cost, convenience of time and place, the variety of courses offered, and the relevance of

(10) Bergquist, An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers, p. 45.

course offerings. The major disadvantages are the length of time required to earn the necessary points and the unavailability of specific desired courses. The system is currently experiencing some difficulties in record keeping and in assigning points inside or outside the certification- assignment areas.

A Beginning Teacher Program is also handled through the TEC's. Teachers who are new to the state or teachers in their first year of teaching must meet the requirements of the Beginning Teacher Program. It mainly consists of principal or supervisor evaluation and counseling to ensure the teacher meets the minimal competencies required by the state. All beginning teachers are issued temporary certificates until they pass the Beginning Teacher Program. The TEC acts as advisor and record keeper in the Beginning Teacher Program, and funds for this program are taken from general inservice funds.

Funding Inservice

To encourage collaboration, staff development funding has been split between the universities and the schools districts. The funds held by the universities may not be spent without a service agreement. The 1973 statute stipulated that the TEC program:

...shall be jointly funded by participating school districts and colleges, and universities, the Department of Education, federal or private grants and

donations, fees, and funds from any other appropriate source. (11)

The Florida Statutes state that \$4.30 per fulltime equivalent student shall be expended for educational training programs. At least \$3 of the \$4.30 shall be expended on the TEC. Under the dual legislation, districts in which the TEC provides inservice activities for all personnel allocate the full \$4.30 to the TEC. Districts where the TEC provides only inservice activities for teachers allocate \$3.00 to the TEC. A budget which is equivalent to at least \$3.00 or \$4.30 multiplied by the district's unweighted full time equivalency student count is then developed by the TEC Council for the year's activities. Despite rising costs, this minimum fixed dollar amount has remained constant since the program became mandatory in 1977.

Prior to 1982, \$5.00 had been allocated, but the 1982 Appropriations Act stipulated that \$1.70 be allocated to the Beginning Teacher Act, and that a minimum of \$4.30 be allocated for all other district inservice activities. In addition to inflation, this further reduced the total funds available for staff development activities.

The Bergquist evaluation report used 1981-82 figures and found the average expenditure for TEC

(11) Bergquist, An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers, p.52.

activities to be \$163,272 with a range of \$5,383 to \$1,040,255. The TEC may use these funds for salaries and benefits of personnel administering the TEC and school board employees conducting approved inservice; substitutes for personnel released to participate in the programs; fees, travel, and per diem expenses for consultants; travel and per diem expenses for district employees to attend approved conferences; and for general operating expenses such as supplies and the rental of facilities if they are not owned by the school board. There was also stipulated in the funding section of the law that funds could be spent to pay tuition or registration fees for college courses if the course was identified in the district's master inservice plan and the employee did not receive college credit.

Under a separate accounting system are the State University System funds that are allocated to provide services from the universities to the TEC's. Total SUS funds projected for 1981-82 were \$2,512,159. The total fund is prorated to TEC's based upon the number of full-time equivalency students serviced by the TEC. The TEC director is notified of the dollar amount allocated and is asked to draw up service agreements with the chosen colleges or universities. These amounts then are totaled for each university and released following receipt of signed service agreements.

The 1982 projected funds from the districts for TEC allocations were \$8,706,086. The State University System funds were \$2,512,159 for a combined total of \$11,218,245 available for staff development in the State of Florida.

There were no exact figures of training hours provided for these funds. Using an estimate of a total teacher population of 80,000, these funds resulted in approximately \$31 per teacher spent on TEC activities from SUS funds, \$109 per teacher from district funds, and a total of \$140 from both sources. All figures came from the Bergquist report. (12)

Florida's Teacher Education Centers and collaborative TEC Councils are a unique statewide structure for inservice training with mandatory collaboration between universities, school districts and teachers in the planning, executing, evaluating, and funding of staff development programs. Florida has legislated some of the "best practices" in staff development into statewide practice such as a required needs assessment, a master inservice plan based on identified needs, and evaluation of the programs. The close ties to teacher recertification and considerable funding from the State combined with the TEC structure give to Florida the promise of more effective staff development programs.

(12) Bergquist, An Evaluation of Teacher Centers, pp. 54-57.

THE PURPOSES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The clamor for change and radical innovation in education is thundering through society and galloping across the headlines of newspapers, but schools are pictured as stodgy and inflexible by both those within the profession and without. In reviewing major educational reform efforts, Goodlad maintains that the work of teachers and students has hardly changed since the turn of the century and Bellack argues convincingly that the most interesting phenomenon of reform is the school's remarkable resistance to change. (13) Schlechty discusses staff development in the same morose vein:

...Yet one can not read that literature without gaining the impression that for the most part, efforts to change schools have been relatively ineffective and job-oriented continuing education has not been proven to be an effective means of bringing about change in schools. (14)

(13) John I. Goodlad, "Schooling and Education," in The Great Ideas Today, ed. Robert M. Hutchins (New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1976); Arno Bellack, Competing Ideologies in Research on Teaching (Uppsala, Sweden: University of Uppsala, 1978), cited in Thomas A. Romberg and Gary Price, "Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development as Cultural Change," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 160.

(14) Phillip C. Schlechty and Betty Lou Whitford, "The Teacher as an Adult Learner: A Cognitive-Developmental View," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 77.

As this clamor for change rises, so does the interest in staff development, a strategy seen as a possible instrument for change within the schools.

The basic assumption of staff development is that investment by the organization to develop the skills and knowledge of its personnel will result in greater student achievement, the basic goal of the organization, as well as benefits to the personnel themselves. This basic goal of staff development is accomplished through several approaches. Some are focused directly on the teacher: the removal of preservice deficiencies; (15) personal growth; (15,16) a means to achieve higher status, advanced credentials, and/or higher salaries; (15) the updating of a veteran staff; (17) a cure for burn out; (17) and teacher recertification. (18) Others purposes of staff development focus more on the organization and include a means to break down the isolation of the classroom, to increase

(15) Ralph Tyler, "Inservice Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future," in Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, ed. Louis Rubin (Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971) pp.13-14.

(16) Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development (New York: Longman, 1988), pp. 6-8.

(17) Sherry Liebes, An Aging Teacher Corps: How Should School Systems Respond (Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 235 553, 1983), pp.3-6.

(18) Madlyn Hanes and Michael Rowls, "Teacher Recertification: A survey of the States," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 123-24.

communication and to improve school effectiveness; (15,16) the accomplishment of particular school goals; (16) the general improvement of teaching and learning, (16,19) and the implementation of new programs. (15,16)

These same purposes are cited internationally as well. The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation discusses staff development programs of several European nations and Australia. Their programs are called INSET.

The Interim Report concluded that there were three main reasons for the recent growth in commitment of national governments to INSET. First, it was inherently important that teachers, of all people, should continue with their personal and professional education; second, the rapid, extensive and fundamental nature of present-day change-- technological, economic, cultural, social, political - made it imperative for the education system in general and teachers in particular to review and modify teaching methods and curricula; third, for widely prevalent demographic reasons, the demand for new teachers was dropping sharply and the INSET needs of a stable teaching force thereby became especially important. (20)

This section of Chapter II reviews what experts believe are suitable purposes for staff development. Nearly all center on personal or educational improvement.

(19) R. Linden Courter and Beatrice A. Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983) p. 208.

(20) Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, In-service Education and Training Teachers, (Paris Cedex, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1982), p.10.

Maintenance, Improvement and Change as Purposes

A useful division of the purposes of staff development has been proposed by Schlechty and Whitford. They separate inservice training into activities that are meant to maintain, enhance or establish.

The Maintenance Function. The maintenance function refers to:

...those conditions that must be fulfilled to assure compliance with preferred administrative routines, to support organizationally preferred modes of operating, and to protect those engaging in these activities from unwanted outside influence. (21)

This type of inservice deals with the most basic, routine matters such as what is the correct procedure for securing help through the special education department or how new materials are stored in the library. Maintenance inservice also includes orienting new teachers into the established traditions of the school. These types of staff development activities are nonthreatening for they require no changes in values or attitudes.

The Enhancement Function. This type of inservice training serves to enhance the performance capacities, refine existing skills, and expand existing knowledge regarding new developments in the field. Most staff development activities fall into this middle definition of refining existing skills. The very fact that the

(21) Schlechty and Whitford, "The Teacher as an Adult Learner," pp. 76-77.

definition recognizes existing knowledge and skills, gives it a positive frame of reference rather than falling into the deficit mode.

The enhancement function is also recognized by Romberg and Price who call this "ameliorative innovation" and is "designed or is perceived as designed to make some ongoing practice better or more efficient, but does not challenge the value and traditions associated with the school culture." (22) This expansion of knowledge and skill is critically important for neither are automatically enhanced, thus making enhancement training essential.

Joyce and Showers are particularly enthusiastic about current inservice, for a wealth of research on practices that affect student achievement has come to light in the last fifteen years that is "virtually unknown to most of today's practitioners." However, they caution that adding new content and teaching strategies to the existing repertoire, to the point that they can be used effectively in the instructional setting, has turned out to be difficult and requires very hard work. (23) Although belief systems do not need to be altered,

(22) Thomas A. Romberg and Gary Price, "Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development as Cultural Change," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 159.

(23) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, pp. 6-7.

institutionalizing enhanced behaviors of individuals takes considerable effort.

It is also under the enhancement function, that Courter and Ward place staff development as a means toward school improvement.

In our view, it is essential that the term "school improvement" not imply a deficiency model but rather an orderly tuning process required of all schools and school staffs on a continuing basis. While school improvement implies change, it should become part of the responsible ongoing operation of schools.
(24)

The Establishment Function The third category of Schlechty and Whitford is the establishment function. Continuing education could serve to support the introduction of new programs, new technologies, and new procedures in schools. This function is also aimed at school improvement, but the focus is on the new rather than fine tuning the existing. The degree is sufficiently different that Romberg and Price call this radical innovation which is "designed to challenge the cultural traditions of the schools and is perceived as doing that. These are the most complex of all changes which deal with values." (25)

(24) Courter and Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," p. 186.

(25) Romberg and Price, "Staff Development as Cultural Change," p.159.

Staff development activities may readily be placed within these three categories. Inservice meant to convey general procedure comes under the maintenance function. Training aimed at enhancing personal growth, improvement of teaching and learning strategies, implementation of new programs which do not require changes in values or attitudes, and diminishing classroom isolation or frustration all come under the enhancement function. The implementation of radically new programs, programs which require major changes in teacher behavior, and the elimination of deficiencies fall into the establishment function because they call for challenging existing traditions. The line between establishment functions and enhancement functions may be a fine one, for an inservice goal may enhance the abilities of one teacher and challenge the established beliefs of another.

Schlechty and Whitford's division of purposes seems to be among the most useful to staff development planners for the type of purpose dictates the complexity of the program design that must accompany it, based on the degree of change in values and tradition that is required. While Joyce and Showers divide inservice as to whether it serves the purpose of individual development, school improvement, or district development, that division is not necessarily related to accompanying program design and focuses on who is changing rather than how the change must proceed.

Less Frequent Purposes

The use of inservice training programs for personal or school improvement are common practices, however, there are other purposes although less frequently mentioned. They include inservice training for recertification purposes, for enlivening a veteran staff, and as a cure for burn out.

Hanes and Rowls write that as many as 40 states required some form of teacher recertification by 1985 and the practice of meeting those recertification requirements through district planned inservices had become an increasingly common alternative to graduate education courses. Twenty-nine of those states had options to meet all or at least some of the relicensing requirements through district staff development, and eighteen states allowed all of their recertification requirements to be met wholly at the district level. (26)

Liebes recommends school-based staff development as a cure for mid-career crisis in teachers who have taught a decade or more and feel that their commitment to the profession is being outstripped by the stress they derive from it. In a staff development needs assessment in Prince George County, Maryland Public Schools, among the most

(26) Hanes and Rowls, "Teacher Recertification," pp. 123-124.

frequently identified problems were improving teacher morale and dealing with job-related stress. Seventy-two percent of the teachers there had taught nine or more years, making this a problem that dealt with the majority of staff. Liebes contends:

There is support in the literature for involving teachers in the planning of their inservice experiences as an antidote for low morale and job related stress. Experts report that teachers feel satisfied, supported and increasingly motivated when they are asked to articulate their training needs and centers." (27)

Staff development is becoming increasingly important as faculties remain stable. In many districts, enrollment has fallen and the teaching staff has experienced declining turnover rates and increasing lengths of service. New blood and enthusiasm are no longer being infused into the schools as before. The few who enter may not be of the same quality as those of the past, for bright, young women are being attracted to other occupations that offer better pay and greater prestige. Recertification, supporting morale, and enlivening a veteran staff may not be as evident among the purposes of staff development as are personal and school improvement,

(27) Sherry Liebes, An Aging Teacher Corps: How Should School Systems Respond. Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children's 61st Annual Convention, Detroit, Michigan: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 235 553, pp.3-6.

but they are important.

In summary, the primary purpose of inservice training is to enable teachers to better fulfill the mission of the school, student achievement, but the approaches are diverse. Most fall readily into the three categories of maintenance, enhancement, and establishment. Maintenance inservice training simply maintains current procedures. It may clarify regulations or train a new staff member into the institutionalized behavior of the school.

Enhancement inservice training is meant to fine-tune skills that already exist. It does not require upsetting values and traditions and may include personal growth for the teacher in a desired area, an updating of older programs and practices, implementation of new programs and procedures that come within established tradition, staff development to increase communication and lessen frustrations, teacher recertification, or a means to achieve advanced status, credentials, or higher salaries.

Establishment training requires changes in values and traditions, thus is the most difficult to achieve successfully. Training meant to cure deficits or derived from a deficit point of view come under this category. Almost any activity that may be classified as an enhancement program may be an establishment program if it requires significant value changes in the teacher. These

changes may include new classroom behaviors, new technologies, new procedures, new programs, or new ways of interrelating with other staff members.

Maintenance and enhancement training are relatively easy to achieve but the significant changes of establishment programs are more difficult. It is difficult to plan staff development activities knowing that what represents fine tuning of present skills for one participant, may be a major change in behavior patterns for another.

THE FOCUS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Whether the purpose of inservice training is to maintain, to enhance or to establish, the planners of staff development must choose where to focus the training. Will training be most effective when focused on programs, on individual teachers, on a school staff, or on the district?

A Changing Focus

McLaughlin and Berman in 1977 found the focus turning away from programs and toward teachers.

Research has confirmed what practitioners knew all along: new technologies, validated programs or more money are not panaceas. Specifically researchers have shown that the best educational products in the hands of unmotivated or inadequately trained teachers are unlikely to fulfill their promise. Thus, the research community is beginning to turn its attention from assessing the effectiveness of educational products to the training and professional development needs of teachers. (28)

The focus had clearly changed to the teacher in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Madilyn Hunter's programs were directed at teachers across the country, the effective teaching research was surfacing in the journals, and changing teachers' behaviors was a prevalent topic on the inservice circuit. The reasoning seemed apparent. No

(28) McLaughlin and Berman, "Retooling Staff Development," p. 191.

educational improvement could occur without involving teachers and getting them to endorse the change. The individual teacher focus was shown in the 1983 Kansas state adoption of individual inservice plans for teachers.

But is individually focused training the most effective? Might individual training be effective for the teacher but have little impact on the school? Authorities were beginning to reconsider the teacher as the primary focus of inservice training. Could individual improvement and school improvement be integrated? Experts are looking at school-based or school focused staff development in the United States as well as abroad.

Defining School-Based Staff Development

School-based staff development focuses on the needs of the organization, needs so powerful that collective action by the entire faculty is required to accomplish the goals. The isolated, cellular nature of schools has caused most improvement efforts to concentrate on instructional or leadership skills that teachers and administrators can employ alone, but major problems or school improvement requires collaborative, coordinated effort.

The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation report defines school-based inservice as:

...those continuing education activities which focus upon the interest, needs and problems directly related to one's role and responsibilities in a

specific school site. These forms of inservice focus not only on individual teacher concerns and needs, but on matters which demand the co-ordinated efforts of several, if not all, persons in a specific school setting.

These forms of in-service commonly call for changes in the organisational structure and programmatic nature of a school. They have implications for basic role as well as specific behavioural changes ... [and] should take place in the form of an articulated framework which considers dimensions of the organisational/ sociological nature of the school and the curriculum and instructional patterns within which teachers work. (29)

Potency of School Based Staff Development

Gordon Lawrence commented on the potency of

school-based inservice in a review of 97 inservice programs, finding "school-based programs conducted by local supervisors or administrators appear more effective than those run by outside personnel," and teacher behavior was affected by both school-based programs and graduate programs, but "school-based programs influenced more complex kinds of behaviors such as attitudes." (30)

Apparently programs at the school site are capable of doing more than conveying information; they are capable of changing beliefs as well. McLaughlin and Marsh found that just offering new information and skills were not

(29) Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Inservice Education and Training Teachers, p. 53.

(30) Eric Research Action Brief. Staff Development, p.4.

enough to accomplish successful educational innovations in schools. Complex changes involving attitudes and motivation were necessary if considerable changes were to be made in the instructional program. (31) If the purpose of staff development is to establish or to enhance and institutionalize those changes, then school-based inservice offers a focus that may be powerful enough to change attitudes and beliefs.

Advantages of School-Based Staff Development

Goodlad believes the individual school is the key unit on which to focus educational improvement through staff development because multiple benefits are derived.

Observations of effective schools reinforce the notion that the single school staff is the best unit of change -- not the principal, not the teacher, not the child, but the total school. Most staff development efforts are aimed at individuals even if they are put into groups for training. If ownership matters, if school culture matters, if a school has an identifiable learning climate or an ethos, if the school can be a satisfying place for persons who work there, then efforts to improve the school are perhaps best focused on the whole school, its problems and its strengths. (32)

Goodlad offers the following reasons. First, polls

(31) Milbrey McLaughlin and David Marsh, "Staff Development and School Change," Teachers College Record 30 (September, 1978) :82.

(32) John I. Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp.39-43.

over the last several years suggest greater satisfaction with the local school than with schooling generally. Second, the danger of expecting general improvement by working on just one of its parts such as teacher inservice, or better curriculum, or inspiring principals, is minimized. Third, chances are enhanced for identifying factors impinging on the well-being and satisfaction of those who work in schools. Fourth and most tentative, chances are enhanced for making schools increasingly satisfactory and effective educational settings.

It is Goodlad's second reason, working on the whole has more promise than working on the parts, that has been echoed by other researchers. Courter and Ward indicate that school improvement can not be brought about through individual improvement alone nor through isolated and occasional inservice activities.

The success of a teacher depends upon the job done by other teachers. No single teacher can alone bring about a marked change in education. Thus, the notion of the isolated classroom in which a teacher works behind closed doors does not mesh with the view of school improvement. (33)

Joyce and Showers cite the example of a teacher who works alone to impose standards not promoted by the faculty as a whole is in for a very frustrating and largely ineffectual experience. "Rigorous standards are promoted

(33) Courter and Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," p. 187 and 208.

not so much by what individuals do as by what the faculty does as a whole." (34)

Goodlad's third and fourth reasons for school-based inservice -- improving satisfaction in the workplace and making schools increasingly effective education settings -- have not been as widely embraced as the notion that inservice activities should be coordinated rather than segmented but are being echoed in the most current publications, especially by Joyce and Showers. They believe both training and the practice have to reside comfortably in the school setting and be collaborative activities with personnel providing much assistance to one another during the early stages of intensive practice. (35) This type of intense, cooperative school-based training, they believe, will develop the well-being and satisfaction of the staff as well as making an impact on the effectiveness of the entire school.

Research Supports School-Based Staff Development

Goodlad's conclusions came from long term research in eighteen K-12 schools. Goodlad, Sirotnick and Overman summarized the research in which school improvement, and teacher satisfaction had a startling congruency. Goodlad

(34) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p.6.

(35) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 17.

examined four characteristics of the schools: self renewal, which he considered to represent the outcome of what successful staff development should be; satisfaction; academic issues; and pedagogical technique. The ranking of schools showed high levels of congruity for renewal, satisfaction, and academic issues with the upper and lower quartiles in the self renewal category virtually overlapping the ordering of satisfying schools, and school related issues. However, the best that could be made of the ordering of pedagogical techniques bore little or no relation to the ranking of the other three. (36)

While Goodlad called satisfaction "the first ordering of schools" and considered it an extraordinarily accurate predictor of nearly all the others, it is difficult to conclude that satisfaction precedes the others, rather than the reverse, and in fact, Goodlad states the overall climate of the satisfying schools was more academic than was the climate of the less satisfying schools. Without greater clarity in knowing which is a predictor of the others, it is doubtful that school-based staff development activities should be primarily aimed at producing satisfying workplaces. Goodman's research also demonstrated the relative futility of directing staff

(36) John I. Goodlad, Kenneth A. Sirotnick, and Bette C. Overman, "An Overview of "A Study in Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan 61 (November 1979) : 174-78.

development activities solely toward pedagogical improvement of individual teachers. The impact of improved pedagogy on the school, its climate, its ethos, or on the student body was slight. Pedagogical technique was nearly equal from the best schools to the worst. There was little pedagogical variance, Goodlad believed, because teachers were foremost concerned with control, and remained within tightly structured, traditional, directive activities, although each possessed great autonomy to be creative in the classroom.

Staff development as conducted is focused predominantly on improving these same [pedagogical] skills, teacher by teacher, largely away from the context of school and classroom. Even if a teacher were fortunate enough to engage in countervailing practices, the setting for using them is not likely to be receptive and reinforcing... Countervailing practices are demanding and difficult virtually by definition; for implementation they require institutional support and legitimization. This will not occur unless school staffs are willing to take their teaching out of the closet of the classroom, admit to the need to improve, and make it, along with the rest of the daily program, the focus of school-wide, on-site staff development. (37)

Goodlad's conclusions about the potency of school-based inservice have been echoed by other researchers, but not in the same terminology. A decade before in McLaughlin's Rand Corporation Study, he found that successful schools trying highly innovative projects often developed their own materials. However,

(37) Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," pp. 56-57.

McLaughlin concluded that the materials didn't seem to be the key; it was the interaction between the staff. It included a "sense of involvement...opportunity to learn by doing...working in the project...an opportunity to think through the concepts... and a chance to communicate with other members of the staff." (38) In other words, the staff had an opportunity to solve school problems jointly, enhance their own skills simultaneously, and institutionalize an innovative project successfully. Collaboration may be a less efficient process than having goals set forth by an administrator, but participation of the staff is likely to lead to greater commitment to these goals, more motivation to implement them, and greater satisfaction when they are achieved.

Is School Based Staff Development Possible?

Goodlad himself realizes collaboration and coordination are difficult to implement. "Collaboration with others on a faculty to determine school-wide goals, for example, is an exceedingly arduous activity and appears not to be commonly attempted." (39)

The task is not impossible, however, and examples of successful projects appear in the literature. A

(38) McLaughlin and Berman, "Retooling Staff Development," p. 191.

(39) Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," p. 39.

project in Prince George County, Maryland, is cited by Liebes. The project started with an inservice planning team from the local school which participated in team development sessions which explained the rationale and philosophy of school-based staff development training as well as the characteristics of effective staff development programs. Participants learned the processes of assessing needs and concerns as well as planning techniques for developing a school-based program. The team went back to the local school and conducted a needs assessment and identified one or two needs that would improve the school program through creative decision-making and group problem solving by the entire staff. Staff development activities reflected the needs of local school professionals and were aligned with the overall mission of the school system. The activities matched the objectives and evaluation procedures were included. (40)

Warnings About the Use of School Based Staff Development

While there are some successful reports of school-based staff development noted in the literature, basic shifts in conventional educational practice must

(40) Sherry Liebes, An Aging Teacher Corps: How Should School Systems Respond. Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children's 61st Annual Convention. Detroit Michigan : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 235 553, 1983, pp. 8-10.

occur if the total school is going to become the basis for effecting improvement. Goodlad suggests the following.

There must be genuine decentralization of authority and responsibility for decision making, including budgetary planning, to the individual school. The accompanying requirement is that those connected with the local school develop, under the principal's leadership, three-to-five year plans which are updated and reviewed annually.

Second the reward structure for inservice education, in the form of both time and salary credits, must shift from the individualistic activities now prevalent, to site-based attack on school problems, the quality of the workplace, and the needs of individual teachers. However both principals and teachers need to develop skills in problem identification, dialogue, decision making and action to use these opportunities wisely. The necessary support must be extraordinarily nonthreatening and sensitive.

Third, preservice education, (student teaching and university involvement), inservice education, and school improvement become one collaborative project.

Given the attractive simplicity, however, of such notions as "it all depends on the teacher" or "the secret to good schools is the principal," it is unrealistic to assume that widespread adoption of the school wide approach is imminent. (41)

Others also recognize the difficulties of school-based approaches to staff development, especially those that deal with changing relationships among staff or between staff and consultants or administrators. There are difficulties when individual autonomy is disturbed and educators asked to solve major problems and improve schools in a coordinated way. Olsen, in a three year action research study conducted by the Royal Danish School of

(41) Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," p. 39.

Education, concluded that it took far more time than anticipated to develop fruitful working relationships among colleagues on an inservice team. The researchers had to develop an active consultancy role and work collaboratively with teachers in the classroom, neither of which they had originally been prepared to do, previously seeing their roles as scholarly consultants and observers.

Olsen also warns that institutional norms must change.

If it is considered important that higher education institutions should modify their approach to encompass school-focused INSET [inservice], then their internal organisation and incentive structures will have to be changed so that college lecturers see it as worthwhile to engage in school-focused work as well as in more traditional courses." (42)

Joyce and Showers point out that collective decision making and collaborative activity require changes in the traditional relationships among teachers and between teachers and principals. Teachers rarely see each other teach, administrators may observe only two or three times each year, preparation and meeting times are scarce, and in the course of adapting to this isolation, many teachers have worked out comfortable patterns of behavior that fit the isolated conditions and the low degree of collaborative action that characterize the workplace. Essentially

(42) O. Olsen, In-service Education and Training Teachers. (Paris Cedex, France : Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1982), pp. 22-23.

teachers have learned to work alone, relying on themselves, unentangled by group decisions or the necessity to coordinate activities with others. Powerful school-based staff development requires collaborative work so changing the social norms of the school and providing adequate time are critical factors. (43)

Several experts counsel that in some schools, school-based improvement ought not to be attempted. Both Schlechty and Goodlad advise that school-based inservice, especially inservice aimed at changing classroom teacher behavior, should not be attempted in organizations having maintenance problems. Schlechty says, "Maintaining the health of the organization is a prerequisite to change, since an organization that cannot keep things from getting worse is in no position to make them better." (44) Goodlad elaborates:

In my judgement, the initiation of such effort in any of the less satisfying schools in our sample would have resulted in unmitigated disaster. These schools almost uniformly were experiencing severe problems of many kinds, lack of authority or inability to exercise authority on the part of the principal, mutual distrust between teachers and principal, low faculty morale, student misbehavior and academic apathy, poor home-school relations, and more. These

(43) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p.18.

(44) Phillip C. Schlechty and Betty Lou Whitford, "The Organizational Context of School Systems," Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 82.

conditions are deeply embedded in the daily life of unsatisfying schools.

These school-wide problems must be addressed first if the workplace is to be capable of addressing the less amenable, less obvious, less open subject of pedagogy. Teachers' pedagogical habits are extraordinarily resistant to change...Direct attack on this sensitive area of assumed teacher autonomy could bring down a school in which the problem-solving capability of the staff is at a low level. Why tackle the most difficult first? (45)

The European INSET report gave additional cautions.

The available evidence indicated that effective school-focused INSET required authorities to devote more autonomy to schools than usually given. They also argued that school focused INSET should in no way be seen as excluding other forms of INSET; it is vitally important that existing methods and approaches be maintained and developed. (46)

School-based staff development seems to be particularly potent in influencing complex kinds of behaviors such as attitudes and motivation. This potency seems to come from collegial planning, reflection, problem solving, and a sense of ownership for the solution.

School-based staff development may also be an exceedingly arduous activity involving significant amounts

(45) Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," p. 60.

(46) Centre for Educational Improvement, "Inservice Education," p.61.

of time for collegial planning and problem solving. Fruitful working relationships among staff and real collaboration between experts and staff take time and effort to be developed, since the norm has been working in relative isolation. Principals and teachers need to develop skills in problem identification, dialogue, and decision making.

Schools wishing to use school-based staff development must have considerable autonomy at the building level, discretionary use of funds, and develop long range plans consistent with the district's philosophy. Rewards for inservice participation will have to shift from those individually focused such as graduate credits to rewards compatible with group participation. While Goodlad states that it is unrealistic to assume that widespread adoption of the school wide approach is imminent, some school districts are making inroads.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Effective staff development starts with planning based on needs. Need assessments determine if and where interventions are required and how to start building support for the successful implementation of the intervention.

Good planning starts with developing the needs assessment planning team as recommended by Kuh, Orbaugh, and Byers for the National Inservice Network of Bloomington, Indiana. (47) Nearly every writer of staff development literature recommends that teachers be involved in assessing their needs and planning their training experiences, as do Kuh, Lytle, and Creamer. (48) Although administrators prefer that they themselves plan the workshops, teachers prefer teacher and committee

(47) George Kuh, Tim Orbaugh, and Kathy Byers. Designing and Conducting Needs Assessments in Education (Alexandria, Virginia :ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981), pp. 72-97.

(48) Kuh, Designing Needs Assessments, p. 89; James H. Lytle, "Investment Options for Inservice Teacher Training," Journal of Teacher Education 43 (December 1983) : 29; Robert Creamer and Mary Gillaspay. Creating a Climate for Success: Developing a District Inservice Plan and Making it Work. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 277 122, 1987), p.6.

planning. Johnston and Yeakey concluded: "the most effective staff development workshops would be those planned jointly by teachers and administrators." (49) Differing perspectives and values and collaborative decision-making achieve a reasoned consensus about how to proceed while reducing the possibility that important issues are overlooked. Thus, the chances are increased that the needs assessment data will be used in planning interventions. Scriven also believes that two or more heads are better than one:

Seeking assistance from a second person will increase the number of possible solutions to potential problems by about 40 percent. A third person might well provide another 20 percent, and perhaps 10 percent can be expected from each of two more assistants. (50)

Not only are problems perceived from multiple perspectives in a collaborative planning team, but consensus is achieved within the district concerning problems that need to be assessed. Programs are supported from a shared sense of ownership and, in turn, the programs are more effective with broadened support.

(49) Gladys Styles Johnston and Carol Yeakey. "Administrators' and Teachers' Preferences for Staff Development," Planning and Changing 8,4 (Winter 1977) quoted in Staff Development: Research Action Brief Number 10, (Alexandria, Virginia : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 189 679, 1980), p.4.

(50) M. Scriven, and J. Roth. "Needs Assessment: Concept and Practice," in Exploring Purposes and Dimensions, ed. S. Anderson and C. Coles (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1978.)

There are rewards that accrue to the team members.

Needs assessment provides opportunities for participants to develop understanding in a variety of areas including data-gathering techniques, group processes, problem-solving, and dissemination of information. All participants learn something more about themselves, the system, the environment and roles within a system. They gain clarity of purpose, and members learn from the process as well as the results. (51)

Needs of the staff and school may be perceived, come from data-based research or be mandated. Needs may be defined as wants -- something that can be shown to be necessary or useful for the fulfillment of some defensible purpose-- (52) or as discrepancies --the difference between what is and what should be. (53)

The National Inservice Network advises that the planning group determine a preliminary focus of inservice activities rather than start with totally open ended questionnaires or checklists to avoid groping in too many

(51) Kuh, Designing and Conducting Needs Assessments, pp. 82 & 89.

(52) D. Stuffelbeam, Needs Assessment in Evaluation. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Evaluation Conference, San Francisco, September 1977. Cited in Designing and Conducting Needs Assessments, George Kuh, (Alexandria, VA : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981). p.77.

(53) Creamer, "Staff Development for School Improvement," p.7.

directions at once, and to preserve school goals. The National Inservice Network also advises planning teams to focus on a serious problem rather than on writing goals, for a solution rather than a process will be the outcome. The problem must be serious enough so adequate support exists for finding a solution. (54) The final selection of a problem must also recognize values of the participants, for what one values most is assessed as the highest priority. (55) Need identification may be an analytical process but need selection is a political process.

The needs assessment plan and its eventual solution must function within the school context and established norms including support from key stakeholders. This support from authority is a key factor to successful implementation of the solution as identified in the Rand study and is one of the reasons for collaborative involvement from the earliest stages.

The planning committee must also understand the target group's awareness of the problem and ability to articulate needs. It must be aware of learning styles of the staff, and previous experience with needs assessment

(54) Kuh, Designing and Conducting Needs Assessment, p. 82.

(55) Leslee J. Bishop, Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982), p. 29; Kuh, Designing and Conducting Needs Assessment, p. 82.

and planning. Pressure groups must be considered and strategies developed to cope with them in a fair manner. Consideration should also be made of strengths in the system to help maintain a balanced perspective while investigating problems. With an understanding of the context, the needs assessment committee should then verify the problem with a small sampling and, if necessary, redefine the focus.

In most instances, revisions of the data gathering methods and instruments improve the reliability and validity of the process. This step frequently is overlooked even though it is mentioned in almost every substantive discussion concerning needs assessment. (56)

In the piloting, as well as in the main assessment, the following three groups must be included: the relevant group - those most affected by the decision; the expertise group - those who have expert knowledge on the subject; and the jurisdiction group - those who will be responsible for carrying out the decision. (57)

After concluding the preliminary planning, at least three different strategies should be used for collecting data. Multiple measures will improve the chances that the needs identified are legitimate and should be considered by program planners. The following possibilities are

(56) Kuh, Designing and Conducting Needs Assessment, p. 86.

(57) Ibid., p. 83.

suggested by Williams, Kuh, or Bishop. (58)

Interviews

Interviews may be unstructured or structured. Attitudes may be assessed by not only what the client says but by how he says it. Clients must be accessible and interviewers must be properly trained for uniformity and accuracy which is costly in terms of time for clients, for interviewers and for analysis.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires may probe information, opinions or attitudes. Wide distribution is possible and they are cost efficient to administer and summarize. Questionnaires are uniform and good for checking or securing information but nuances may be lost. With questionnaires, it is difficult to differentiate between needs and wants.

Checklists

Checklists offer forced choices but generally within a fairly extensive group of alternatives. Interviews, questionnaires or checklists may be administered to all participants or to a random sampling. More than 200 respondents will not be cost efficient.

Lanier warns about "laundry lists of...meagerly described topical options" saying that participants tend to choose the familiar and bypass great areas of need due to unfamiliarity. Majority interests tend to dominate. (59)

Observations and Visitations

Observations are the most system centered because they cannot be challenged by subjects. They are expensive in terms of time and difficult to analyze and categorize.

(58) Martha Williams. Needs Assessment Instrument Categories, Prepared for the National Dissemination Forum, (Alexandria, VA : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981), p. 92; Kuh, Designing and Conducting Needs Assessments, pp. 79 & 86; Bishop, Staff Development and Instructional Improvement, p.33.

(59) Judith Lanier, "Tensions in Teaching Teachers the Skills of Pedagogy," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, : University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 139.

Documentary Evidence

To use archival material, records must be easily and legally accessible. They may be used when the target population is not accessible. Documents may be difficult to analyze and compare across record-keeping systems. This may include test scores, case studies, logs, diaries, attendance records, etc.

Group Consensus Discussions

The Delphi technique may be used with groups representing varying viewpoints within the system. This is costly in terms of time.

Open Forums to elicit community opinion.

Whatever the methods, at least ten percent of the personnel in all categories should be assessed. The analysis of the data may be simple or complex depending on the amount of the data gathered and the expertise of the analysts. Interpretation of the results should be made from several perspectives as various constituencies will be affected.

Results should be made public, and an action plan developed based on the results of the needs assessment. The plan must be integrated into the planning process of the district, the building, and individual staff members.

Needs assessment is continuous as problems shift and new ideas and alternative answers merit consideration. One set of problems addressed often leads to another set of needs. Needs assessment lays the groundwork for implementation of a plan by creating interest in the problem, increasing the credibility of the planning effort, and building support for an action plan.

ADULT LEARNERS IN THE WORKPLACE

A great deal of effort is often expended by staff development planners in deciding on the aims of staff development, focusing the activities where desired, doing needs assessment, and planning the program design, only to have the innovation flutter for a short time and then die. This premature end may be the result of failing to consider the adult learner and the norms of the workplace.*

Capacity to Learn

Although adults have the capacity to learn new behaviors and attitudes, (60) staff development planners should take into consideration the stage of cognitive development of the learners. Sprinthall and Sprinthall found cognitive development to be a useful model for explaining change and growth in adults while tying it to desired inservice outcomes. Although adults pass normally through hierarchical stages of cognitive development, processing experience in more complex ways, passage is neither automatic nor unilateral but occurs only with appropriate interaction between the person and the

(60) Paul Baltes, and Warner Schale, "On the Plasticity of Intelligence in Adulthood and Old Age," American Psychologist 31 (October 1976): 720-25.

environment. (61) Appropriate interaction may include effective staff development activities.

This particular theory is useful because adults who are at the upper end of the model represent desired staff development outcomes. They function more complexly, possess a wider repertoire of behavioral skills, perceive problems more broadly, and can respond more accurately and empathically to the needs of others. They also have the ability to take roles, to make decisions according to principles of democracy and justice, to tolerate stress, to attend to the least compelling stimulus, and to perceive from an objective "third party" perspective. (62) This description of persons functioning at the upper level of cognitive development conforms closely with clusters of behaviors associated with effective teaching (63) and contrasts with the teacher who follows a standard recipe for improvement, even in light of inappropriate circumstances. Principals who function at higher cognitive levels were perceived by their teachers as more flexible in

(61) Norman A. Sprinthall, and Lois Thies-Sprinthall, "The Teacher as an Adult Learner: A Cognitive-Developmental View," Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 16.

(62) Ibid., p.18

(63) David Hunt and Bruce Joyce, "Teacher Trainee Personality and Initial Teaching Style." American Educational Research Journal 4 (May 1967): 253-59.

problem solving, more responsive, less rigid, and less authoritarian. (64)

If staff development procedures could aid teachers in reaching higher stages of cognitive development, then technological, instructional, and curriculum innovations might have higher success rates.

To aid the design of staff development, program designers should follow the Sprinthall's recommendations:

1. Growth toward a higher stage of cognitive development is most influenced by placing a person in significant role taking experiences, i.e., performing a new and somewhat more complex interpersonal task than his or her own current preferred mode. The experience is direct and active as opposed to vicarious and indirect.

This means the learner must be a participant in staff development rather than a listener, and the experience must go beyond the awareness and understanding stage, to the stage of discussion and implementation.

2. The quality of the role is neither beyond the reach nor below the grasp of an individual learner.

3. There is careful and continuous guided reflection. Unexamined experience misses the point.

4. There is a balance of real experience and discussion-reflection. The amount of real experience does not seem to matter, but without guided reflection, no discernable effect is evident.

5. Programs need to be continuous. The time for significant change probably should extend over at least a one year period.

6. Instruction needs to provide for both personal support and challenge. To adopt the new means dumping the old, creating personal dissonance and providing major personal support. Grouping teachers by building makes it

(64) Paula Silver, "Principals' Conceptual Ability in Relation to Situation and Behavior," Educational Administration Quarterly 11 (Autumn 1975): 58.

more possible to provide continuous, on-site support and supervision when teachers are asked to transfer their newly learned teaching skills to their own classrooms.

On-site, collaborative staff development, which gradually increases the complexity of teacher perception, seems congenial with elements of the cognitive-developmental approach. (65)

Effective staff development program design can incorporate procedures which may lead to cognitive growth. Such growth not only benefits the teacher personally but leads to behaviors that are more complex, flexible, diagnostic and empathetic in dealing with organizational problems. Such a design would include participation in implementation at an appropriate level; collaboration; discussion, reflection and feedback; time; and personal support. These needs fit very closely with the Joyce and Showers model of program design.

Points of View Vary with Role

Just as cognitive development and levels of experience create different concerns and needs among teachers, so do differences based on teaching roles and across-role differences. Lanier writes an eloquent description of the difficulties encountered when groups representing different role viewpoints are forced to collaborate. Although it is lengthy, it is particularly relevant to the staff development mandates of Florida where

(65) Sprinthall and Sprinthall, "Teacher as Adult Learner," pp. 27-30.

university/school district collaboration is required.

Lanier describes a cooperative staff development program between an elementary district and an university. The two teams of teachers, elementary and university, collaborated to develop new criteria for preservice education. When federal funds which had given the elementary teachers released time to participate in the collaboration were no longer available, teachers found themselves desiring to continue the relationship and developed a plan where preservice teachers served a senior year internship which enabled the elementary teachers to be released from their classroom duties for two half-days per week to continue in the collaboration.

Although both teams benefited from the relationship, it was not always a smooth, and tensions developed which stemmed from their differing philosophies of education and daily focuses. The practical views of the classroom teachers and the theoretical views of the university teachers were in frequent opposition to one another, provoking both cognitive and affective disagreement and unrest:

The [university] educators, in the main, held the view that the most important pedagogical skills were embedded in the exercise of informed professional judgment and decision-making. The teachers, on the other hand, held the view that the most important pedagogical skills were embedded in the performance of smoothly orchestrated routines and actions.

For staff development activities, the

[university] educators wanted to share and examine the knowledge that they thought should inform teachers' professional judgment and decision making. The teachers, on the other hand, wanted to discuss particular practical problems they were encountering and find out what they should do about them...

As the staff development sessions got underway, however, the classroom teachers were often uneasy and skeptical when discussions focused on general principles and abstract ideas related to effective teaching practice. Although the university people tried to give examples about how the principles could be applied, the teachers often countered with examples demonstrating why it wouldn't work such as no resources, the principal wouldn't allow it or what would the parents say.

The teachers wanted the university people to be the experts and to tell them exactly what to do in specific situations. The university people said they did not have the specific knowledge about individual students or peer groups to give exact answers but that knowledge of general principles, when applied to specific situations, would give the teachers the answers.

Teachers challenged the university people to 'show them'. Such a challenge both threatened and frustrated the teacher educators. In addition to being nervous...they were philosophically opposed to being put in this position. They did not believe that there was a right way to do it, nor did they believe that classroom teachers should continue to look to 'outside experts' to tell or show them precisely what to do. The teacher educators wanted the teachers to think seriously and critically about the ideas they put forward, and then they wanted them to devise reasonable means of applying and evaluating the applications in their own classrooms.

Thus, the teacher educators appeared comfortable in the belief that their advice was appropriately tentative and removed from particular, specific situations. But the teachers, on the other hand, seemed to interpret this stance as a sign of weakness, an indication that the teacher educators really did not know.

They would show the teachers how some of the principles might be applied by doing demonstration teaching in their classrooms, but the teachers would be

asked to participate in the exercise as joint planners and subsequent coaches and evaluators of the instructional experience...

Though some of the [university] educators valued their direct elementary teaching experiences, a number merely tolerated them... But in fact, the practical application lessons were usually threatening and sometimes disappointing for the teacher educators.

A fair summary would suggest that the exchange of concrete classroom experience with the teacher educators, like the exchange of abstract ideas with the teachers, was not generally received with great enthusiasm. (66)

Collaboration, often touted as the panacea to staff development, was not enough nor was long term contact for the Lanier collaboration lasted three years. The university demonstrations put the brunt of the burden on single individual as "enlightened sources." The university faculty never left the consulting role to become collaborators. When collaboration, where professionals work together to solve significant problems, and social norms of teaching and of the school are considered as the context for innovation, effective staff development follows.

Social Norms of Teaching

The social norms of teaching are often slighted in the literature and in staff development programs, as if the innovation were adopted without any context at all or that

(66) Lanier, "Tensions in Teaching Teachers the Skills of Pedagogy," pp. 130-133.

all contexts were ideal. The norms of teaching and of the school are extremely powerful forces, and innovations which rely on countervailing practices are doomed from the start. Either staff development must work within the norms of teaching and the organization, or provision must be made in the design of the inservice to alter the norms so that the innovation can be institutionalized.

Two of the most powerful and pervading norms of teaching, according to Lieberman, are practicality and privacy. Being practical is the opposite of being theoretical and idealistic. Being theoretical is associated with university courses and professors.

The criterion for an idea's practicality is that it considers the circumstances of the school and that it can work immediately in a classroom. Practical school problems are problems of discipline, order, and achievement. Practical solutions require little additional preparation or work, are immediate and concrete, and can be effected with the resources and structures that presently exist. To be practical is to concentrate on products and not processes, to draw on experience and not on research, to be short-range and not long-range in thinking and planning.

Practicality, as an opposite to idealism, places a value on adjusting expectations to the present realities. To be practical is to accept the school as it is and to adapt. The striving to change the "system" is idealistic; the striving to "make do" is practical. The concern for the well-being and optimum learning of every student is idealistic; the acceptance of limitations on some students' potential is practical. The process of reflective self-criticism is idealistic; the expressed belief that "I do the best I can" is practical. Being open to change and to outsiders offering services is idealistic; being self-sufficient is practical. In essence, the value placed on practicality is a value placed on resistance to change and to expanding the possibilities of teaching.

The practicality ethic is linked to the privacy ethic - it is practical to be private about teaching. Being private means that teachers do not share experiences about their teaching, their classes, their students, or their perceptions of their roles with anyone inside the school building. (67)

When asked by Lieberman with whom he shared his teaching, a respondent paused and simply stated, "My wife". By following the norm and being private, teachers forfeit the opportunity to display their successes, and they reserve the right to conceal their failures. There is some safety in the tradition, even if it is lonely.

In a study by Glidewell, 92% of beginning teachers did not seek help from colleagues except indirectly by swapping stories. (68) The privacy norm hides novices' weaknesses but does not enable them to deal with inexperience, unavailability of expertise, or ambiguity about goal attainment - factors that produce 93% of teacher stress related to performing professional tasks. (69)

When staff developers ask teachers to collaborate,

(67) Ann Lieberman, and Lynne Miller, Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), pp. 59-60.

(68) J. C. Glidewell, S. Tucker, M. Todt, and S. Cox, "Professional Support Systems: The Teaching Profession," in New Directions in Helping, Volume 3: Applied Perspective on Help-Seeking and Receiving, eds. A. Nadler, J.D. Fisher, and B. M. Depaulo, (San Francisco: Academic Press, 1983), p. 199.

(69) William A. Gray, and Marilynne M. Gray, "Synthesis of Research on Mentoring Beginning Teachers," Educational Leadership, (November 1985): 39.

to coach peers, to reflect on theory and apply it in the classroom, to examine research, to do long range planning, to allow outsiders into their world, they are asking for things that "aren't practical" to most teachers. These modes of operation, although they are powerful components of staff development design, are unfamiliar to most teachers. Even if the teacher is capable, willing, and honestly believes in the concept of the innovation, the teacher may be uncomfortable with the process, realizing that it is a countervailing practices, and probably going to die out soon anyway. Schiffer believes that staff development planners:

...underestimate the degree to which individuals' values, self-interest, previous experiences, expectations, aspirations, needs and personality traits influence their acceptance or rejection of an idea. (70)

There are other social norms in teaching in addition to practicality and privacy. Conventional wisdom dictates that different styles are equally effective for different teachers. Changes required by staff development programs are often threatening in the form of perceived criticism of their style. (71) There is uncertainty that

(70) Judith Schiffer, "A Framework for Staff Development," in Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, eds. Ann Lieberman and Lynn Miller (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), pp.4-5.

(71) Bishop, Improvement: Plans and Procedures, p.9

new procedures are really more effective and more applicable than old ones, for researchers are theoretical. Most frequently rewards are derived from students: "Most teachers learn their craft in isolation from other adults. Rewards come from the children, not from sharing, discussing, or reflecting on the nature of the work." (72) Feedback, so essential to all people, comes from one source - the student, thus, it is outside the norm to receive feedback from adults.

School goals are often unclear and sometimes conflicting. It is well known that many teachers are left to their own devices to somehow translate what these goals mean to themselves and to their classes. Classroom management is a prerequisite, and innovations which disrupt the control norm are sometimes ignored. Teachers, unlike other professions, move from undergraduate coursework to struggling with the ambiguities alone. Peer support groups are almost nonexistent. Isolation best describes the teachers' work environment. (73)

These social norms - practicality, privacy, personal style, lack of recognition from adults, lack of feedback and support, uncertain learning links, mixed goals, the need for classroom control, and isolation are

(72) Lieberman, New Demands, p.55.

(73) Ibid., p. 56.

realities. They are firmly entrenched in nearly every school and are often antithetical to the more powerful designs of staff development.

How will an innovation ever be institutionalized? Some designs of staff development may work within the system of social norms. Enhancement models of inservice which do not require changes of tradition or attitude may be successful with individual teachers, but individual changes are not powerful enough to affect school-wide improvement efforts.

For establishment models of inservice, Schiffer believes the norms will have to altered:

Deep-seated attitudes and expectations can be influenced by new ideas, but real and lasting behavioral change requires a more intensive resocialization experience - one that is powerful enough to bridge the gap between the old response patterns and new requirements...Organizational patterns and procedures [must] change to accommodate the changes occurring in people. (74)

To effect change in social norms is no easy task, but there are suggestions from the literature. Many are the same as those found in powerful staff development designs. This is sensible and reasonable, for if a design is described as powerful, it must include provisions for adapting to or changing attitudes and norms.

To encourage changes in school and teaching norms, staff members need personal support during the change

(74) Schiffer, "A Framework," pp. 5 & 9.

process. (75) The isolation of the classroom must be broken down by working with a coaching team, (76) or with a peer working on the same problem. Productive use of peers can become a mark of professionalism, not a threat to autonomy. It can counteract lack of reward and feedback by adults. Peers are helpful for they can solve mutual problems and often have similar within-role perspectives.

Principals have the responsibility of organizing such peer teams, finding time for collaboration, and providing feedback so that established school norms are not constraints to the innovation. (77) Principals need to arrange for time for guided reflection about the changes that are to be introduced and for integration of these change into the staff members' repertoires. (75, 76, 77) Principals can set the tone for changing norms by becoming knowledgeable about and participating in training and inservice options and they must provide opportunities for the staff to become knowledgeable also. (77)

The staff development design must provide opportunities to try out the new roles that may be required and consider how they may be applied. (75, 76) Persistence

(75) Courter and Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," pp.191-192.

(76) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development, pp. 73-78.

(77) Ibid., pp. 19-25.

is needed to practice a new behavior, and stick with it although the first trial may not have looked promising.

(76) When opportunities to practice with small or simulated groups are given, it allows reflective time and interactive experience. (76)

In order to integrate new goals with the norms of the school, goals should emerge from the staff or should be determined collaboratively, although organizational goals must be primary. (78) There must be an understanding that school improvement efforts are binding on the members of the group and collaborative decisions must be carried out by all. All have an obligation to carry out the joint decision made by the majority with each member free to pursue additional studies or projects. Starting with a group of volunteers and hoping the success will spread the innovation will not work. Total collaboration is needed. (77)

There must be continuity of emphasis on a particular improvement, a particular set of goals, or a specific set of desired changes in the behavior of the teachers or other staff members. (75) Authorities must not demand too many or conflicting goals or all initiatives will be weakened. Principals may facilitate the process by setting up a staff development/ school improvement council

(78) Schiffer, "A Framework," p. 9.

that will ensure focus and continuity. (77) Staff development design must consider how students will deal with discomfort when they must exhibit the new behaviors. Teaching students the cognitive and social tasks will help to sustain the innovation. (76) Successful staff development activities must be developed within the variables of adult development, social norms, organizational and managerial patterns, and rewards and incentives. (78, 79)

Policy decisions regarding the purposes, activities, and outcomes of staff development programs typically emerge from the formal authority structure. The degree of maintenance of the program, the persistence of participants in it, and the perceptions of its worth can usually be traced to the influence of the informal authority structure. Both should be considerations when doing staff development. (80)

Lack of attention to social and organizational norms will lead to frustration on the part of persons who are changing, a tendency for them to revert back to old behaviors, and, ultimately, failure to implement innovations.

Incentives for Participating in Staff Development

Teaching and organizational norms of the school may provide constraints for adoption of innovations, but some

(79) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns," p. 104.

(80) Griffin, "Toward a Conceptual Framework," p.

components of staff development programs provide incentives. Incentives for professional growth may include released time, additional pay, leadership status, inservice credits, tuition reimbursement, recognition, conference attendance, technical assistance, or increased involvement in decision making, but perhaps satisfaction is the most powerful. Rewards derived from students are the most common rewards and perhaps the most potent incentive.

Lytle cites several studies which found intrinsic rewards more powerful. Research on teacher satisfaction and motivation (Lortie, Murname and Phillips, Sergiovanni) indicated that teachers tended to be more concerned about psychic reward than extrinsic reward. They were most satisfied when their students had or developed such traits as good attitudes towards learning, high effort, good behavior, respect for their teachers, and improved academic performances. Further, teachers preferred to work in conditions they perceived as facilitating good student performance. (81) Salary did not correlate with job

(81) D.C.Lortie, Schoolteacher, A Sociological Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); R. J. Murname, and B. R. Phillips, The School as Workplace: What Matters to Teachers (Philadelphia: Mathematics Policy Research and the University of Pennsylvania, 1977); Thomas Sergiovanni, "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," In D. Gerwin (Ed.) The Employment of Teachers: Some Analytical Views (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1974), cited in James H. Lytle, "Investment Options for Inservice Teacher Training," Journal of Teacher Education 34 (January-February 1983): 29-31.

satisfaction. In a study by Lortie, he found 59% of the males and only 4% of the females cited low salaries as a source of dissatisfaction with teaching. Intrinsic reward was also promoted by Griffin:

Informal rewards for school people, particularly teachers, appear to emerge from two sources: interactions with students and alterations in conditions of work made available by authorities in the system. (82)

Another powerful intrinsic incentive is involvement in planning:

While there are logical and political reasons for such participation by teachers, the psychological underpinning provided by responsible and accountable involvement should not be underestimated as a significant reason for teacher involvement. (83)

For some teachers, taking a role in staff development as a teacher-leader provides the incentive of recognition and the feeling of self-accomplishment. The organization benefits by keeping teachers through a type of career ladder, but Howey cautions teacher-leaders do not just need to be experienced or good teachers, but need to be trained to provide expertise. (84) Goodlad also

(82) Gary Griffin, "Toward a Conceptual Framework for Staff Development," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983) pp. 235-236.

(83) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns," p. 99.

(84) Kenneth Howey, "A Program for Those Preparing Teachers for Leadership Roles and the Mentoring of New Teachers." Presentation at the twentieth annual conference of The National Staff Development Council, Chicago, 11 December, 1988.

recommends concentrating on intrinsic rewards as incentives shift from individualistic salary credits to group incentives including improved quality of the workplace.

(85)

Released time is the corollary to problem solving for time given to work on an innovation is an incentive. The Rand Study found effective programs provided released time for planning and training rather than monetary incentives. (86) For the National Inservice Network, Hutson summarizes intrinsic rewards:

The incentives for participating in inservice programs should emphasize intrinsic professional rewards. The corollary to this is that there should not be disincentives: inconvenient times or locations or other factors that would penalize participation. The research literature does not support the notion that extrinsic rewards such as extra salary credit, extra pay and so on will induce teachers to work hard planning or participating in inservice programs if professional motivation is absent. The effective implementation of inservice requires, in a word, human support -- personal contact and interaction among clients, planners, providers and consultants, and the growth of a professional supportive culture. (87)

Extrinsic rewards may not be as powerful or as long

(85) Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," p. 45.

(86) McLaughlin and Berman, "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment," p. 192.

(87) Harry Hutson, Jr., "Inservice Best Practices: The Learnings of General Education," in Collaborative Planning Guide for Personnel Development, Organizing for Change Through Planning, Prepared for the National Inservice Network in Bloomington, Indiana, Leonard C. Burello, ed. (Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981) p. 15.

lasting, but they should not be ignored. Taking part in staff development activities can be highly valued by classroom teachers who desire to move up in the system. Such visibility is often a prerequisite to upward mobility, a promotion or transfer to a preferred school.

The reward structures for participation in staff development, formal and informal, continue to be powerful organizational variables and should be a major focus of attention when planning and implementing staff development programs.

INSERVICE PROGRAM DESIGN

The last decade has brought a wealth of research on program design which considers staff development a process rather than an event. Joyce and Showers have developed an outstanding model of program design. (88)

The messages from Joyce and Shower's research are positive: nearly all teachers can acquire new skills that 'fine tune' their competence. They can also learn a considerable repertoire of new teaching strategies, but need certain conditions - conditions that are not common in most inservice settings, even when teachers participate in the governance of those settings. Those conditions form a hierarchy of program design components. The extent of usage of those components depends on the purpose: awareness, maintenance, enhancement, or substantial change.

Inservice training can produce four levels of impact on teachers: 1) general awareness, 2) acquisition of concepts and knowledge, 3) learning of principles and skills through practice, and 4) application to problem-solving in the classroom. Joyce and Showers argue that it is only when the fourth level is reached that it is

(88) Bruce Joyce, and Beverly Showers, "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research," Educational Leadership (February, 1980) : 379-385.

reasonable to look for impact on pupil learning:

Awareness alone is an insufficient condition. Organized knowledge that is not backed up by the acquisition of principles and skills and the ability to use them is likely to have little effect. (89)

The hierarchy of training components includes:

1. Presentation of theory or description of skills or strategies
2. Modeling or demonstration of skills
3. Practice in simulated and classroom settings
4. Structured and open-ended feedback
5. Coaching for application

If only the first components are used, the level of impact will be among the lowest. The more components utilized, the higher the level of impact, whether one thinks in terms of percentage of teachers that change their behavior or in terms of long-lasting changed behavior in the classroom for both teachers and students. Alone and in combination, each of these training components contributes to the impact of a training activity. If any of these components is left out, the impact of training will be weakened in the sense that fewer people will progress to the transfer level, which is the only level that has significant meaning for improvement.

If the content of training is new to teachers, training must be more extensive than if content is relatively familiar. Fine tuning existing approaches is easier than mastering and implementing new ones because

(89) Joyce and Showers, "Improving Inservice Training," p, 379.

the magnitude of change is smaller and less complex. If transfer of training is the objective, feedback and coaching in the workplace are probably necessary. The most powerful training activities, then, are those that combine theory, modeling, practice, feedback, and coaching to application. (90)

No single study has used all training components and measured effects at all levels of impact, however, training literature taken as a whole provides information on many of the possible combinations. Table II-1 summarizes the effects from several studies. The table is not complete, for, in some cases, there was no research study that measured that combination. (91)

TABLE II-1
LEVEL OF IMPACT FROM TRAINING

Training Component	Training Impact -- Increases in Standard Deviation from a Control Group		
	Knowledge	Skill	Transfer of Training
Information	.63	.35	.00
Theory	.15	.50	.00
Demonstration	1.65	.26	.00
Theory & Demo.	.66	.86	.00

(90) Joyce and Showers, "Improving Inservice Training", p, 379.

(91) Ibid., p. 71.

Table II-1 Continued

Theory & Prac.	1.15	--	.00
Theory, Demo., & Prac.	--	.72	.00
Theory, Demo., Prac., & Feedback	1.31	1.18	.39
Theory, Demo., Prac., Feedback, & Coaching	2.71	1.25	1.68

Training Components

Presentation of Theory or Description of Skill or Strategy

Theory is necessary for an understanding of the rationale behind a skill or strategy. It may be acquired through readings, lectures, or other presentations and is often the sole component of inservice training. For either fine tuning or mastery of new approaches, presentation of theory can raise awareness and increase conceptual control to some extent. It is sometimes assumed that if teachers are informed, if they know the objective, the rationale, and the substance, then the desired consequence will occur. However, it is for relatively few teachers that it results in skill acquisition or the transfer of skills into the classroom situation. Alone, it is not powerful enough to achieve much impact beyond the awareness level, but when combined with the others, it is important. (92)

(92) Joyce and Showers, "Improving Inservice Training," p. 384; Bishop, Staff Development and Instructional Improvement, p. 57.

Modeling or Demonstration of Skills

Modeling involves enactment of the teaching skill either through a live demonstration with children or adults, or through media. In a given training activity, a strategy may be modeled any number of times. Much literature is flawed because only one or two demonstrations of quite complex models of teaching have been made, thus comprising relatively weak treatment.

Modeling and demonstration appear to have a considerable effect on awareness and some on knowledge. A good many teachers can initiate demonstrated skills fairly readily and a number will transfer them to classroom practice. However, for most teachers modeling alone is unlikely to result in the acquisition and transfer of skills unless it is accompanied by other components. Fairly good levels of impact can be achieved through the use of modeling alone where the tuning of style is involved, but for the mastery of new approaches, it, by itself, does not have great power for many teachers.

Practice in Simulated and Classroom Settings

Practice involves trying out a new skill or strategy with a real class or in a simulated condition. The closer the training setting approximates the workplace, the more transfer is facilitated. How much practice is needed depends on the complexity of the skill: "To bring a

model of teaching of medium complexity under control requires twenty or twenty-five trials in the classroom over a period of about eight to ten weeks." (93)

When awareness and knowledge have been achieved, practice is a very efficient way of acquiring skills and strategies, whether related to the tuning of style or the mastery of new approaches. Once a relatively high level of skill has been achieved, a sizable percentage of teachers will begin to transfer the skill into their instructional situations, but this will not be true of all persons by any means, and it is probable that the more complex and unfamiliar the strategy, the lower the level of transfer.

Structured and Open-ended Feedback

Structured feedback involves learning a system for observing teaching behaviors and providing an opportunity to reflect on them. Feedback may be self-administered, provided by observers, or given by peers and coaches. It may be regular or occasional. It may be combined with other components, that is, it can be directly combined with practice, and a practice-feedback -- practice-feedback sequence can be developed. Taken alone, feedback can result in considerable awareness of one's teaching. In general, these changes persist as long as feedback

continues, and then styles gradually slide back toward their original point. Feedback alone does not appear to provide permanent change, but regular and consistent feedback is probably necessary if people are to make changes and maintain those changes.

Unstructured feedback consisting of an informal discussion following observation, has uneven impact. It is most likely that unstructured feedback best accomplishes an awareness of teaching style and as such can be very useful in providing 'readiness' for more extensive and directed training activities. Modeling, followed by practice and feedback, can be very powerful in achieving skill development and transfer.

The Rand study confirmed this need for feedback. Skill-specific training influenced student gain only in the short run. To encourage teacher efficacy, the factor identified as the best predictor of long range continuance of the innovation, staff feedback was necessary. These feedback activities included classroom assistance by resource personnel, regular project meetings where teachers could clarify issues and work on problems together, and teacher participation in project decisions. Observations of other classrooms were also useful because teachers could receive advice and encouragement from successful peers. The need for feedback was also confirmed by Lawrence in a review of 97 inservice programs which found training that

emphasized demonstrations, trials, and feedback was more effective than those in which teachers merely absorbed ideas for a future time. (94)

Coaching for Application: Hands-on, In-classroom Assistance with the Transfer of Skills and Strategies to the Classroom

If consistent feedback is provided with classroom practice, modeling and concept presentation, probably nine out of ten teachers, will transfer their skills into the teaching situation. For others, however, direct coaching on how to apply the new skills and models appears to be necessary.

Coaching takes place in the workplace and can be provided by peers, other teachers, supervisors, professors, curriculum consultants, or others thoroughly familiar with the approach. Coaching for application involves helping teachers analyze the content to be taught, the approach to be taken and making very specific plans to help the students adapt to the new teaching approach. Coaching provides personal support for the teacher as well as technical feedback on practice trials.

(94) Eric Research Action Brief: Staff Development, (Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 189 679, 1980) pp. 3-4; Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and David D. Marsh, "Staff Development and School Change," in Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, eds. Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), p. 77-80.

Before coaching became a common term in staff development, the Rand Corporation study found the same phenomenon. McLaughlin and Berman looked at 300 educational innovations to determine why some projects succeeded after three years and others failed. They found successful change agent projects seemed to operate as staff development projects. Concrete, ongoing training typically offered by local people who were available when needed had continued through the third year of the projects and was related to on-line planning. The staff had been working together, most often developing materials. (95)

McLaughlin believed the real contribution lay in providing the staff with a sense of involvement. Working together to develop materials gave a sense of pride in accomplishment and a sense of ownership in the project. Even more importantly, individuals were given an opportunity to think through the concepts in practical, operational terms and an important chance to communicate with other staff members. It broke down the traditional isolation of the classroom teacher, provided a sense of professionalism and cooperation not usually available in school settings, and improved building climate. (96) The

(95) Eric Research Action Brief: Staff Development, p. 2.

(96) McLaughlin and Berman, "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment," p. 192.

successful projects continued, McLaughlin believed, because of support and encouragement and flexible implementation strategies. (97)

The successful innovative projects did what coaching is supposed to do. Peers and supervisors collaborated, planned for application, analyzed content, and adapted for local conditions; teachers received feedback and worked out problems together over a period of time long enough to allow for reflection, and received personal support from each other.

Hutson and others state that sound educational reasons exist for coaching and collaboration in staff development. They improve inservice through multiple perspectives, increasing participants' sense of ownership, creating a climate in which joint planning and operating are encouraged, enlarging the circle of participants, and reinforcing the notion that decisions ought to be made on the basis of competence rather than position. (98)

(97) Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Innovations in Classroom Organization, paper presented at the sixtieth annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C. (Alexandria VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 106 895, 1975) p. 13.

(98) Harry Hutson Jr., Inservice Best Practices: The Learnings of General Education, p.8; Maria E. Defino, and Heather Carter, Changing Teacher Practices: Proceedings of a National Conference. Paper presented at Austin, Texas, 1981. (Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 223 582, 1981), p. 98.

Changing the Norms

There is a sixth component in program design that is not part of the original Joyce and Showers model, but which is addressed in their 1988 book. It is often neglected and probably accounts for much laying aside of educational innovation. The norms of teaching and of the school must be taken into account, especially those that are not under individual teacher control, or provisions made for changing norms which act as constraints to powerful staff development components.

Despite the tremendous advantages of collaboration, coaching and mentoring of teachers as components of staff development projects, a major flaw exists. This structure for cooperative problem solving is outside the norms of most teachers and schools. Teachers are unaccustomed to working with other adults as peers for their usual work condition is isolation. The peers and mentors are unprepared to coach, lacking a structure within which to operate and being unclear about their goals. Howey recently stated to be a good coach requires being more than just a good teacher and having experience; a coach needs specialized expertise to take a leadership role. (99)

(99) Kenneth Howey, "A Program for Those Preparing Teachers for Leadership Roles and the Mentoring of New Teachers, Presentation at the twentieth annual conference of The National Staff Development Council, Chicago, 11 December, 1988.

Nonetheless, coaching proved helpful in a Georgia study of 393 pairings of mentors and beginning proteges:

"Significantly more novices demonstrated mastery of 16 competencies related to effective teaching when assigned a buddy teacher." (100)

Training models are being developed to help teachers become more comfortable and proficient in unaccustomed collaborative roles. Gray has developed instruments for new teachers and their mentors to help define areas of assistance. (101) The role of mentor, as described in Gray's model, demands that the mentor alter his style from telling, to selling, to participating, to delegating, to receiving, along the lines of the Hersey and Blanchard model, as the protege grows in ability. (102) Thus, the coach must not only learn a style for mentoring, but be able to adapt it to the situation.

Gray's model for peer coaching is similar. In

(100) C.K. Tanner, and S. M. Ebers, "Evaluation of Beginning Teachers in a Performance-Based Certification Program," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1985, cited in William A. Gray, and Marilynne M. Gray, "Synthesis Research on Mentoring Beginning Teachers," Educational Leadership (November 1985): 39.

(101) William A. Gray, "Peer Coaching/Mentor Teaching," Presentation at the 1988 National Staff Development Conference, Chicago, 10 December, 1988.

(102) William A. Gray, and Marilynne M. Gray, "Synthesis Research on Mentoring Beginning Teachers," Educational Leadership (November 1985): 42.

several training projects, Gray found that participants needed training for knowing the roles and responsibilities of both partners, developing goals, determining expectations, solving problems of meeting times, action planning, and providing the appropriate kinds of help for the interaction to be successful. (103)

These roles are unfamiliar to most teachers and they proceed with trepidation, if at all. Joyce and Showers believe school organizations can encourage changes in teacher norms by making organizational changes in the building:

Schools must provide opportunities... building norms that support experimentation, instead of the one right answer, and an organizational structure that supports learning where collaboration is possible and rewarded. Time for training is provided, and teachers feel that they can experiment with curriculum and instruction. Forceful and active leadership of school and district administrators can counter prevailing norms and help establish new ones. (104)

Establishing supportive conditions for staff development must be a component in inservice design. Building principals and district administrators must believe in the project, work toward its accomplishment, participate visibly, give personal encouragement, indoctrinate teachers new to the school, schedule

(103) Gray, "Peer Coaching/Mentor Teaching," Presentation at the 1988 National Staff Development Conference, Chicago, 10 December, 1988.

(104) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 77.

meetings, and provide time and resources. These support systems will encourage teacher efficacy - the belief that teachers can make a difference - which is the best predictor of continued innovation.

In a dissertation study, Lloyd found teachers could produce the desired pedagogical changes taught to them in intensive inservice programs, but rarely used them in their classrooms. She concluded the elements firmly embedded in the schools' cultures, and in the conventional wisdom of teaching itself, reinforced old practices and discouraged the new ones. (105)

Support systems that give personal support and legitimize the innovation are needed to keep the project going. Without conscious effort to maintain the gains, they may disappear if the support system disappears. (106) Defino found without continued presence of the model, provision for follow-up, and the availability of opportunities for monitoring behavior, teachers did not continue to reflect upon their teaching strategies and reverted quickly to their original behavior patterns. (107)

(105) Dorothy M. Lloyd, "The Effects of a Staff Development Inservice Program on Teacher Performance and Student Achievement," (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973), p. 43.

(106) Bishop, Staff Development and Instructional Improvement, p. 57.

(107) Defino, Changing Teacher Practices, p. 98.

Howey and Vaughan suggest that support mechanisms provide visible evidence to participants of the commitment of the school through continuing follow-up and feedback. (108)

Fenstermacher says adapting to or changing local norms is a condition necessary for lasting change. The teacher must be helped to understand how to control the existing setting to aid the innovation, and features not under the teacher's direct control must be altered to encourage teacher performance. He continues, "The allocation of research talent to how to adopt an innovation is predicated on an affirmative answer to the question of whether this new thing is worth doing at all." (109)

Content for Staff Development Activities

Consideration that the new innovation be worthwhile seems to be sorely lacking in some staff development designs. Howey and Vaughan suggest choosing content in terms of its potency: relevance and practicality to the participants. (110) Joyce and Showers go further:

(108) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," p. 104.

(109) Gary D. Fenstermacher, "What Needs to be Known about What Teachers Need to Know," in Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research, ed. Gene E. Hall (Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1980) p. 147.

(110) Howey, and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," p. 104.

While benefits to personnel and organization are by themselves a strong rationale for a strong staff development system, the bottom line should concentrate on benefits that accrue directly to students from the study of teaching, curriculum, school improvement and technology. (111)

Content falls into four categories: 1) academic, 2) studies on teaching such as cooperative learning, or classroom management, 3) content about students such as self-concept, and 4) workshops on technology such as computers. The academic content needs of educators are so diverse that they are often addressed in university courses, except for broad topics such as language arts and math. Technology is often relatively easy to teach and sometimes to institutionalize.

Thus, most inservice content deals with the study of teaching or student characteristics. Joyce and Showers have assembled a group of studies that are appropriate for inservice training and have shown through research to make a difference in student achievement. Programs proven effective include cooperative learning from Johnson and Johnson, 1981; Ausubels's advance organizers, 1963; mnemonics by Atkinson, 1975 and Pressley and Levin, 1977; Taba's inductive social studies curriculum, 1966; Suchman's model for causal reasoning, 1964; Schrenker's inquiry training in science, 1976; Synectics, Gordon and

(111) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development, p. 27.

Poze, 1971; Roebuck, Buhler and Aspy's study on self-concept with students having learning difficulties, 1976; cybernetics by Smith and Smith, 1966; TESA from Kerman and Phi Delta Kappa, 1979; and wait-time by Rowe, 1969, 1974. (112)

The clearest evidence about the potential effects on students comes from the study of academically oriented curriculums in science and math that were developed and used from 1955 to 1975. These include programs from Bruner, 1961; Brandwein, 1962; BSC's Biology, Man, A Course of Study; School Mathematics Study Group; Individually Prescribed Instruction, and DISTAR. (113)

These practices are complex and powerful. In most cases the intellectual component of the teaching skills is fairly substantial; the teacher needs to master the theory of the model and learn to apply it to academic substance and instructional materials. It is also necessary to induce the students to engage in the cognitive and social tasks of the model. In nearly all cases, the mastery of a model by the students is the key to effectiveness. Since changes in teaching behavior are required, training in new strategies must often be intensive; thus potent content requires potent inservice program design.

(112) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development, pp. 32-44.

(113) Ibid., pp. 44-47.

The naturalistic studies, based on comparisons of effective schools and teachers, do not have as strong a research design, but are making available to the field a much clearer set of hypotheses about how to approach the problem of increasing the positive impact of the school environment. In research the increase in achievement is often quite small, but the potential number of students that could be affected by improvements in the schools is very large.

Research on effective schools is fueled by the belief that educational goals are achieved both by the organizational setting as well as by curriculums and individual teachers. Areas for staff development are expectations and standards, clarity of mission, curricular organization, the reward structure, parent relations, student involvement in governance, orientation of the peer group, provisions for orderliness and safety, instructional leadership, collaborative decision making, and organizational climate of the school. (114)

Research on effective teaching generally relates more to the management of instruction than to actual instructional behaviors. Options for staff development include time on task, amount of instructional time, maintenance of highly-structured learning environments,

(114) Ibid., pp. 47-50.

supervision of seatwork, regular assigning of homework, direct instruction, provision of practice, corrective feedback, teacher accuracy in diagnosis, and clarity of directions. Joyce and Showers are optimistic about using these topics as a basis for staff development because they often do not require extensive training and are easily implemented. (115)

Process as Content

The compliment to content, is process. While the content should be important, developing skills in inquiry and problem solving is also important to the staff and ultimately to the students. Rankin expands on this idea:

The most powerful, long-range impact of staff development will come from content designed to improve the cognitive development and inquiry skills of the participants. If school people can raise their thinking, learning, and inquiring skills, they will be better able to analyze the teaching and learning processes and to consider alternative methods and materials. They may also improve their communication and interpersonal skills. One new innovation is nice but innovative, reflective, and evaluative skills can produce self-renewal and a continuing flow of innovations. (116)

Hutson continues in the same vein:

If problem solving skills are not made a part of inservice activities, then it is unreasonable to

(115) Ibid., pp. 50-56.

(116) Stuart C. Rankin, "A View from the Schools," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 254.

expect that the activities will help teachers solve problems. Problem solving as content is justified on two levels. On a first level, the learning style of many teachers is probably more like problem-solving than anything else, and so the wisdom of teaching such skills is apparent. On another level, the skills many teachers use in teaching are themselves problem-solving competencies such as planning, classroom decision making, the analysis of classroom transactions and action research. (117)

Cautions About Content

Goodlad, Schlechty, and Rankin all caution about inservice content that emphasizes pedagogical change in schools that have climate problems. They recommend that these less satisfying schools first work on maintenance or climate activities: "Maintenance is an organizationally legitimate prerequisite to change, since an organization that cannot keep things from getting worse is in no position to make them better." (118) Goodlad believes inservice in schools that are not ready for pedagogical change will result in unmitigated disaster. Lack of authority, inability to exercise authority by the principal, mutual distrust, low faculty morale, student misbehavior, academic apathy, poor home-school relations must be addressed first before the less open subject of pedagogy. (119)

(117) Hutson, "Inservice Best Practices," p. 117.

(118) Schlechty and Whitford, "The Organizational Context of School Systems and the Functions of Staff Development," p. 82.

(119) Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," pp. 58-59; Rankin, "A View From the Schools," p. 254.

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Who should be involved in planning, presenting, implementing and following-up staff development activities?

Those with the greatest knowledge - university personnel and outside consultants - are often perceived as not being relevant, and those who are familiar with the problems - building administrators and teachers - have the problems of being evaluators or lacking the training to be effective teacher-leaders. Nonetheless, everyone wants control. In both Bruce Joyce's and Johnston and Yeakey's studies, administrators, teachers, and college faculty each favored themselves as the responsible agents for controlling staff development. (120) Hutson believes that these squabbles will not be resolved by control from a higher source:

Neither is it likely that state and federal bureaucracies will take control of inservice, for to reapply the thinking of DeTocqueville, the functions of education in a federal system may be centrally overseen but not centrally administered, or at least not successfully. (121)

Because no single group controls, or is likely in the future to control inservice, the password it seems is

(120) Eric Research Action Brief, Staff Development, p. 4.

(121) Hutson, Inservice Best Practices, p. 115

collaboration. (122) In study after study, two threads kept emerging. One was administrative support was needed to get a project started, and the second was collaboration between administrators and teachers and among teachers was needed to sustain the innovation in the classroom and institutionalize it in the school.

Administrative support was a key in successful innovative projects studied by the Rand Corporation. Principals showed high levels of commitment, (123) participated in training, gained knowledge that enabled them to help teachers with program objectives, and showed teachers that their efforts were supported. (124) Without administrative backing, the project seldom worked and was hardly ever continued after three to five years. (125) Hutson also notes that teachers need to witness administrative support in order to sustain their own extra efforts in the project. (126)

(122) Ibid., p. 114.

(123) Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, "Innovations in Classroom Organization," paper presented at the sixtieth annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C., (Alexandria VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 106 895, 1975) p. 8.

(124) Eric Research Action Brief, Staff Development, p. 3.

(125) Milbrey McLaughlin and Paul Berman, "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment," Educational Leadership 34 (December 1977):192.

(126) Hutson, Inservice Best Practices, p. 115.

Collaboration is recommended for planning, implementing, and evaluating inservice projects. Collaboration leads to greater introspection about the problem and solution (127) and allows for changes in training and assistance because key personnel have not departed after one-shot presentations. (128) Effects are longer lasting in collaborative projects (129) due to ownership, commitment, involvement, and changes in attitude. (130)

Teacher and administrator collaboration is essential in inservice, but the outside consultant or professor does not fit comfortably into the picture despite his status as expert. While it is recognized that outside consultants can be helpful in various ways, there is ample evidence that external personnel are perceived as less able to provide necessary job and site-specific help. (131)

Lawrence determined that programs in which

(127) Courter and Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," p. 192.

(128) McLaughlin and Berman, "Retooling Staff Development," p. 192.

(129) Courter and Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," p. 192.

(130) Eric Research Action Brief, Staff Development, pp. 3-4.

(131) Bruce R. Joyce, Kenneth R. Howey, and Sam J. Yarger, ISTE Report I: Issues to Face (Syracuse, N. Y.: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, 1977).

teachers participated as helpers and planners had greater success in accomplishing their objectives than did programs conducted by college or other outside personnel without teacher assistance. (132) In the Rand study of innovative change, visits by consultants and outside 'experts' were not considered particularly helpful. Teachers complained that most visiting consultants could not relate to the particular problems they were experiencing or that their advice was too abstract to be helpful. Teachers believed the most useful sessions were meetings among the project staff in which ideas were shared, problems discussed, and support given. Teachers felt that seeing a similar program for just a few hours was worth much more than several days of consultants delivering talks on philosophy. (133)

Hutson recommends specialized use of outside consultants in staff development:

Consultants should offer neither too much nor too little help. The purpose of consultant work is to help teachers adapt, not adopt innovations, and to help them learn how to solve problems rather than solve their problems for them. One way to structure consultations ... is the advisory approach whereby consultation is made only at the request of a teacher, is limited to the teacher's expressed needs, and it takes place at school during school hours. A second way ... is to organize and operate statewide

(132) ERIC Research Action Brief, Staff Development, p. 4

(133) McLaughlin, Innovations in Classroom Organization, p. 11.

dissemination systems of information pertinent to the planning and delivery of inservice. A third option is for consultants to help form temporary task forces of inservice planners in local school districts. (134)

The role of university presenters who lecture and leave is diminishing as program designs become stronger with better follow-up and greater collaboration. Creative roles for university personnel are developing such as training teacher-leaders and conducting interactive research at the school site.

Howey and Vaughan believe universities have expertise in clinical supervision, techniques for organizational problem solving, and collaborative research that schools need as tools for staff development, irrespective of content. They see a university role in training teacher-leaders and administrators to become staff development specialists within their own schools:

Currently, one of the apparent major reasons that there are not more powerful ongoing programs of staff development in districts and schools is that no one person is charged with well-defined responsibilities and authority. Often, even when there is such responsibility and authority, the person's training and skills may be lacking. It is even more rare to find an individual with such skills at the individual school building level. It is equally apparent that in the vast majority of cases the building administrator's staff development role is quite a limited one despite evidence of its crucial influence. (135)

(134) Hutson, "Inservice Best Practices," p. 15.

(135) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," pp. 111-112.

Tinkunoff and Mergendoller recommend a collaborative effort called Interactive Research and Development between classroom teachers, university researchers, and staff developers doing applied research and developing an inservice program for diffusion of that information. There were many benefits in the group Tinkunoff and Mergendoller studied: the researchers had a long term research group and a current topic; the teachers had the status of participating in significant research and collaboration with adults, which helped to break down classroom isolation; and teachers also gained skills of reflection, inquiry and problem solving that would prove useful in instruction.

It is our perception that when teachers begin to understand the 'techniques' of inquiry, and practice thinking through problems and selecting appropriate methodological strategies for further inquiry, it often has a more powerful impact on their future classroom practice than exposure to research findings in a series of inservice workshops. Teachers who participated in a project demonstrated significantly greater changes in concerns about the use of research findings and practices in teaching than those who did not participate in a project. (136)

Collaboration of university faculty with school-based teachers is often difficult due to differing perspectives and the difficulty of time restraints. Wu's

(136) William J. Tikunoff, and John R. Mergendoller, "Inquiry as a Means to Professional Growth," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 217 & 223.

experience with Florida Teacher Education Centers brought him to this conclusion: "Different organizations, with differing goals, administrative arrangements, norms, customs and language, find collaboration anxiety producing, time consuming and in the short range inefficient." Successful university-teacher projects need sufficient time to plan and overcome differing norms. (137)

Lieberman, commenting on social norms of schools, adds not only must consultants be knowledgeable about content and local conditions, they must take a personal, collaborative stance, recognizing that it is not the teachers' problem, but "our" problem. (138)

In a long-term project, Lanier found the same tensions created by differing norms, but over time found the exchange beneficial:

When formal knowledge was considered, it was consistently examined in light of the purposes, consequences, and context of teaching. When problems of teaching practice were considered, they were typically examined in light of the formal knowledge that might shed some possible light on the various resolutions that could be tried. Thus, it is fair to say that there was a flexible interplay between the theoretic and practical knowledge that might be viewed as important and helpful to teachers. (139)

(137) Wu, Facilitating University-School District Inservice, p. 3.

(138) Lieberman and Miller, "Social Realities of Teaching," p. 67.

(139) Lanier, "Tensions in Teaching Teachers the Skills of Pedagogy," p. 145.

It almost seems to be a process of elimination: university courses are not relevant to in-school problems, short term presentations by "experts" have no impact, principals are important to start change and keep it going, but are not rated highly as inservice instructors, (140) ongoing projects with experts serving as consultants are acceptable, but combining viewpoints into a workable operation is difficult and long term. The only group left is the teachers and how are teachers turned into teacher-leaders?

Most experts indicate that teachers should be responsible for much of their training because they are the most familiar with the problems in their own classrooms and their specific work situations. However, the pitfall of teacher-leaders is well summarized in the CERI report:

Unfortunately, the evidence and suggestions that teachers be given the pre-eminent voice in INSET [inservice] should not be construed that they also desire to be, or are currently competent as INSET trainers. (141)

Teachers are infrequently given training to aid them in their responsibilities for staff development. (142) A European study included results from an English and Welsh

(140) Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Inservice Education and Training Teachers, p. 32.

(141) Ibid., p. 32.

(142) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns," p. 98.

beginning teacher program which used teacher tutors for providing school-based inservice.

Whereas, at the outset of the project, there were uncertainties about both the need for and content of tutor training, by the end, the case for training was made most forcibly: 71% of all respondents agreed that tutors needed some form of training. Tutors themselves were most convinced of this, especially those from secondary schools, 94%. Eighty-seven percent said that the local educational agency should also produce written guidelines for tutors and 69% thought that on-going and not simply preparatory training was necessary. (143)

In a study of 14 English local authorities, less than 15% of advisors and inspectors, most of whom spent a great deal of their time providing inservice, had received any specific training. (144) Mulford suggests courses for teacher-leaders should include:

...the need to be aware of schools as organizations, the nature of teachers and teaching, the school's context, the trainer input dilemma, adult learning theory, emphasis on participatory approaches, experiential learning, and educational administrator training. (145)

Howey and Vaughan reemphasize the need for trained teacher-leaders who are knowledgeable. If neither the facilitator nor the participants are knowledgeable, "their wants may be satisfied according to the needs assessment, but the final product bears no fruit. They are satisfied

(143) CERl, Inservice Education and Training Teachers, p. 31.

(144) Ibid., p. 33.

(145) Ibid., p. 37.

but no better." (146)

Reinventing the wheel to build investment in a project may be an appropriate task, but going round and round on that wheel, with personnel who are not knowledgeable, supportive, or situation relevant will just leave another staff development project collecting dust on the shelf.

Joyce and Showers, Rankin, Couter and Ward, Goodlad and Hutson all see this site-specific problem solving approach to staff development as integrated with school improvement as well as with individual teacher improvement. It is seen as collegial and continuous and as the core of effective professional practice. "Few writers or researchers will deny that this statement is a best practice concept, but even fewer point to situations where it has been whole heartedly acted upon." (147)

(146) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns," p. 100.

(147) Hutson, "Inservice Best Practices," p. 11.

COST AND TIME

If the design of staff development is potent and thus long range, it is an expensive proposition both in terms of time and money. The cost of supervisors' and principals' salaries is a given, but staff development planning, participation, and follow-up take time from other duties. There are costs for trainer's fees, materials, and facilities, but paying for released time for collaboration or peer coaching is the most expensive. The European Centre for Educational Research and Innovation concluded: "Inservice which aims to improve the complex business of teaching and learning can only be effective if it is relatively lengthy, labour intensive, and, therefore, expensive." (148)

How Expensive is Staff Development?

A study of three urban school districts with reported high, medium, and low levels of staff development activity showed staff development expenditures ranging from \$1000 to \$1700 per teacher per year. These costs were not

(148) Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, In-service Education and Training Teachers (Paris Cedex, France: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1982) p. 57.

all recognized as staff development expenses by the districts and, in fact, exceeded their estimates of such expenditures by fifty to sixty times. (149) It is difficult to account for all costs, especially the percentage of time of district personnel who are involved and advancement on the salary schedule.

Lytle uses the example of Philadelphia to demonstrate how expensive advancement on the salary schedule may be:

A teacher with an MA and 11 years' experience is paid \$3,100 more than a teacher with a BA and 11 years; the difference increases to \$5,200 for a teacher with an MA and 30 additional credits. The total salary differential paid Philadelphia teachers in 1980-81 for advanced training exceeded \$21,700,000 or about 7% of the annual salary costs in Philadelphia, an average of about \$1735 per teacher. Direct expenditures on inservice courses and other teacher development activities in Philadelphia were trifling in comparison, well below \$500,000.

Further, it recurs annually; teachers are paid for accumulated hours every year afterward. At current salary levels that would mean a cost of \$75,000 to \$90,000 for each teacher with a Master's degree over a 25-30 year career. (150)

Costs are very difficult to ascertain due to lack of and dispersion of data and non-comparability of programs. Staff development is often an ongoing activity carried on concurrently with other activities, so its costs

(149) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," pp. 96-97.

(150) Lytle, "Investment Options for Inservice Teacher Training," p. 28.

are often not clearly separated. Nonetheless, CERI reported the types and percentages of expenses paid in an Australian staff development study: accomodation and travel, 20-25%; salaries of substitute teachers, 60-65%; salaries of administrative and clerical staffs and general office supplies and postage, 10-12%; and lecturers' fees, materials and equipment for specific courses, 8-12%. (151) This accounting is most likely a typical breakdown of costs for a district not including salary schedule advancement.

Joyce and Showers describe the Schenley program in Pittsburgh, which was an obviously potent design, but a very expensive one. The program restaffed one secondary school with outstanding district teachers and a staff development team. Over three years, every secondary teacher in Pittsburgh spent two consecutive months in residence at Schenley relieved by a cadre of substitutes. This program provided an unusually long time for training, but cost the equivalent of staffing an additional high school for three years. (152)

To become more cost effective, researchers suggest school-based staff development. The enormous costs of moving up on the salary schedule may be eliminated because

(151) CERI, In-service Education and Training Teachers, pp. 38-40.

(152) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development, p. 23.

graduate credits are not included. Site-based teachers who are given specialized training to spread the innovation to teachers within the school are also considered to be cost effective:

More intensive, small-group training, presented in several sessions that can be recycled to reach additional staff, may have the most cost-effective end-product. This type of training allows participants to interact with each other, to have time to develop materials rather than to only listen to suggestions, and to grow as a group, learning from each other as well as from the facilitator. (153)

There seems to be no way around it: "For certain, a best practice in inservice is that inservice programs should be adequately supported, preferably with long term, hard money." (154)

Finding Time

"Precious few funds can be used for staff development or to provide access to teacher time for inservice education. This last, finding time for school staff to meet and learn, is the toughest of all." (155)

There is considerable disagreement as to what is the appropriate time, even if there are funds to access it.

(153) Angela Carrasquillo, and Frances Segan, Staff Development: From the Bilingual Schoolroom to Beyond the Walls of the University (Alexandria, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 265 736, 1986) p. 17.

(154) Hutson, "Inservice Best Practices," p. 115.

(155) Rankin, "A View from the Schools," p. 256.

One group holds that released time must be arranged, and the other says that classroom time cannot be taken away.

After School Time

Many teachers and administrators view the uninterrupted presence of the teacher in the classroom as essential. Thus, any inservice activity that systematically removes teachers from the classroom is likely to be resisted by some teachers and administrators as distracting from the primary mission of the schools. (156) This position may also be influenced by political decisions such as by the School Board of Broward County, Florida who in 1987-88 demanded that staff development activities not take place during class time. (157)

Released Time

Bishop recommends released time because staff development that has been consigned to non-classroom time indicates to teachers that it is extra, and not integral to the instructional program. (158) McLaughlin and Berman

(156) Schlechty and Whitford, "Organizational Context of School Systems," pp. 65-66.

(157) Interview with Dr. Mary Dorsey, Teacher Education Center Director, Broward County, Florida, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, February 1988.

(158) Bishop, Staff Development and Instructional Improvement, p. 68.

found in successful, highly innovative programs, districts used released time instead of monetary incentives for participation in staff development:

Teaching requires an enormous amount of physical and psychic energy; it is unrealistic to expect teachers to undertake significant professional growth activities entirely in the evening or on weekends. Provision of release time seems to provide a 'signal' to teachers that the district takes their professional development seriously and they should take it seriously as well....If staff development programs are to contribute to the vitality and quality of a district's educational program, release time is an issue that cannot be swept under the rug. (159)

Lanier also argues for released time because after school, teachers are already fatigued and overloaded with stress. She recommends a coordinated approach with student teachers who are totally familiar with classroom procedure and content to avoid the cost of paid substitutes and simultaneously to coordinate pre-service and in-service training. (160) In a San Diego project, paid substitutes were employed, but a building cadre well acquainted with the school improvement project was used, and teachers felt there was less disruption. (161)

(159) McLaughlin and Berman, "Retooling Staff Development," p. 12.

(160) Lanier, "Tensions in Teaching Teachers," p. 137.

(161) Courter and Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," p. 202.

Sufficient Time is Important

In the Rand Study of successful, highly innovative projects, participants singled out the twice-weekly afternoon meetings as one of the most important factors contributing to project success. McLaughlin states, "We found that where meetings were infrequent or irregular, morale was noticeably lower and reports of friction within the project were higher." (162)

Successful programs require time to learn concepts, change attitudes, adapt to local conditions, and practice new skills. In Florida's exemplary inservice programs, almost all of the 24 cited programs lasted for an entire year, some extended up to three years, and some went on indefinitely. A minority entailed from 30 to 150 hours of contact time. (163)

To make a noticeable impact, educators must commit funds and time to staff development as in a curriculum change/staff development program in Berea, Ohio that was to take place over a five year period. In the first year, team members reviewed research, reviewed current practices, selected objectives, prepared guides and obtained reactions

(162) McLaughlin, Innovations in Classroom Organization, p. 12.

(163) State of Florida Department of Education, Strides into the Future of Florida's Teacher Education Center Programs (Tallahassee: Department of Education, 1985), pp. 3-76.

from staff, parents and community. In the second year, formal adoption of the program guide occurred. In year three, changes in classroom practice, observable by a supervisor were expected. Only in the fourth and fifth years of the cycle were the curricular changes expected to manifest themselves in students' behavior. (164)

Thus, significant amounts of time and money must be allocated over a lengthy period of time if improvement is expected within the schools.

(164) Romberg, and Price, "Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development as Cultural Change," p. 175.

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Several types of questions may be answered in staff development evaluation. Some deal with the results, others evaluate the process, and still others become the basis of the next planning stage. What interventions were used and who participated? Has the program accomplished its goal? What additional support mechanisms are necessary? Does the program need to be continued? Does the program need to be modified? How far have we progressed? How can the staff development system be improved? Has the expenditure of limited time and money been justified? To what extent will changed practices continue?

Types of Evaluations

Evaluation may be approached in three ways which move from simple to complex. Each may be considered appropriate depending upon the initial purpose of staff development: the opinionaire-questionnaire, evaluation which considers changed teacher behavior and takes into account the follow-up aspects of staff development, and program evaluation which includes not just the individual teacher, but the impact upon students and the organization.

The Opinionnaire

The opinionnaire is the most commonly used instrument for evaluating staff development activities. It is often given at the end of the training session or occasionally after a short period of time. It is simple, inexpensive, and often yields very little useful information. It is typically a check-off form or has a five point scale on which to rate the presenter, the level of understanding perceived by the participant, satisfaction, or future applicability of the idea. When opinionnaires were checked independently in an European study, their reliability was shown to be questionable.

(165) They are poor predictors of implementation.

Self reports which are completed following try out of the skill are also often inaccurate. It is difficult for teachers to estimate their own skills because they have infrequent opportunity to observe each other, thus, little basis for comparison. Joyce and Showers found that "extremely skillful teachers routinely underestimated their competence and ability and focused on their (perceived) shortcomings." (166)

If the purpose of the initial training was to build

(165) Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Inservice Education and Training Teachers, p. 47.

(166) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 118.

awareness, to provide an enjoyable experience, or to reaffirm current practices, then the opinionnaire serves the purpose quite well. If the purpose of training was to change student and teacher behaviors in the classroom, the opinionnaire is inadequate.

Two unanticipated outcomes may develop from the use of opinionnaires. First, familiar topics are most often rated highly, thus, known topics become perpetuated in staff development activities. Secondly, due to the perpetuated offerings, teachers get the impression that they must know everything worth knowing, an impression staff developers have not intended, especially in an era where knowledge as to what constitutes effective schooling is expanding at an astounding rate. (167)

Evaluation for Staff Development Meant to Enhance

Much of staff development has to do with the enhancement of commonplace activities of the school such as improved pedagogy, improved curricula, management practices, student-teacher relations, and the like. Individual teacher growth and change may be the focus of these types of inservice, and evaluation needs to discover what has changed in the classroom due to staff development intervention.

Opinionnaires at the end of the instructional sequence do not give this type of information.

Schlechty notes that for enhancement types of inservice activities, tangible outcomes, such as reading scores, are not appropriate evaluating criteria. (168) Changes in teacher behavior need to be established and evaluated first. Rankin adds:

Although research can do little as yet to connect staff development efforts causally with pupil attainment of learning objectives, teaching behavior is seen both as modifiable through staff development and as a key variant in student achievement. (169)

Assessing changes in teacher behavior is not an easy thing to do. First, the evaluator must know what the teacher was doing previously by establishing baseline data before the project ever begins, perhaps as part of the needs assessment. Existing knowledge, skills, and attitudes pertaining to the goal should be documented. Then, precise evaluation criteria are needed and variables identified. Griffin states:

In general, the effects of staff development interventions are more easily identified when the interventions are precisely purposeful, focused on particulars of educational activity, and bounded by an observable situation. (170)

(168) Schlechty and Whitford, "The Organizational Context of School Systems," p. 83.

(169) Rankin, "A View from the Schools," p. 252.

(170) Griffin, "Toward a Conceptual Framework," p. 244.

The training of evaluators and observation time are both very expensive. In an evaluation report of several European countries, sophisticated instruments and evaluation designs were rarely feasible because they were too expensive and the courses being evaluated often were not amenable to a behavioral approach. (171)

Since it is so difficult to measure success of an inservice program in terms of teacher behaviors, Howey and Vaughan suggest some programs may be judged successful "by virtue of their coherence in terms of employing empirically supported principles." (172)

Evaluating Student Behaviors

Evaluating the impact of staff development programs on student learning is even more difficult than assessing changes in teacher behavior and perhaps inappropriate for enhancement inservice. There are so many variables. "The implementation ...is heavily influenced by its context. The energy and interest of the schools and teachers amplify or diminish the effects of training events." (173) The

(171) Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Inservice Education and Training Teachers, p. 47.

(172) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," p. 105.

(173) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 111.

entire sequence of training needs to be scrutinized: initial skills and knowledge, design complexity, proper application in the classroom, and support for carry through. Romberg and Price believe that only in long term staff development activities, perhaps in the fourth or fifth year, could an impact be seen in student achievement.

(174) Howey and Vaughan state:

No appropriate and feasible methodology exists for exact tracking of these relationships on any large scale. Those who have done it have done so on a limited basis with tight experimental controls and at a relatively high cost. (175)

Joyce and Showers recommend that in situations where complex evaluation is desired on a limited budget, a sample population be studied thoroughly rather than doing a superficial study of the entire population. (176)

Yet without an attempt to link the bottom line, student achievement, to inservice activities, there is dismay over the time and money spent. Berquist writes:

The lack of absolute conclusions from impact evaluations...discourages directors and faculty from conducting studies. Without the studies, it is difficult to justify continued funding. (177)

(174) Romberg and Price, "Curriculum Implementation," p.165.

(175) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," p. 106.

(176) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 111.

(177) Bergquist, Florida Teacher Education Center Evaluation, p. 68.

Evaluating the Staff Development Program

Griffin and Hutson believe the focus of evaluation

should be on the program rather than on individuals.

Hutson, in describing best practices, states that

evaluation should be a collaborative venture with a primary purpose of assisting with program planning and

implementation. (178) Griffin suggests that data should be

gathered to provide information about program effectiveness, not the participants' capabilities or

aptitudes. (179) Hutson believes that program evaluation

consists of technical questions and should rely on expert

advice, rather than client satisfaction. Components should

be evaluated for effectiveness, adequacy, and relevancy.

(180) Recommendations from program evaluation will not

only describe the results, but will specify modifications

for continued use or disuse of the components.

Good and Grouws describe program evaluation in a

Tulsa project for improved procedures in math classes.

While satisfactory progress was made in familiar procedures

(178) Hutson, "Inservice Best Practices," p. 116.

(179) Gary A. Griffin, "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Staff Development Programs," in Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, eds. Ann Lieberman and Lynn Miller (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), pp. 127-128.

(180) Ibid., p. 114.

such as review schedules and assigning homework, the more complex area of instruction showed only small increases. Thirty-three percent of the treatment group exhibited the desired behavior, versus only twenty percent of the control group of teachers. Neither figure was satisfactory, and it was decided that a more intense design for inservice was needed to accomplish the desired result in instruction. By breaking down the evaluation into various components, specific recommendations could be made for continuing the staff development program with greater anticipated effectiveness. This evaluation analysis was ambitious in scope and expensive in the use of trained observers and test data analysis, even in a small project which included 40 teachers. (181)

Evaluation Should be Formative as Well as Summative

Making mid-stream changes before things get out of hand may be accomplished if there is ongoing evaluation. Successful innovative projects studied by the Rand Corporation were more likely to engage in flexible on-going planning that permitted frequent reassessment and fairly immediate resolution of problems. In those projects where frequent staff meetings for the purpose of on-going

(181) Thomas Good, and Douglas Grouws, "The Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project: An Experimental Study in Fourth-Grade Classrooms," Journal of Educational Psychology 71 (June 1979): 357-358.

assessment were held, there were fewer serious implementation problems and the staff demonstrated higher morale and a greater sense of cohesiveness. (182)

Evaluation Appropriate for Staff Development Meant to Establish Innovations

A new focus for staff development has emerged in recent years that is aimed at the system as well as the individual. It focuses upon the educator, the staff as a whole, and the climate of the workplace rather than upon the educator's direct relation to students but still maintains the ultimate purpose of effecting schooling. Examples include greater collegiality, opportunities for self-actualization of educators, increasing teacher participation in school decision making, and allowing for peer-group interaction. (183) This focus is most closely associated with school-based staff development.

Because the structure of the organization and existing patterns of relationships must be altered to accomodate establishment innovations, system evaluation is required as well as individual performance evaluation.

(184) "Essentially, the issue is whether an active system

(182) McLaughlin, Innovations, p.12.

(183) Griffin, "Guidelines," p. 128.

(184) Schlechty and Whitford, "The Organizational Context of School Systems," p. 167.

is operating and the lives of all personnel are touched regularly by it." (185)

The complexity of establishment types of staff development, is necessarily followed by a need for complex evaluation. The organization and the inservice plan are entwined, and evaluation of only one part would be incomplete. System evaluation may focus upon governance processes, reconceptualizing rewards for participants (time, status, technical support, money), communication systems, support systems, and monitoring and evaluation systems. (186) Decision making, leadership, community relations, expectation levels for students, mission statements, curriculums, and the climate of the organization may also be analyzed in addition to individual teacher and student changes.

As in evaluation of teachers and programs, the state of the existing organization should first be documented, perhaps as part of the needs assessment. The difficulty with this type of top-notch evaluation is although the benefits are apparent, it is beyond the temporal and financial capabilities of many districts.

(185) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 112.

(186) Griffin, "Guidelines," p. 129.

Documentation

Many instruments are available to the evaluator without reinventing the wheel. The instruments are listed in Table II-2.

TABLE II-2

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

NAME	PURPOSE
CASES (Classroom analysis schedule for educational settings)	Student coping styles
STARS (Spaulding Teacher Teachers Activity Rating Schedule)	Teacher behavior
FLACCS (Florida Climate & Control System)	Classroom interaction
OSCAR SV	Classroom interaction
TIS (Teacher Innovator System)	Classroom interaction
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	Personality variables
Conceptual Level	Personality variables
CBAM (Concerns Based Adoption Model)	Concerns about and use of innovations
Growth States	Level of participation in staff development activities
School Improvement Questionnaire	Health & activity of school, readiness for staff development
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire	Principal leadership styles (187)

(187) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p.

There are also situation specific instruments for collecting data. These include structured interviews, structured observations, questionnaires, inventories, document analysis, and student testing data. It is best to use multiple sources reflecting multiple perspectives and consult experts when doing intense evaluation.

To the planner absorbed in implementing and evaluating staff development programs, it is easy to get carried away. Griffin cautions:

It is important to remember that participants in these programs are usually involved in the dailiness of school life. This dailiness is time consuming, energy reducing and the principal focus of teachers' professional lives...Even with the most well-intentioned participant in a program to improve the nature and quality of school life, it is unreasonable to assume that elaborate and time-consuming evaluation procedures are realistic. (188)

Intense evaluation is difficult because all the components interact with and are influenced by each other. There are so many links in the chain that tracing effective and ineffective procedures is difficult. Enthusiastic teachers may compensate for poor staff development design; great design in a poor climate may be unsuccessful; well trained teachers may not teach necessary student behaviors and find implementation difficult; organizations may enthusiastically sponsor training, but fail to change social norms of the school and thus discourage continued

(188) Griffin, "Guidelines," p. 135.

implementation. Evaluation that is diagnostic, ongoing, uses multiple perspectives and investigates components appropriate to the initial purpose will provide outcome data as well as information to improve results.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Five questions guided this study. Question one asked what authorities said were appropriate means for planning, executing and evaluating staff development programs. Question two asked what were appropriate procedures for school-based inservice and when was this procedure appropriate to use. The answers, which were taken from the literature findings presented in Chapter II, are given in brief summaries at the beginning of each section in this chapter.

Questions three, four and five were

3. What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for planning, executing, and evaluating staff development programs?
4. What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for conducting school-based inservice?
5. Are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers consistent with the components frequently reported by the authorities?

These questions are answered in Chapter III as the data are presented and analyzed in comparison with best practices.

PURPOSES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Staff development literature recommends no best practices when it comes to the purposes of inservice; there are just choices. Districts invest funds under the assumption that developing skills and knowledge of personnel will result in greater student achievement. Efforts may be focused on the teacher: removal of deficiencies, personal growth, higher status, advanced credentials, enlivenment of a veteran staff, a cure for burn-out or focused on the organization: breaking down isolation, increasing communication, improving school effectiveness, accomplishing school goals, improving teaching and learning in general, or implementing new programs. In almost any of these areas the purpose may be to maintain current practices, to enhance practices, or to establish new practices.

In setting purposes, a push may be felt from new technology or new research, the need to retrain stable teaching forces, or from public pressure. The choices made may be weighted toward the needs of the organization or the needs of the individual. Purposes are also influenced by the constraints, norms, and conditions of the organization.

The purposes and goals of each Teacher Education

Center or "TEC" are set by the TEC Council, a collaborative group of teachers, administrators, university personnel and sometimes other participants operating within State statutes. The Department of Education's stated purpose for TEC's is, "to increase the knowledge, skills, and attitudes which enable educational personnel to perform their assigned tasks with maximum effectiveness" (1). Staff development programs are to be developed from assessed needs. TEC's are also given authority to facilitate the entry or reentry of educational personnel into the teaching profession, but no State Department of Education rules are identified which directly address TEC involvement in the certification - recertification process. Constraints in Florida include State mandates, recertification legislation, stated goals of the TEC system, younger staffs, teacher shortages, and political constraints. Purposes were interpreted in many ways in Table III-1 when TEC's were asked to identify their objectives on the questionnaire.

Teacher staff development activities can be used to fulfill many purposes. Please check all the aims of teacher inservice programs sponsored by your TEC for 1988-89. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important and "L" next to the least important.

(1) Rules of the Florida Department of Education, State Board of Education, Section 6A-5.055.

Table III-1
PURPOSES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

	Number	Percent
For the general improvement of teaching and learning		
Checked	36	95%
Least	2	11%
Most	25	66%
To accomplish a particular school goal		
Checked	35	92%
Least	1	2%
Most	18	47%
To implement a new program		
Checked	35	92%
Least	1	2%
Most	14	37%
For teacher recertification		
Checked	36	95%
Least	4	11%
Most	14	37%
To foster personal growth of teachers		
Checked	36	95%
Least	7	18%
Most	12	32%
To meet teacher deficiencies		
Checked	34	89%
Least	5	13%
Most	9	24%
As a cure for burn out		
Checked	29	76%
Least	19	50%
Most	2	5%
To aid the enlivenment of an aging staff		
Checked	26	68%
Least	18	47%
Most	1	2%

All of the districts identified multiple purposes for their staff development programs. It was clear that directions were not followed on many questionnaires as several directors checked many options as being the one most important and many options as being the one least important. The results of the questionnaires must thus be looked at as being indicative rather than as being precise.

As the questionnaire responses were analyzed, pertinent comments from personal interviews with nine TEC directors were included to broaden the analysis of the data. Questionnaire responses were reported in table form and interview data was attributed to specific TEC directors. Each item on the questionnaire were broken down into tables by district characteristics: whether the TEC served single or multiple districts, whether the director was full or part time, whether the TEC served teachers only or also served administrators and noncertified staff, by district size, and by district location. These characteristics were the same factors used to identify representative districts for interview. Due to the great bulk of these additional tables, and the relatively few differences demonstrated in the characteristics, these tables were placed in Appendix F with table numbers corresponding to table numbers in Chapter III.

The Improvement of Teaching and Learning

The purpose of staff development most frequently cited on the questionnaire was for the general improvement of teaching and learning and was recognized as most important by two thirds of the responding TEC's. This purpose approximates the State's goal and concurs with the general understanding of staff development. However, improving teaching and learning is so general and innocuous as a choice, one needs to look at other purposes to see how organizational and personal needs were balanced and if the purpose was to maintain, enhance, or establish.

This most frequently cited goal of the TEC's in their regular September to June programs was a process goal rather than a content goal. The director of TEC 4 explained: "Specific [academic] content is more reserved for the summer institute...The money that we get for that is more money than we get to operate the TEC." The State of Florida has funded summer institutes, currently at a level of nine million dollars a year, which are solely courses in academic content. Although summer institutes were managed by the TEC's, they were not a part of their regular programs and were funded separately. Summer institutes had competitive enrollment limited by funding, and volunteer teachers were screened by the TEC Council for acceptance. Classes were usually 60 contact hours, and

teachers received inservice credit and were paid a stipend.

Process classes or workshops that may be applied to any field such as dropout prevention or effective teaching methods were called generic inservice in Florida and could not be offered through summer institute. These generic programs were offered during the year, and programs abounded such as Project TEACH, Project PRIDE, Learning Channels, POWER (a research base for the teacher evaluation system), and CRISS (Content Reading Including Study Skills). Because academic content was mostly reserved for summer institute, it was not surprising that the most commonly cited purpose for inservice programs during the regular school year was one of process and not of content.

Implementing Goals and New Programs

The next most commonly cited areas on the questionnaire were to accomplish a particular school goal and to implement a new program. Many of these programs dealt with the content of new State mandates. These choices reflected a priority toward organizational needs and establishment programs. TEC 3 director lamented:

The main purpose and intent is to provide for improvement in the classroom based on the local needs assessment but the State mandates are overwhelming and take away the funds for local needs. The State mandates must be taken care of first and local needs receive second priority.

Developing goals is always a matter of balancing personal and organizational needs, but in Florida,

questionnaire results showed the heavier weighting was given to organizational needs despite a teacher majority on the TEC Council. State mandates commanded priority over everything else. Some Councils tried to coordinate and balance organizational and personal needs by developing district goals from perceived teacher needs, and other TEC's by only assessing teacher needs within the framework of district and school goals. There was little evidence in most districts that district goals, school goals and individual needs were coordinated in any way.

Recertification

Recertification was the next area of inservice importance on the questionnaire with 37% of the respondents answering it was the most important purpose. Classes and recordkeeping for recertification were not included in the original TEC legislation, but they were a major part of TEC services. TEC's not only provided classes for recertification, they maintained all the records and counseled teachers on requirements, which was very time consuming. Teachers must recertify every five years with 120 contact hours of either university credit or TEC inservice or any combination. The advantages of TEC recertification were low cost, convenient time and place, and relevancy of courses to local needs. In the 1983 evaluation report, 41% of teachers said they renewed their

certificates through the TEC and the majority of TEC programs were developed for certification or recertification.

During July of 1988, changes in recertification were made. Teachers and administrators were required to have 120 hours in each of their certificates with 60 of those 120 hours in content of their specific area. Teachers with multiple certificates began scrambling, realizing they would have to take the equivalent of two colleges courses in a five year period for each of their certificates. These changes prompted great activity in the TEC's. TEC 5 director recalled:

In a normal year, this county would extend between 60 and 70 teaching certificates which is about 9% of our staff through inservice, which indicates that in about a five year period about 50% of our teachers will extend their certificates through inservice and about half through college credit. Last year the county did 167 teachers through inservice alone which projected means that our rate of renewal through inservice has jumped from 50% to 80 or 90%...We did tremendous publicity and offered programs specifically in generic training for certificate renewal. Last year we had 63,000 inservice points in this county...Last year that was our focus and most other things because of the rule changes were set aside and we hit certification.

Those districts which were located farthest from universities felt the greatest need to provide courses for recertification. The director of TEC 8, which was located 70 miles from the nearest university, expressed doubts about being able to take the place of a college adequately.

Yes, I'm in the college business, and I'm able to offer staff development activities for elementary,

but I'm not in a position to provide adequate staff development activities for secondary content. I simply don't have enough [teachers in his area] to justify the expense.

While TEC's were often more convenient than colleges, offered courses directly relevant to local needs, and often offered formats preferable to college courses, the TEC's sometimes competed with available college classes thus diluting their other services and reducing their funds. Recertification is also focused on the individual teacher and affords no coordinated benefit to the school or district. Little TEC-university coordination was seen and the universities showed little or no initiative in offering specific courses to meet local needs.

Much cynicism was expressed over new certification requirements. TEC 3 director said, "Credentialing is wagging the whole dog. Credentialing becomes the key focus not the updating of necessary skills."

Personal Growth

"To foster personal growth of the teacher" ranked fifth in the questionnaire composite. State mandates, school goals and district goals came before personal benefits to the teacher. Only 32% of the directors marked this goal as most important and 18% marked it as least important. This again confirmed the greater importance given to organizational goals by the majority of Florida TEC's rather than to personal needs of teachers. Achieving

personal growth is important to the satisfaction level of adults, but TEC's believed teachers could find opportunities to meet their personal preferences and needs through the myriad of classes and workshops that were offered or through taking classes at the local college or university. Achieving higher status or advanced degrees were left to the initiative of the teacher.

Teacher Deficiencies

"To meet teacher deficiencies" ranked sixth on the questionnaire with 24% marking this item as most important. The exception was in the northwest where 57% of the directors marked this item as most important and none marked it as least important. The complete breakdown of this questionnaire item by district characteristics may be found in Appendix F, Table F-1.

The director of TEC 8 said they were between a rock and a hard place in the northwest. If a teacher were told that he needed remediation, there were few TEC resources within the district to provide it, and universities were far from the small districts. Although State law allowed for dismissal of tenured teachers, the district must first go through an assistance program which TEC 8 would have liked but could not afford. "If I can't offer staff development to good teachers, I certainly can't offer it to poor teachers. Because of the limited dollars, it's

difficult to provide staff development, period." During the interview, this director said:

It's not a reflection of the northwest having more deficient teachers than anybody else. It's a reflection of size and the ability of districts to cope with the problem. The northwest and the north central area is where the small, sparsely populated districts are clustered, so it's a selection of size and resources....We're not in a position to offer assistance and the problems aren't going to improve, which means that you're going to have to keep them anyway, so who's kidding whom?

The director's analysis was consistent with the questionnaire responses. Thirty-two percent of the small districts marked "teacher deficiency" as most important, 16% of medium sized districts, and 14% of large districts. His geographical assessment was accurate also: 57% of the northwest districts marked teacher deficiency as most important, 28% of central districts, 0% of northeast and southern districts. While poor, rural districts were not in a strong position to remediate teacher needs, their levels of frustration placed remediation high on their lists of staff development purposes.

The need for staff development to meet teacher deficiencies was not as prominent in other areas of the state which had larger, wealthier districts and were experiencing phenomenal growth; Hillsborough County was planning to build 22 new schools in the next five years. The problem of southern and northeastern districts was to find a certified body for the classroom. Staff development for the remediation of deficiencies is teacher focused and

a maintenance program.

Burn Out and Aging Staffs

While there were some staff development activities aimed at the veteran staff, burn out was ranked next to last and rated as least important by 50% of the respondents, and enlivenment of an aging staff was rated least important by 47%. Florida's rapid population expansion had created young faculties and growth was so rapid that several counties actively recruited out-of-state. The State held special summer institute content courses to retrain teachers in state-wide critical teacher shortage areas. These choices for veteran staff inservice were teacher focused and maintenance programs.

Although a major focus of staff development is on beginning teachers and those new to the state, if experienced teachers are ignored, districts may lose the backbone of their systems. Programs that train experienced teachers as mentors or peers could have the benefit of rejuvenating older staff, taking advantage of their expertise, and enculturating new teachers into the system.

Beginning Teacher Program

Although not included on the questionnaire, the Beginning Teacher Program, BTP, ranked high among the purposes of the TEC's. It is a State mandated program,

with protected funding. Every first year teacher, every teacher new to Florida, regardless of his experience, and any Florida teacher who has let his certificate lapse must go through the program.

Although BTP differs slightly from county to county, it is similar to the Florida Performance Measurement System which is based on effective teaching behaviors. (FPMS is the standard evaluation tool for most Florida teachers.) For the experienced teacher, BTP may be as simple as two classroom observations by a supervisor, but in other cases it may include support teams and a series of classes and workshops. During interviews, it was found that some small and medium districts were able to get the most out of their money by opening BTP classes to experienced teachers as refresher courses, or as an introduction to the effective teaching research, or to the FPMS.

In general, the purposes of most TEC's were so diffused, as indicated by questionnaire answers and interviews, that all services were diluted and staff development offerings pulled at one another rather than supported each other. Although more types of programs focused on the teacher, the greater priority was given to organizational needs. The establishment of new programs ranked higher than maintenance programs. New State mandates in certification were changing the balance toward

an individualistic approach which gave no coordinated benefit to the district. The constraints of State mandates, recertification requirements, young staffs, limited funds, and teacher shortages influenced the choices made for the goals of staff development. Without strong leadership from the TEC director or upper administration to channel staff development programs into a coordinated whole, where each part supported the others, there was little hope for ending the fragmentation and achieving noticable results.

Interview Results Differed

In follow-up interviews, five of nine directors reported that recertification was their first priority. Credentialing really was wagging the inservice dog! TEC's 1, 2, 5, 8, and 9 were most concerned with recertification. TEC 3 believed the purpose should be improvement in the classroom but was overwhelmed by State mandates.

TEC's 4, 6, and 7 had a markedly different philosophy - the individual school should be the unit of change, and State mandates and recertification requirements could be worked into larger goals that were based upon teacher and district needs. TEC 7 was guided by school goals. It preferred working on the school level because it dealt with nine different districts. "District goals are too large, too difficult to change. We've had our best

results when we worked with an entire faculty on a specific area, provided long term training, follow-up, and support."

Only TEC's 4 and 6 had made a proactive effort to coordinate staff development offerings. They saw staff development as a process with a much broader purpose than recertification or a series of mandated courses. TEC 4's purposes were to improve instruction and build climate, and TEC 6's aims were school goal accomplishment and teaching effectiveness. TEC's 4 and 6, however, were single district TEC's and could tie school-based staff development into district goals. The director of TEC 6 explained:

Staff development is a process. You have to have all the research that we put in here and is behind our program, which indicates without the buy-in of the participant, you don't have the kind of result you want. Plus, you've got to have the follow-up and the coaching, and you've got to deal with those things. If you can't afford to do it, there's no point in even offering the thing.

We know the school is where change must occur and we don't let them just say we want this training. It has to tie into what their plan is and what their goals are. We have a process in place to identify goals...That is really our philosophy, that the schools must do some bonding, must do some vision building, goal setting, they've got to know what the research is, and they have to look at successful practices they already have.

The director of TEC 4 had much the same philosophy.

Inservice is a very narrow little chunk of staff development. Inservice is very formalized training workshops and programs specifically designed to change teacher behavior in some way, and it meets all the State requirements such as 10 hours, appropriate for certificate renewal and some kind of evaluation.

Staff development, on the other hand to us, is

any kind of activity to improve instruction, or to build climate, or to develop the student conduct code, or to select textbooks. It's any kind of activity that the district does to meet its goal involving people working together. School climate is one of our major goals...Recertification and keeping up credentials is like one of our last goals. We expect people to keep up their license by taking these programs. Staff development is developing and achieving district goals, improving school climate, increasing communication and increasing productivity among staff members. It encompasses instructional and noninstructional personnel.

These two districts did proactive planning. Both districts had defined district goals which were incorporated into school goals and then into individual teacher goals. The director of TEC 4 explained how their purposes were set.

Some of our original goals come straight from the State Standards of Excellence, by which our schools are measured and by which we have to abide, so we start with some very general State goals and we tailor these to the district. We give our teachers all that information so that none of it is a mystery. We tell them some goals do just come out of the sky. It's called the State Department of Education and we don't have any control over that, but there are many other goals that we do.

We give them [the teachers] this graphic of a bull's eye...The outer ring is the State, and then the district goals, then school goals, then departmental goals, and then your goals and all of those are connected to make the whole...Our new teacher assesment system ties individual teacher objectives to the school objectives...so we've got that all connected now. [TEC 4's principals' goals are also tied to school goals.]

Both districts made decisions to focus on a limited number of goals each year so that it wouldn't be like "four mongrels all tuggin' on one rag." TEC 4 focused on a few of the State's 12 in a three to five year plan. "When

there are so many focuses, it's so diluted. We really need to be concentrating our efforts." TEC 6 director observed:

You can't focus on everything. You have to focus on the school, number one. One of the reasons we developed this long range plan was because we knew we had to visibly focus. We were trying to do too much for too many and by making that model, we show that teaching effectiveness is tied into leadership and school improvement. That really pieces together and that's the major part of our program.

These two districts were unusual in their efforts to avoid the fragmentation that exists in staff development in general and especially in Florida due to the multiple responsibilities with which TEC's are charged. Through the strong leadership of two talented and knowledgeable TEC directors with the support of their superintendents, a proactive stance toward coordinating district goals with staff development and increasing individual productivity had been taken.

The majority of other districts reacted to the State's multiple requirements and tried doing everything for everybody, resulting in little for no one in particular. Neither upper administration nor TEC directors took the stance of choosing priorities and fitting all requirements into their focus. Clarity in purpose seemed especially difficult in Florida, because as TEC 9 director said, "We get a lot of help in education from the legislature. We have a lot of experts." Between State mandates, Beginning Teacher Program, recertification requirements, personal growth, school goals, deficiency

remediation, a teacher shortage, and district goals, it was easy to diffuse the efforts of the TEC. Among the choices of purposes for staff development found in the literature, Florida has said, we choose them all.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The literature on needs assessment describes four categories: who is involved, what triggers awareness of needs, the organizational context, and methods of assessing. Best practices say that staff development needs should be assessed by joint teams of administrators and teachers. Collaborative planning makes use of different perspectives and values, and provides consensus, shared ownership, a broad base of support and gives individual members new skills in the process itself. Among those who should plan and those who are assessed, there should be membership from three groups: those affected, the experts, and those responsible for carrying out the eventual plan.

The National Inservice Network advises planning teams to determine the general focus before developing data gathering instruments that are too open ended. This limited focus avoids the dilemma of being pulled in too many directions and focuses the plan within established school or district goals. The planning team may be influenced by perceptions, data-based research or mandates, but the limiting of focus is a political process because priorities are chosen by values of the team.

Besides gathering data, needs assessment planning teams may begin building support for successful

implementation of the intervention by taking the organizational context into consideration from the very beginning. There is little use in probing problems or considering solutions that are in direct opposition to prevailing norms unless the organization is willing to put tremendous effort into an establishment program. Norms to be considered are the school context, district goals, the decision making process, available resources, readiness for change, support from authorities and stakeholders, and awareness of the target groups.

Frequent references in the literature say the assessment should be tried first on a sample group to allow for improvements in the instruments. Multiple instruments should be used including interviews, questionnaires, checklists, observations, documentary evidence, and consensus decisions. Information gathered should be analyzed and made public.

Some best practices were built into Florida State laws governing TEC's. State guidelines required that a needs assessment be done and programs developed according to those needs. The TEC Council, the governing body, must, by law, include teachers, administrators and university personnel so multiple viewpoints and broadened ownership were obtained. TEC's were asked who participated in the writing of the needs assessment instrument. The results are shown in Table III-2.

Table III-2

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DEVELOPERS

	NUMBER	PERCENT
TEC Council	36	95%
TEC staff	29	76%
Teachers not on TEC Council	22	58%
Administrators not on TEC Council	21	55%
University consultants not on TEC Council	12	32%
Others:		
Supervisory staff	1	3%
Office of Educational Accountability	1	3%
Program Research & Evaluation staff	1	3%

Nearly every TEC reported in the questionnaire that there were multiple viewpoints represented in the development of the needs assessment provided through the TEC Council. About half of the TEC's also included additional representatives. Although university personnel were represented on the TEC Council, and 32% of the TEC's said they used additional university consultants, the university contacts reported in the 1983 evaluation that they only spent 5% of their time involved in needs assessment. Contrary to best practices, TEC's were not making good use of the experts.

There were few outstanding differences when the composite was broken down by single and multiple district TEC's, part or full-time directors, teacher only or others TEC's, district size or location. Large districts had more participation by university consultants, 57%, due to their proximity to the universities and greater participation by

other teachers, 71%, due to stronger union involvement. The breakdown by district characteristics is shown in Appendix F, Table F-2.

When asked how data were gathered for the last needs assessment, survey results showed that teacher questionnaires were overwhelmingly the most popular choice for gathering information because of the low cost and ease of tabulation of results. Sources of data for needs assessment are presented in Table III-3.

Table III-3
SOURCES OF DATA FOR NEEDS ASSESSMENT

	Number	Percent
Teacher Questionnaires		
Checked	38	100%
Least	2	5%
Most	27	71%
Administrator Questionnaires		
Checked	31	82%
Least	4	11%
Most	11	29%
Test Data		
Checked	27	71%
Least	2	5%
Most	11	29%
Review of Documents		
Checked	27	71%
Least	9	24%
Most	9	24%
Interviews		
Checked	26	68%
Least	10	26%
Most	5	13%

Table III-3 -- Continued

	Number	Percent
Observations		
Checked	20	53%
Least	7	18%
Most	6	16%
Community Input		
Checked	16	42%
Least	13	34%
Most	1	2%
Student Questionnaires		
Checked	11	29%
Least	11	29%
Most	0	0%

Other:

- Brainstorming at the school level
- Group process among and between grades
- Grade level report
- Interactive process at the schools/department level
- Analysis of school improvement plan
- School climate inventory

In questionnaire responses teacher surveys were rated as most important by 71% of the TEC's. The next most important rating dropped to 29%. The reliance on teacher perception of needs was heavily weighted, but all districts used multiple sources to balance personal needs and organizational goals. According to Joyce and Showers, TEC's should be concerned about the ability of teachers to discern their own needs, recognize their strengths and weakness due to isolated working conditions and few opportunities for comparison, and reveal their weaknesses to their supervisors. TEC's must also be concerned that minority needs may go unmet when district-wide summaries

are totaled and that teachers may be unfamiliar with current trends and tend to shy away from the unfamiliar when presented with options. It is the intended duty of the TEC Council to take organizational goals into consideration when making inservice plans, but it may be difficult when so much of the information comes from teacher questionnaires.

There were few noticeable differences in questionnaire results when data were broken down by district characteristics except for southern districts which indicated less use of multiple sources. TEC 1 director explained, "Large districts don't have time to do all that stuff." Broward County only did a small representative sample, perhaps simply a function of size with over 8000 teachers.

When asked on the questionnaire what triggers awareness for staff development needs, teacher desires overwhelmingly were cited. Questionnaire results are reported in Table III-4.

Table III-4

TRIGGERS FOR AWARENESS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Teacher Desires		
Checked	35	92%
Least	0	0%
Most	28	74%
Inside District Reports		
Checked	34	89%
Least	2	5%
Most	12	32%

Table III-4 -- Continued

	Number	Percent
Test Scores		
Checked	32	84%
Least	3	8%
Most	12	32%
Outside Reports		
Checked	26	68%
Least	12	32%
Most	6	16%
Public Pressures		
Checked	23	61%
Least	16	42%
Most	0	0%
University Input		
Checked	22	58%
Least	14	37%
Most	2	5%
Other:		
State mandates	2	5%
District goals, objectives	2	5%
School goals	1	3%
Principal input	2	5%
Building level input	1	3%
New programs	1	3%
School Board policy	1	3%
State recertification	1	3%

State requirements often triggered inservice offerings, and several responses reflecting mandates were added under "other." Those topics for staff development added by the State were not optional, regardless of the district's present needs, and had to be acted upon immediately. At times, State mandates moved districts to act on current problems that the districts may never have acted upon by themselves. Those districts with leaders who kept abreast of current situations in the State were seldom

surprised, but in other districts the mandates demanded movement by those with feet of clay.

The breakdown of questionnaire answers indicated that size made a difference in responsiveness to staff development needs. Inside district reports played a greater role in large districts than in either small or medium districts. Large districts simply had more specialized administrative staffs to generate the reports. The opposite was also true; large districts paid less attention to outside reports; they indicated 29%, as compared to medium 75%, and small 79%. University input played a larger role in small districts. Lacking the specialized internal administrative staffs, these smaller districts relied on university contacts for trends and information. Large districts were far less responsive to public pressure with 29% checking public pressure in large districts, 50% in medium districts and 79% in small districts. Table F-4, with the complete breakdown of district characteristics, is located in Appendix F.

Again the South seemed less responsive than average to triggers for staff development, reporting a lesser percentage to every question. The very large sizes of the majority of southern districts predisposed them to bureaucracy and lack of responsiveness to outside triggers.

Because needs assessments were required by law, Florida TEC's did a more thorough job than many districts.

The TEC Council developed the needs assessment so multiple viewpoints were considered. TEC's also used multiple methods for collecting data, both of which reflected best practices. Teacher desires and teacher questionnaires were overwhelmingly most important. Inclusion did give teachers a sense of ownership and involvement in planning their inservices, but this reliance on teachers' wishes may be unrealistic if teachers were unaware of current trends in education or upcoming State mandates and thus were unaware of how to plan for personal or school needs. Except for a few districts, little evidence was shown that the TEC Council had planned the general focus of the needs assessment within the organizational context or organizational goals prior to doing the actual assessment. This fragmentation was demonstrated in the diffused offerings of inservice activities and encouraged by the multiple purposes which the TEC had to serve. Poor use was made of the knowledge of university personnel in developing or contributing to needs assessments.

Successful districts planned using needs assessment data; school-based, district, and State objectives; teacher evaluations; university input; test scores, and long range planning. The five year Master Inservice Plan encouraged comprehensive planning but did not insure it.

FOCUS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The literature has noted a shift in the last fifteen years in the focus of staff development from curriculum and materials to the individual teacher to the school.

Researchers have noted that a teacher focused program may boost an individual's skills and improve the achievement of students in that class, but little or no coordinated school improvement occurs.

School-based staff development focuses on the needs of the organization, needs so powerful that collective action by most or all of the faculty is required to accomplish the goals. Individual needs may also be taken into account, but they are related to the needs of the school.

School-based staff development is an arduous and time consuming task that requires changes in most schools of both teacher and organizational norms. While it is difficult to achieve, school-based staff development is a very powerful model. The power is achieved through collaboration in problem solving which involves teachers and administrators working together to identify problems, to find potential solutions, to learn new interventions, to support each other, to coordinate and reinforce teacher-student interactions, and to evaluate the results.

The benefits that accrue are accumulative coordinated programs for students, collegial planning, a sense of involvement and ownership in the program by the teachers, an opportunity to learn by doing, and a chance for communication among teachers to break down the isolation that so often exists in schools. School focused staff development often results in an improvement in climate and greater commitment by the staff, a sense of renewal, a willingness to try new ideas, and school-wide improvement. School-based staff development has the power to influence more complex kinds of behaviors such as attitudes.

Although school-based staff development is a very powerful model, it is quite difficult to implement because teaching and organizational norms often do not support the model. The organization must be willing to decentralize and share power and shift rewards from the individual to the group. The organization has the responsibility to provide time for long term staff development, for planning, and for collaboration. Best practices say collaborative skills must be taught to teachers who are accustomed to working in isolation. For teachers, it disturbs their autonomy and the norms of privacy and practicality. Teachers must be willing to learn collaborative skills and be convinced that the benefits of the innovation will outweigh the comfortableness of established norms.

University personnel need to change their roles from consultants and presenters to collaborators.

School-based staff development is not the ultimate answer. It is too complex when simple awareness is needed or when skills just need to be maintained or enhanced. Schools that are in disarray should not attempt this complex model. They first need to stabilize and maintain normal procedures.

A Diffused Focus

While Florida legislation requires programs based on assessed needs, there are no guidelines for weighing and balancing the needs of teachers - individually or as a group, curriculum and material needs, school needs, or district needs. Each TEC Council must determine the balance and focus of inservice programs. The focuses identified by the TEC's on the questionnaire are reported in Table III-5. TEC directors were asked to:

Check all the areas on which your teacher inservice programs focus. Wrote "M" next to the area on which activities most often focus and "L" next to the area of the least focus.

Table III-5

FOCUS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Number	Percent
School-wide programs		
Checked	37	97%
Least	2	5%
Most	23	61%
District-wide programs		
Checked	38	100%
Least	6	16%
Most	23	61%
Curricular programs and materials		
Checked	36	95%
Least	9	24%
Most	14	37%
Individual Teachers		
Checked	37	97%
Least	15	39%
Most	10	26%
Other:		
State mandates	1	3%
Add on certification	1	3%
Multi-district programs	1	3%

Nearly every district provided activities focused on every area. While not all needs could be met with a singular focus, the effect of focusing everywhere produced some confusion: duplicated efforts, diluted focus and slipping through the cracks of some personnel. TEC 4 director said that conflicting goals and too many goals were "a hot topic right now." To avoid conflict, TEC 4 held district meetings where goals were given priorities and coordinated.

Before they [the schools] start asking for possibilities from me and the district starts asking, we make sure that they're matching and we're not double

funding joint goals and getting the district staff connected with the schools so if the school does want to make a major change in language arts goals, the language arts supervisor is honestly involved and it's not a surprise to her.

When the focus data from the questionnaire were broken down by district characteristics, teacher-only TEC directors indicated a higher percentage of most important programs in all four categories than did directors who also served administrative and noninstructional personnel. Teacher staff development was their only concern. TEC 5 which served all personnel, spent two fifths of its inservice hours with noninstructional staff, and one of its major concerns was Assertive Discipline for bus drivers. The directors of TEC's which served all personnel had more money allocated to the TEC, but they had no more time and usually no larger of a staff. Spending two-fifths of a TEC's time on bus drivers certainly distracts from instructional improvement.

District size also made a difference when the questionnaire results were broken down. Small districts were more apt to focus on the school with 68% marking the school as most important; 58% in medium districts, and 43% in large districts. Large districts were more likely to focus on district-wide staff development, probably to maintain across-the-board consistency. Their size made it difficult to track 100 plus schools pursuing individualized goals. The ranking for large districts was district-wide,

school-wide, curriculum, and individual. The table of the breakdown of questionnaire answers by district characteristics is found in Appendix F, Table F-5.

For the professed interest in school-wide activities, the follow-up question on the survey yielded the results in Table III-6 demonstrating that not much inservice really was school focused. The item read, "What percentage of your teacher inservice programs focus on one entire school?"

Table III-6
SCHOOL-BASED INSERVICE

	Number	Percent
75-100%	3	8%
50- 74%	7	20%
25- 49%	9	25%
0- 24%	17	47%

Almost half of the districts said that less than a quarter of their inservice activities focused on a school, and just 28% said that the majority of their staff development was school-based. This did not tally with results from the previous question where 61% checked school-based as being most important. Apparently, TEC directors recognized the power of the school-based model and marked it as important but had difficulties implementing the model.

Upon breaking down district characteristics,

teacher only TEC's were more likely to have school-based inservice with 40% responding that half or more of their activities were school-based as compared to 22% of TEC's servicing others. Not having to plan for administrative selection plans or sanitation inservices for lunchroom workers, teacher only TEC's could focus on powerful school-based inservice models that affect instruction and climate in the schools.

Examination of the questionnaire breakdown of district characteristics indicated that size also made a difference. Forty percent of medium sized districts responded that half or more of their activities were school-based as compared to 22% of small districts and 14% of large districts. This finding also conflicted with the previous question where small districts rated school-based staff development as most important. Even if these smaller districts considered it of importance, they were not implementing school focused inservice as often as medium sized districts. Medium TEC's had the financial capabilities to support research, a director and a staff dedicated to school-based staff development, but were still small enough to be able to monitor a limited number of individualized school projects. Centrally located districts were least likely to have school-based inservice with 55% responding that less than a quarter of their activities were school focused.

In follow-up interviews, five of the nine TEC's chose school-based as being the focus that had given the most effective results. The responses followed the district size and location patterns of the questionnaire composite breakdown by district characteristics. Those TEC's, 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7, were composed of 2 small districts and the three medium ones. TEC 3, the largest, chose a district-wide focus, and TEC's 8 and 9, the smallest of the sample, chose individual focuses. TEC 5, a small central district, had no preferred focus.

In the largest district, TEC 3 director said that district programs were perceived as having higher quality and better evaluations, and teacher participation in planning had improved the quality of those programs. This district was the one that felt local needs were unmet because of the pressures of getting State mandated courses to its 5,200 teachers. The director believed those mandates were better met with across the board classes to all teachers.

This large district also had peculiar political circumstances that made it difficult to provide school-based inservices. District norms would not allow countervailing practices to succeed. By Board policy, released time could not be used for inservice and much of the training was offered to principals who were expected to train their building staffs. The director reported, "One

of the reasons there has been little school-based staff development is because much of it depends on the principal, and he is never in the building because he's always out being trained."

TEC's 8 and 9 were very small districts with 250 and 152 teachers in K-12. They tended to focus individually because it was difficult to get a large enough group together for a relevant workshop and still make it cost effective. TEC 9 director said he often focused on individual problems such as classroom management for new teachers and then opened up the workshop to experienced teachers as a refresher course for recertification in order to make a large enough group. He also provided district-wide programs in mandated areas such as middle school recertification, drop out prevention, and PREP - a primary grades program. These efforts exhausted his funds.

I think a lot of legislative ideas basically are good but implementation and funding goes lacking so we stay in a state of confusion in the educational system. We are trying to provide a lot of things on limited budgets. To say the least it's difficult.

TEC 8, the smallest in the state, also focused individually by sending teachers out to conferences and workshops rather than trying to provide specialized courses within the district. A good deal of the budget went to travel. The director said that curriculum goals did not particularly influence his staff development offerings and district goals certainly did not, since the district did

not have any goals until last year when he wrote them to comply with a mandated performance appraisal system for district administrators that was based on district goals. He admitted that, to date, his office had been reactive, providing that which was requested.

We still react in a sense that we design needs assessment surveys, and I've always done them for the purpose of compliance but they were really pretty meaningless to a large degree because we didn't have the dollars...Since we weren't able to do it anyway, we didn't pay too much attention to the needs assessment but I think that having a Council will make a difference. [The Council was suspended for several years due to a political problem.]

TEC 5 director could not name a particular focus, saying that some components were directed toward the individual, others at the school, and some at the district. Curricular matters were taken care of by the curriculum department but funded by the TEC.

These districts operated within their existing norms and constraints. Lack of additional funding, a strongly centralized power base, inability to fund released time, political policies against released time, extracurricular sponsors not being able to attend after school workshops, a lack of leadership dedicated to a school-based focus, lack of leadership time, heavy focus on noncertified personnel, unwillingness to disrupt teacher norms, and inexperience in training teachers in an adult learning model all made school-based staff development an exceeding difficult task to accomplish. Without making

dramatic changes in their power structures, trying to implement school-based staff development would be a disaster. None of TEC's 3, 8 or 9 spoke of an improving climate or a renewed sense of professionalism. The climates of their organizations said a move in the direction of school focused inservice would be beneficial.

Degrees of Compliance to a School Focused Model

The remaining five TEC's found that they derived their best results when using school focused inservice, though each at times focused on the individual, the school, and on curriculum and materials. Although these TEC's supported the school-based model, they did so to different degrees and with varying results.

TEC 1, although 75% of its components were school-based, did not encourage a full blown school focused model. The director, a former principal accustomed to school-based management, had delegated decision making power to the schools and responded reactively as a booking agent for their requests. He provided an idea book to the schools listing commercial, State and local options. He believed, "Inservice is just one part of school-based management." Much of their inservice occurred on one designated inservice day each year. Coursework for a few district goals was offered through the TEC, and curriculum matters were taken care of through the Directors of

Elementary and Secondary Education.

While lack of time and additional staff in this small district TEC office made delegation one of the few options available, it put the entire matter into the hands of a principal and staff who may not have been aware of current research or trends, and may not have had the expertise to follow through. A staff that does not know cooperative learning exists, will not choose it as an option out of an idea book by title. Any successes in this district with school-based staff development were dependent on the talent of an individual principal and staff.

TEC's 2, 4, 6, and 7 worked with a more developed school-based inservice model. TEC 7 director explained his procedure:

We'll go in [to the school] and do long term training with the teachers on different strategies and teaching techniques. We'll do classroom demonstrations for the teachers and then we go back and meet with the teacher individually, observe her, coach her, give her feedback, give her the materials that she needs and have had really good results with that model. Now it's expensive, it's time consuming, but it's powerful.

TEC's 2, 4 and 6 went even further. When working with a school-based model, they laid groundwork in the school as preparation for change and collaborative work. They conformed to the best of best practices by training teachers in collaboration rather than just telling them they were going to collaborate despite established teachers norms.

In TEC 6, schools in the full blown school-based

model did Blocker's vision building, a review of the research, goal setting, a bonding process of brainstorming and consensus building, and training of facilitators before the "option of buying in for any of the courses." They used the Myers Briggs Personality Type for learning their own styles and the Lazat model of change as well as the effective schools research. Principals were trained in what change entails. These schools developed short and long range goals for a five year period with yearly reevaluations. Due to limited funds, only 14 of 53 schools in TEC 6 were in the full blown plan with an additional five starting in 1988-89 and seven more asking to be included for the next year.

Once the preparation of the school had been completed in TEC 6, usually in a year long process, and goals identified, the school staff selected according to their needs from seven or eight courses which the TEC had prepared. Among them were FORMAT, which combined brain research and learning styles theory; POWER, the research base for the Florida Performance Measurement System (the evaluation instrument for teachers and the basis of the Beginning Teacher Program); Project TEACH, and Project PRIDE. Training was followed up by coaching, evaluation, and monitoring.

TEC 4 had been in the school-based process for four years, and only had six schools in the full process.

That process included preparing a principal cadre in a two year training course on how to design and develop school-based staff development programs using the Managing Productive Schools program. More schools were seeking training, as this focus was heartily encouraged by the superintendent, and each original principal of the cadre was training another 15 principals in a second two year program. Through continuous training, they eventually expected to have all 180 plus administrators trained.

Components for School-Based Staff Development

To TEC's 2, 4, and 6, a school focused inservice plan did not just mean that it occurred at the school. They consciously aimed at school improvement, improved climate or a renewed sense of professionalism. A school-based focus, to them, was inconceivable without substantial planning of goals, using shared decision making, using a research base, extensive use of in-district personnel as trainers and encouraging peer support. The implementation of each of these components is described and analyzed in the following pages.

A. Coordinated Planning Based on Needs and Goals

Each of the interviewed districts that extensively used school-based staff development coordinated planning for school and district goals incorporating data from its needs assessment. The exception was the co-op, TEC 7, which only planned school goals because it dealt with nine different districts.

TEC 2 was having success using a school effectiveness indicator survey from New York to help establish school goals. The usual procedure was to then aggregate school goal data and offer district-wide any program for which there was a common need or which was required by State mandates. Other components were done at the school level, and often district-wide goals were accomplished at each school separately. TEC 2 director explained the process of applying district goals in a school-based model. When the district adopted the Wisconsin Reading Program, the curriculum supervisor brought in one teacher from each school, trained the group for several days, and sent the teachers back on-site to train building staffs. In the schools, the district had 512 teachers in voluntary programs, all after school on their own time, being trained by TEC trained teachers.

Those TEC's who used the fully developed school-based model followed best practices by setting

school goals within district goals or using school goals to develop district goals thus avoiding conflicts and fragmentation. TEC's who had no procedure for coordination were pulled in different and sometimes conflicting directions. Unless upper administration or the TEC director takes a leadership role of establishing a mechanism to coordinate goals, staff development programs will continue to have a diffused focus and not be supportive of each other.

B. Shared Decision Making

During interviews it became clear that shared decision making in the planning process was highly valued in those TEC's which made extensive use of school-based staff development. In addition to teachers in TEC 6, parents and volunteers were a part of every school planning team plus administrative staff. TEC 4 heartily encouraged involvement of teachers in district level planning, school improvement efforts, and representation on State task forces. Of 1900 teachers, 1256 were involved in those projects during the last two years. The director of TEC 4 reported the teachers were "so excited that they actually sit on committees with administrators. We have teachers team teaching with principals." TEC 1 had a newly elected superintendent, the first in 21 years, elected on the platform that there would be more faculty involvement in

decision making at the school level.

These directors who promoted school-based staff development frequently cited the necessity of having the principal involved in shared decision making in staff development. They also encouraged the principal to believe he was the instructional leader. To procure this involvement, the principals' personal goals were often tied into the school improvement plan. The director of TEC 6 said:

One of the things we have in our performance appraisal system is the principal establishes 3-5 goals, and they have to be tied into district goals and they have to be tied into school goals. That process that builds his goals is the same process that builds the school's goals. There is this very strong linkage that makes him an integral part. It's absolutely critical that he is.

TEC 4 director confided that all principals were not wildly enthusiastic about sharing decisions, and some saw it as a major change in their own leadership styles because they were not inherent power sharers but power keepers. "It's a major philosophical hurdle to get over." TEC 1 director reemphasized that the enthusiasm for shared decision making all depended on how dictatorial the principal had been.

The benefits, however, compensated. TEC 1 director said the teachers were enthusiastic when they participated in planning because they could take something they wanted back to the classroom and try it out instead of something he told them they should have. TEC 7 director observed,

"Especially if you have a shared decision making model and a school-based model, you get the buy in and donating time," which he found a substantial benefit.

TEC's successful in school-based staff development followed the best practices of decentralizing power and sharing decision making. These districts had made a successful change in the norms of school administration changing from an authoritarian model to a participatory model. The result was a sense of ownership in the project, opportunity for communication of professional ideas and an improved climate.

Collaboration on the TEC Council, by itself, was an insufficient indicator of shared decision making in the district for it may have only involved fifteen teachers out of thousands. Only when district administration had decided to involve teachers in local school-based planning did shared decision making reach the majority of teachers. The problems with which they were involved were relevant to the teachers, and sitting on committees with administrators was an obvious change from past practices. Sharing power gave teachers the nod of confidence from administration, gave opportunities for discussion and solution of problems between teachers and administration and among teachers, encouraged buy-in in the project because it could be adapted to local norms, and produced a motivated staff. While the teachers may initially have been more

enthusiastic than the principals about sharing power, those principals who came to understand the power and enthusiasm that was released through the process, often became ardent supporters of shared decision making. Districts who believed that mandated collaboration on the TEC Council was indicative of shared power in the district were fooling themselves.

C. Research Based

During interviews, it became apparent that a feature that set TEC's 4 and 6 apart from other TEC's was their constant use of research. TEC 6 director explained:

We are heavily into keeping up with research in this department. We meet every other Friday to discuss what we're reading to make sure that somebody in this department knows what's current. People are too busy, especially at the school level, to keep up with it. The biggest piece of school improvement that we put in is research. We make sure that the principal and the planning team are reading the most current research. We make those decisions on what research we give them, but it's very basic stuff that supports effective schools.

TEC 4 director stated, "One of the things we do in our trainer's training is to give them the research first." While other districts presented the mechanics of the Florida Performance Measurement System, TEC 6 director said, "We wouldn't dare just say do this without explaining the research behind it." Unlike small districts, the medium sized districts had staffs available to find, distill, and distribute the research as a portion of their

school-based staff development. Large districts had the staff available but found the logistics of school-based staff development too unwieldy for management and were more predisposed to bureaucratic across-the-board training.

Use of research findings is not often mentioned as a best practice, seeming almost too simple to mention. Researchers and writers sometimes seem to think that everyone is familiar with best practices, but much current research is virtually unknown in many schools and sometimes in district offices for school people are caught up with day-to-day matters. TEC 4 director noted that a large southern district was often in the news with innovations, but the projects often were designed in opposition to research findings. She noted somewhat gleefully that the large southern district had great press but poor results.

Those directors who were familiar with best practices from the research had a vision of what a coordinated successful program should be. They were able to weave the myriad of TEC responsibilities into one interwoven focus with the powerful results that could be achieved through school-based staff development. Those directors without this research base just seemed to muddle along without direction, repeating past practices, successful or unsuccessful ones, or trying one new idea here and another new idea there achieving no cumulative results and continuing the fragmentation of staff

development.

d. In-district Personnel as Trainers

TEC's 2, 4, 6, and 7 extensively used teachers from their own districts and taught them to be trainers of on-site components. TEC's 2, 4, and 7 arranged for an additional incentive to the trainers by having the community college appoint the trainers as adjunct faculty.

Some of TEC 7's teachers saw being teacher leaders as a career ladder. TEC 7 had site coordinators for each county who met with teachers, surveyed their needs, got teachers involved in planning the inservice, and about half of the consultants leading the workshops were teachers. "We've identified outstanding teachers that have expertise and materials to share with other teachers and that's made a world of difference."

TEC 6 had 70 in-district people who were certified trainers and another 260, or 11% of the staff, who served on staff development teams or as technical assistance personnel. This district not only trained the trainers in content but in methods of presenting to adults effectively.

The director of TEC 4 said, "Teachers are my best trainers. They're out there every day, not me." She felt there was no better way to improve instruction than through teachers as trainers and coaches. A standing procedure in this TEC was to train a cadre of teachers and use a

networking model. The TEC got the buy-in from the small group who then spread the innovation in individual schools.

We rely on our teachers to train each other and our principals to train each other and on combinations of teachers and staff to train mixed groups. It's the only way we could get it done. All of our people are our staff developers. That's how we do it as cheaply as we can.

TEC 4 has adopted a trainer of trainers model from State "canned programs" such as Interaction Management and Target Selection. The training of State trainers was very costly, but it provided the TEC with a model. Trainers first went through the program as participants and then were trained as trainers.

Before they leave, they have to actually teach portions of the program and get feedback and coaching from the trainers of trainers to make sure they've got it straight before we send them out. Now there's a lot of stuff that is left to the trainers' discretion in terms of style, but there are suggested points to be covered to keep the training consistent... They develop strategies for how they're going to do it next time and in some cases when they don't do well, we give them another round and go through it again. We give them the research first, role model, and put them through the steps: readiness, concept development, demonstration, practice. We make sure that in all the presentations we develop, they have a presentation, a concept, a video model or a live model of it, then a practice round and then the feedback and coaching is attached.

These districts who used in-district trainers as a component of school-based staff development had found a way to obtain more training with their limited funds, a career ladder opportunity for a flat organizational pattern, trainers who had credibility with other teachers, and TEC's 4 and 6 in particular had wrapped training in a pattern

supportive of adult learning theory. They followed best practices by using local personnel, sharing power with outside presenters and achieving a strong buy in for the innovation. They were also able to improve program design because the presenters were in the school and nearly always available for feedback, discussion of the innovation, and coaching.

TEC's who showed no effort to include teachers as presenters missed out on an opportunity to build professionalism among the staff, adapt innovations to local conditions, and improve climate. Solely relying on outside presenters hindered program design due to unavailability of presenters and mismatches of presenters' perceptions and actual local needs. Organization norms provided constraints to districts considering using in-district personnel as trainers. Adament interpretation of policy against released time for teachers left no opportunity to train a cadre of teacher trainers. Attitudes by upper administration or TEC directors that limited shared decision making also limited opportunities for using in-district personnel as staff development presenters. Without shifting power in other districts, there will be little opportunity to improve climate through staff inclusion as presenters.

E. Sharing the Knowledge and Peer Support

The directors of the four interviewed districts that worked with a full school-based model knew the excitement that sharing a new idea could bring to a staff. Greater enthusiasm can be expected in a school-based project than in a district-wide project because sharing occurs more frequently when there are a substantial number of teachers working on the same project able to communicate daily. TEC 2 director eloquently told the effects of communication within a staff on a project.

You don't come back as a wierdo where nobody understands what you're doing. Everybody starts it, each with his own little twist. Then you watch your colleagues doing it and it starts to grow...There is an excitement in learning that occurs when people share over lunch, as they come and go from their automobiles and it's exactly what's happening... The internalizing process takes place right there...They come back and say I tried this, this far, and the one next door says, well I did this, and you get a sharing of expertise. It enriches everything that much further. Those idiot [Wisconsin Reading] tapes are merely prompts.

These components: development of programs within coordinated goals, shared decision making, knowledge and use of practices found in the research, in-district personnel as trainers, and opportunities for communication are all best practices of school-based inservice. District administrators and TEC directors encouraged shared power but kept the process focused and coordinated through a planning committee or through the vision of a talented

leader. That leader most often was keenly aware of current research and best practices so personnel time was not wasted on unfruitful projects or scattered in conflicting directions. However, a dedicated and knowledgeable TEC director was insufficient. It took upper administrative support to allow teacher responsibility and authority in local school planning, and it took upper administrative support to arrange for time and resources. Those TEC's which made use of most or all of these elements were able to conduct successful, powerful, school-based staff development programs. Their organizational norms permitted and/or encouraged these elements to exist.

Successful school-based staff development would be difficult or impossible in smaller districts that could not carve out time for a faculty member or administrator to be a knowledgeable coordinator or in districts with tight authoritarian control. In districts where teachers are unwilling to voluntarily participate, administration would need to add inservice days or allow for released time for collaboration or training until climate improved. Organizational norms would have to change to produce a climate where school-based staff development could succeed.

Benefits of School Focused Inservice

The TEC directors offered their testimonials to school focused inservice during interviews.

This is my 30th year in educational administration. I've been in teacher staff development as a school principal, involved in district level, almost twenty years, and I'm convinced the most successful staff development for teachers is on-site...We try to work with school focused training so it stays on-site and very, very, realistic to the teachers. (TEC 2)

Our bias is that the school ought to be the unit of change, not the individual. You can work on the individual change through teacher observation and evaluation and assessment. (TEC 7)

The school is the most effective. (TEC 6)

The TEC directors saw many benefits to school-based inservice, most notably an improvement in climate and a model powerful enough to produce change. Experts attribute the climate changes to a sense of inclusion, satisfaction, a lessening of isolation, and personal support. (2)

The directors, themselves, saw these changes.

TEC 4: The morale is very high. Teachers have a sense of control over their destiny. There are improved relationships between administration and the union.

TEC 2: I see a change in climate... If you walked into the school, that's probably what you would see more than anything else. There are evidences of very professional things. People, instead of talking about

(2) John I Goodlad, "The School as Workplace," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 39-43; R. Linden Courter and Beatrice A. Ward, "Staff Development for School Improvement," Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 187 and 208; Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development (New York: Longman, 1988), p 6.

children being disciplined, they are talking about strategies.

TEC 6: It's been incredible, the change in climate ...We do the Kettering Foundation IDEA school climate inventory so we have proof besides just what we feel that the climate has changed so positively. In 12 of those 14 schools, it's been incredible.

TEC 2: In the past three to four years, I see teachers who see themselves as professionals once again...We had more teachers go to State conferences this year. A few years ago we could not have gotten teachers to go. They are all day Friday and Saturday and the district gives a day off. We literally had carloads.

TEC 1: I see an improvement in school climate. It's their program.

The directors also saw school-based staff

development as a model powerful enough to affect change.

TEC 2 director called district-wide programs buckshot. "As it was, it was scattered. I call it buckshot. You go pow, and you hope it hits something. It may or may not and individually, I'm sure teachers do wonderfully with it." However, the teachers had no back-up support, and individual teacher change did not affect the school as a whole.

TEC 6 director observed that one of her principals in their initial school-based project said she was constantly pulling her staff for seven years and now they're pulling her in the same direction. This director realized the strength of the design and some of its problems.

A lot of the leaders are very strong leaders but they don't understand or they haven't learned yet

how powerful the model is, and how strong staff development can be for them. Until they see that, and they're seeing it with the other schools' successful practices, it's going to be slow.

Problems with School-Based Staff Development

Because of the complexity of a full blown school-based staff development model, there were many problems associated with it. In an open-ended item on the questionnaire, responses concerning problems fell into six categories: leadership and planning, time, funding, content, teacher interest and commitment, and problems with district size and State mandates.

Leadership and Planning as Problems in School-Based Inservice

Twelve directors on the questionnaire cited lack of administrative leadership and planning as problems in school-based inservice. Administrators did not involve teachers in planning or were not trained to facilitate school-based inservice. Plans ignored school goals, plans conflicted with district goals, schools failed to develop long range plans, or schools lacked planning time. TEC's experiencing problems were not following a best practice of planning based on coordinated goals or the best of best practices, training teachers and administrators in the collaborative process.

TEC's 4 and 6 particularly seemed to have solved

many of these problems by coordinating State mandates, district goals, school goals, and individual goals of teachers and principals, but this took a guiding hand as well as time and a process for communication among all groups. Districts must also train teacher-leaders and administrators in collaboration and adult learning techniques. Untrained principals may be unaware of the power of school focused staff development, may find it antithetic to their styles or may simply not have the knowledge to execute it. Training must be provided to the leaders and trainers, and school-based staff development not just dumped into the schools' laps as TEC 1 had done.

Administrative support is vital to staff development of any type, and especially to school-based. TEC 4 had the most visible administrative support.

There is some resistance [among principals] but there is absolutely such a high value put on power sharers... Those who do the school-based school improvement project are constantly reinforced by upper level management for doing that. You're crazy if you don't go along with it, because the rewards are so much greater when you do. It is also tied into their performance system.

Time as a Problem in School-Based Inservice

Time is a problem for all types of inservice activities and school-based inservice is no exception. Seven directors in their questionnaire responses cited lack of time for training, planning or follow-up; three cited lack of released time and the difficulties of training

after school when teachers are exhausted. One TEC cited problems of inservice days coinciding with ends of grading periods while extra-curricular activities conflicted with after school inservice time in another. One director noted that consultant time was difficult to schedule in a series of one hour after school workshops. TEC's experiencing problems did not follow best practices of changing organizational norms to allow for time for planning, reflection, training and follow-up, but changing norms is partly dependent on having funds to access time.

During interviews, the directors of TEC's 2, 4 and 6 noted that as climate improved, they saw an additional willingness of teachers to donate their own time or to participate with a smaller stipend. No director of a TEC that focused on individual or district needs expressed any indication of greater teacher professionalism. TEC 8 director said teachers wouldn't walk across the street without getting paid. The fully developed school-based model may be a way to encourage teachers to participate in activities on their own time when additional school time just cannot be funded. TEC's with in-district trainers solved the problems of consultant time and travel.

Funding as a Problem in School-Based Staff Development

Funding was the next category of the questionnaire responses and was nearly synonymous with time. Three

directors cited inadequate funding in general. Three others cited the cost of outside consultants, or the cost of funding released staff time.

While the State of Florida provided basic funding for the TEC's, some districts paid director and/or staff salaries from their own revenues, indicating upper level administrative support for staff development activities. District contributions freed TEC funds for training, and some TEC's had excellent funding when district contributions were included. Best practices cite the necessity for upper management support as indicated by sufficient funding.

Content and Commitment as Problems in School-Based Staff Development

Two TEC's responding to the questionnaire had difficulties with content, not finding topics to cover the needs of the entire staff, and a third respondent felt that individual needs were not always met. Interviews revealed that TEC's 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 overcame problems with content by usually offering generic programs that dealt with discipline or effective teaching techniques, or they offered umbrella components that met State mandates.

Four TEC's responding to the questionnaire had problems because of teacher attitudes. These responses included teachers not seeing a need to be better - "a

knowing it all attitude," problems with maintaining total faculty involvement, and problems with teacher interest and commitment.

Failure to get the buy-in from teachers may be attributed to lack of involvement in planning or a disorganized and poorly planned program. "Buy-in" was a phrase often used by districts with well organized school-based staff development activities. Successful districts had no problem with commitment due to shared decision making, in-house trainers, and administrative support. Teacher attitude demonstrating lack of commitment may be altered by broadening the power base, allowing greater participation by teachers in assessing, planning, and implementing programs in staff development, and changing organizational norms to allow for time for planning and personal support.

Size and Mandates as Problems in School-Based Inservice

The last group of complaints from the questionnaire dealt with district size or mandates. Directors found it difficult to support 37 centers, difficult to follow component requirements, and believed there was a problem because most of their schools were small. Medium sized districts had dealt most successfully with school-based activities while meeting State requirements.

TEC's that used the full blown model of

school-based staff development were better able to overcome the problems associated with on-site inservice. It seemed to be a model that could not be successfully done half way or without changing the organizational norms. Districts which used only part of the model experienced problems severe enough to outweigh the advantages.

When it is Appropriate to Use School-Based Inservice?

Question four that guided this study asked, "What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for conducting school-based inservice and when is this procedure appropriate for use?" Even the most ardent supporters felt that school-based was not always the answer. TEC 7 director said there was still a need for awareness building and bemoaned the ten hour rule because he could no longer offer inservice hours for short awareness sessions.

There were also times when program leadership was required at the district level. The curriculum specialists in TEC 4 investigated writing programs over a two to three year period looking at best practices and decided to implement a developmental writing program. That decision took district leadership. "If we had to wait around for 39 schools to decide that they wanted to do developmental writing, we'd still be waiting."

State mandates that must be met across-the-board

could often best be handled in district-wide activities. Content was often best covered in summer institutes. TEC 2 director said articulation would be best done on an inservice day since on most "district-wide inservice days, we just call them all in and give them a verbal memorandum."

School-based staff development is best reserved for "when you need a powerful model for teaching techniques and strategies" and when you are making long term change according to TEC 7 director. For "real intensive staff development, where you make changes in behavior, do that in the building," advises TEC 2 director. The directors of TEC's 4 and 6, in addition to seeing a powerful model to change behavior, also saw climate changes as outcomes of site based staff development.

TEC's that wish to tap into the powerful attitudinal and behavioral changes that can occur from school-based staff development must make a serious commitment to use most or all of the components of the model and be willing to change district norms to provide a supportive environment. Dabbling with a few of the components such as encouraging in-district presenters without providing training in the adult learning model or without giving the trainers responsibility and authority will cause problems with poor presentations and lack of commitment. Asking teachers to solve local school problems

without the knowlege of long range goals and constraints of the district may cause conflict between goals. Teachers who are asked to solve problems without administrative support and involvement will never be sure of district commitment and resources for implementation. Assuming teachers will make long term changes in their teaching styles without feedback, assistance and personal support is wishful thinking. Asking teachers to collaborate without training in collaboration and problem solving skills and without rearranging schedules to provide the time will lead to frustration. Unless this organizational support is provided by TEC's, there is little chance that successful school-based staff development will flourish.

A district desiring complex changes must be willing to do complex planning and change organizational norms to a supportive climate. Although the requirements of planning; preliminary training of teachers and administrators in collaboration, problem identification, dialogue and decision making; funding sufficient time for training, follow-up and sharing of ideas; investigating and applying the research; sharing power; and coordination of goals are substantial, so are the benefits of improved climate, greater professionalism, long term change, and school-wide improvement. Only a few of Florida's TEC's were able to change organizational and teacher norms to successfully apply the best practices of school-based staff development.

PROGRAM DESIGN

Staff development activities, whether school-based or not, may have a powerful design. Joyce and Showers believe that the most powerful designs will include presentation of theory, modeling or demonstration, practice, feedback, coaching, and consideration of organizational norms. The fewer elements that are included, the less powerful the design in terms of percentage of teachers transferring the concept to the classroom or in terms of long lasting behavior. Presentation alone may lead to awareness or acquisition of concepts and knowledge. Modeling and practice may lead to principles and skills, but for the majority of teachers, feedback and coaching are also needed for application to problem solving in the classroom. Concepts that are unfamiliar or complex require higher level program design elements. There is no student impact, and thus little or no worth in staff development, without teacher skills reaching the level of application in the classroom. (3)

Frequent references in the literature indicate that feedback and coaching provide many of the same benefits as

(3) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 70.

do school-based staff development. Those benefits include increased communication, collegial problem solving, time to reflect on a professional problem, multiple perspectives, and a sense of involvement for both mentor and protege. Teachers develop a sense of accomplishment and renewal from collaborative problem solving.

Feedback and coaching also suffer from the same problems as school-based staff development. Teacher and organizational norms often need to be changed to include: shared decision making, delegated authority, sufficient time and resources provided by the organization, an experimental environment, administrative support and participation, and diminished personal autonomy.

On the questionnaire, TEC's were asked how often they included program design elements in teacher inservice training. Table III-7 presents their responses.

Table III-7

ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DESIGN

	Number	Percent
Presentation of Theory		
Never	1	2%
Sometimes	18	47%
Usually	14	37%
Mostly	3	8%
Almost always	2	5%
Modeling or Demonstration of the Concept		
Never	0	0%
Sometimes	6	16%
Usually	21	55%
Mostly	6	16%
Almost always	5	13%

Table III-7 -- Continued

Practice Under Simulated Conditions

(with other teachers or students)

Never	1	2%
Sometimes	17	45%
Usually	13	34%
Mostly	4	11%
Almost always	3	8%

Structured or Open Ended Feedback Following Classroom
Tryout of the New Concept

Never	0	0%
Sometimes	21	55%
Usually	11	29%
Mostly	3	8%
Almost always	3	8%

Coaching for Application by the Presenter,
a Supervisor, or a Peer

Never	0	0%
Sometimes	21	55%
Usually	12	32%
Mostly	3	8%
Almost always	2	5%

According to the questionnaire answers, TEC designs were not very powerful, relying mostly on presentation and demonstration. Forty-five percent of the directors said the design allowed for practice sometimes, and fifty-five percent allowed for feedback and coaching sometimes. The distribution of those TEC's doing feedback and coaching dropped considerably when compared to presentation, demonstration, and practice. Eighty-one percent of the TEC's had said that half or more of their programs were enhancement or fine tuning of skills, which by definition do not require major changes in teacher behavior or attitudes, so the design may not be as weak as it first

appeared but still cannot be considered powerful.

While it is possible to do concept development, demonstration, and simulated practice in the initial presentation, coaches must be trained and must provide feedback on-site and individually. This training and individual assistance presented many problems in terms of time and funding. Even in-district coaches could be expensive, and the director of TEC 4 said the union was not supportive of supplements to coaches' salaries or released time because they knew "there is a lesser amount of money to go around to all teachers." If an outside consultant was used, many trips to the schools enlarged the consultant's fee considerably, and if the consultant was from a distant university, the budget was eaten up with mileage and travel time. TEC's that used in-district personnel and based the program around one school eliminated some of these difficulties. The exception to presentation without follow-up was the Beginning Teacher Program which always included feedback through classroom observation by an administrator, peer teachers or coaches.

From interview responses, some TEC's appeared willing to pay the costs of feedback and coaching in return for a more powerful model. TEC 2 had been working with a university consultant who asked that segments of his classes be offered at two to three week intervals so that practice of the concept could occur before follow-up

discussions. The director considered this format very successful for teacher carryover of the innovation so was willing to pay the consultant's travel expenses.

Only one director who was interviewed made all five elements an integral part of training. This director of TEC 4 realized the difficulty of imposing a powerful design and had "hefty debates" with curriculum coordinators about mandated components such as Minimum Student Performance Standards. The teachers complained, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, another set of State guidelines. Forget it. Just give me the checklist and I'll fill it out." TEC 4 director believed that to make such a dry topic exciting and have carryover, the workshop must be experiential and include all five elements of program design.

District Characteristics Made a Difference in Program Design

When the questionnaire composite was broken down by district characteristics, no noticeable differences occurred in presentation of theory, however, the other elements showed variation. A complete breakdown of this question may be found in Appendix F, Table F-7. The southern TEC's generally had a weaker program design with no TEC indicating "almost always" in modeling, practice, feedback, or coaching. Only one southern TEC marked the "mostly" category in three of the five elements. This TEC was a small southern district that used school-based activities.

This weaker program design may have been a function of size, with three very large districts and two small ones which both focused mainly on recertification.

Size made the biggest difference with large TEC's doing less modeling, practice, feedback and coaching than either the small or medium districts. Only one large TEC responded it "mostly" did modeling. None of the others marked the "mostly" or "almost always" categories in any of the four higher elements. Large districts did more district-wide inservice, less school-based, and tended to focus on State mandates and district-wide goals. Follow-up was extremely difficult when participants of the original program were scattered and isolated at schools all over the county. Large districts also experienced big city problems that detracted from instruction. Next to computer education, the item that ranked highest on Broward County's needs assessment was stress management. During the interviews, the director of a medium sized district said, "I'm not sure that professionalism we talked about ever gets a chance to surface in Broward and Dade Counties. They're just too busy surviving just to get through one week at a time." Without the higher elements, large districts missed the benefits of collaborative problem solving, increased teacher involvement, and increased communication. This isolation was heightened by being part of a large impersonal bureaucracy.

The director of TEC 3, the large district, remarked that in the legislation there were no funds specifically provided for follow-up.

The intent of the legislation has a very cognitive flavor and staff development is often looked upon as the presentation of knowledge without the belief that staff development also includes practice and feedback aspects. The State does really not have a serious focus on follow-up, just on post-testing.

Without the State providing the push and the funds for supervisory feedback, principals in TEC 3 were mostly responsible for follow-up, but they were always off being trained since teachers could not be released to become in-district trainers. "Principals are being trained on the effective schools research, on management and communication, but they don't reinforce teachers on curriculum." Principals were often ineffective presenters and sometimes delegated training and follow-up to assistant principals so the training came to the teachers second and third hand. Time was difficult to find with the curriculum department claiming the two inservice days each year, and the union had negotiated that on pre- and post-school days, teachers could not leave the building for inservice. Organizational norms in TEC 3 interfered with powerful inservice program design.

Although there were only seven large districts in the State of Florida, they included 52,000 teachers and 899,000 students. All small and medium districts combined only totaled about 40,000 teachers. Thus, the majority of

the State's teachers were not being exposed to very powerful staff development designs and collaborative benefits. District-wide programs made follow-up and coaching logistics difficult, big city problems detracted from instructional concerns, political problems left follow-up in the hands of the principals - the least qualified source, and the State did not enforce follow-up as part of program design.

While big city teachers may need the most support and guidance in dealing with their clientele, they received the least. Releasing power to individual schools for a school-based focus would ease the logistical problems of follow-up, encourage peer support and coaching, and remove the burden from unqualified and unavailable principals.

Follow-up

The follow-up item on the questionnaire read, "Do your teacher staff development programs include some type of follow-up?" The director's responses are presented in Table III-8.

Table III-8

FREQUENCY OF FOLLOW-UP TO INSERVICE

	Number	Percent
Never	0	0%
Sometimes	19	50%
Usually	9	24%
Mostly	4	11%
Almost always	6	16%

These follow-up responses coordinated closely with the questionnaire feedback and coaching composites, but the higher percentages in the upper categories of this question reflected that post-testing was considered a follow-up to staff development. The co-op multi-district TEC's scored relatively lower reflecting the difficulty of following-up in multiple counties covering a wide geographic area with few supervisory personnel. Southern and large districts followed-up much less often due to their district-wide rather than school focus.

On the questionnaire, those doing follow-up were asked to "Check the types of follow-up activities that your TEC uses. Write "M" next to the most frequently used follow-up and "L" next to the least frequently used follow-up." The types of follow-up are presented in Table III-9.

Table III-9

TYPES OF FOLLOW-UP TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT

	Number	Percent
A skill check or testing of what the teachers learned in the program		
Checked	31	82%
Least	3	8%
Most	26	68%
Technical assistance in the classroom or school site		
Checked	33	87%
Least	9	24%
Most	13	34%
Peer Coaching		
Checked	32	84%
Least	11	29%
Most	8	21%
Evaluation of the teacher by a supervisor		
Checked	30	79%
Least	12	32%
Most	5	13%
Formally scheduled maintenance activities		
Checked	27	71%
Least	17	45%
Most	4	11%
Other:		
Observation checklists		
Perceived needs questionnaire completed by participants		

At first glance, it seemed that there was much follow-up to staff development activities, indicating a powerful design, but 50% of the respondents said they only had follow-up "sometimes." When the types of follow-up were broken down by district characteristics, no large district used peer coaching "most frequently" as compared to 26% of small districts and 25% of medium districts.

Small districts had to rely on peers, lacking the resources for supervisory personnel. Large districts seemed to have a network of content consultants, area supervisors, and technical assistants and, at least in TEC 3, heavily relied on principals and assistant principals for follow-up. Administrator reliance was confirmed. Twenty-nine percent of large districts tied follow-up to evaluation in the "most frequent" category as compared to 11% of small districts and 8% of medium districts. The complete breakdown of this questionnaire composite answer by district characteristics is found in Appendix F, Table F-9.

The TEC's used a variety of follow-up techniques but used them infrequently. Those districts that used peer coaching or technical assistance in the classroom had the additional benefit of personal as well as technical support. Programs without follow-up tend to create awareness but little transfer to the classroom.

Post-testing as a Follow-up

The high reliance on a skill check shown in the questionnaire came from pre- and post-testing legislation in which teachers must show improvement on 80% of the activity components on their post-test scores. During interviews, directors expressed great cynicism over this piece of legislation. One told an anecdote about a

prominent State senator who in 1982-83 visited the teachers' lounge in a high school. High school teachers, who seldom used TEC services, were making fun of the TEC courses, and three weeks later the legislature decided to require a minimum of 10 contact hours for a component to count toward recertification and to have pre- and post-testing. This director considered post-testing a "paper chase" and knew of districts that eliminated courses in music or creative thinking because of the difficulties in constructing a post-test. Another director said the legislators were worried that teachers were taking courses in which they already knew the material, so the post-test became a gain model where pre- and post-test scores were compared rather than a mastery model where only the final test mattered. TEC 2 director said:

It has become a game where teachers show as little knowledge as possible on pre-tests so that they can show increased knowledge on post-tests. At one time teachers were refused inservice courses when they scored too high on the pre-test.

Other Types of Follow-up

The legislation does allow for trainer observation rather than pencil and paper testing, so the director of small TEC 9 said he always chose the observation option.

In the bigger districts, they have people to write the thing, and score the things. I'm not interested and I don't have the time. My problem is finding ways to get people to attend, not ways to screen them out.

Follow-up Personnel

On the questionnaire, TEC directors were asked to indicate who was responsible for follow-up activities. The results are presented in Table III-10.

In those staff development activities that include follow-up, who is responsible for the follow-up? Check all those who have responsibility. Write "M" next to the persons who are most frequently responsible and "L" next to those least frequently responsible.

Table III-10

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Principal		
Checked	33	87%
Least	5	13%
Most	18	47%

Subject area supervisor		
Checked	31	82%
Least	6	16%
Most	12	32%

Teaching peers		
Checked	26	68%
Least	12	32%
Most	7	18%

University personnel		
Checked	28	74%
Least	15	39%
Most	6	16%

Other:

- Participants themselves - 3 responses
- Presenter - 3 responses
- TEC staff - 3 responses
- Support team - 1 response
- Assistant Principal of Curriculum - 1 response
- Consultant - 1 response
- District level - 1 response
- Curriculum specialists - 1 response

After reviewing the questionnaires and interviews, two interrelationships stood out, one concerning personnel and the other concerning funding. First, those districts that made extensive use of in-district personnel as trainers had more follow-up simply because there were more people available to do so as compared to those districts which heavily relied on university personnel, principals or district resource people who already had heavy demands upon their time.

Some districts placed impossible demands upon their resource and administrative personnel and lack of follow-up was the result. TEC 5 director said:

We have one resource person who is learning to work with middle grades. We have nothing for high school and the reason is, who the heck are we going to get who is going to be able to deal with 90 different personalities and 90 different individualized needs, 75 in another and 65 in another building.

Although principals were most often given the responsibility of follow-up, they sometimes did not take it. TEC 5 director noted:

The principal is the one responsible for follow-up to training and support, but a lot of principals don't get involved with anything like that. They just stay out. The theory of many is that it's staff development's area and if there's something to be done, it's staff development's problem.

Interviews revealed that attitude also got in the way. TEC 8 had poor follow-up with the principal being mostly responsible. In-district personnel were not encouraged to become trainers because little staff

development was done within the district, and "the notion was always that you weren't an expert unless you lived more than 50 miles away." Being the smallest district in the state, the TEC had often sent its people out-of-district for conferences rather than try to provide for the needs of 152 teachers in K-12.

The second interrelationship was concerned with ample funding. There was more follow-up in districts that had funds to build into program design the costs of sufficient supervisory personnel and/or released time for peer observation, coaching, and feedback. TEC 2, which had good follow-up, used TEC funds to provide released time to teachers to meet with coordinators and said their principals had the least responsibility for follow-up. TEC 6, which had good follow-up, built in the costs of released time for the entire school planning team which usually included an in-district trainer to meet with teachers. The follow-up plan included peer coaching, technical assistance, evaluation, and scheduled maintenance activities. TEC 4 director indicated that she never wrote a component without the inclusion of feedback and coaching and made it a part of the teacher's Professional Development Plan to encourage follow through.

The poorer rural districts had a difficult time finding funds for either released time or supervisory personnel. TEC 9, a very small district, was an exception.

Its follow-up was very good, due to a combination of peer coaching, released time, excellent relationships with university contacts, and administrative follow-up. TEC 9 made extensive use of in-district teachers as peer trainers in certain programs. In the Florida Performance Measurement System and the Beginning Teacher Program, it used administrators, and for curriculum matters, outside consultants were used for follow-up.

All of our principals are certified observers [in FPMS and BTP]. We have a cadre right here that can give any kind of information and feedback within the system. On a lot of curriculum type inservice, we have pull-out where we bring in a consultant often from another district and contract for so many days. They come for inservice and stay over tomorrow and go into the schools and visit each of the teachers in their own settings and give feedback to them.

Presenters

As seen in the above section, follow-up, so essential to a powerful staff development design, can depend on the availability of the presenter or trainer. Best practices from the literature do not give rosy reports on presenters, but dissatisfaction may be due to weak program design rather than the presenters themselves. University courses are not relevant to in-school problems, short term presentations by "experts" have no impact, principals are important to start change and keep it going, but are not rated highly as inservice instructors perhaps because they are also evaluators, ongoing projects with

experts serving as consultants are acceptable, but combining viewpoints into a workable operation is difficult and long term. The only group left is the teachers, but how are teachers to be turned into effective teacher-leaders? Teacher-presenters require training in adult learning models and need encouragement to lead peer groups. Best practices recognize teachers as a currently under-utilized resource. They are credible, available, can provide continuing personal support, and are aware of local needs. The questionnaire responses of the Florida TEC directors concerning who were the presenters of inservice activities is shown in Table III-11.

Table III-11

PRESENTERS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Who presents the inservice activities for teachers? Check all those who are presenters. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important and "L" next to the least important.

	Number	Percent
University personnel		
Checked	37	97%
Least	0	0%
Most	21	55%
Teachers from the district		
Most	36	95%
Least	3	8%
Most	18	47%
Presenters from outside the district		
Checked	35	92%
Least	2	5%
Most	15	39%

Table III-11 -- Continued

Curriculum personnel from the district

Checked	35	92%
Least	6	16%
Most	12	32%

District administrators

Checked	32	84%
Least	7	18%
Most	7	18%

Personnel from the TEC

Checked	31	82%
Least	8	21%
Most	5	13%

Representatives from textbook firms

Checked	34	89%
Least	24	63%
Most	2	5%

Other:

Governmental agencies

Community health, police, sheriff, doctors, lawyers

Retired educators

According to questionnaire responses, university personnel were considered the most important presenters with their current knowledge base and the added incentive of TEC hours, a set amount of money provided by the State which is unavailable to the TEC's unless they contract in a service agreement with the university. In a certain sense, the university consultants are "free" up to a limited number of contract hours.

Teachers were the next most important presenters with their high credibility, and high availability. Teachers were a good economic investment for the district when they were taught to become trainers. Teachers appeared to be presenters more often at the time of this

study than they were in the 1983 TEC evaluation report when the State average was 12% for teacher presenters. Teachers have also become more prevalent than administrator/supervisor presenters who were the delivery agents 19% of the time in 1983.

Outside consultants ranked next and were most often called in for particular projects when local expertise was not available. Even small districts could occasionally bring in big names. In descending order, other presenters were curriculum consultants, district administrators, TEC personnel and textbook representatives.

In the last six years, TEC's have progressed toward best practices in making greater use of teachers as presenters. It is a good economic investment, teachers are credible and in touch with local needs, and it gives teacher-presenters a sense of professionalism. TEC's who subscribed to best practices took the responsibility of providing training to their teacher leaders.

District Characteristics Made a Difference

When the questionnaire composite data were broken down by district characteristics, ranking was most noticeably different by district size as shown in Table III-12. The complete tables of district characteristics data are located in Appendix F.

Table III-12

RANKING OF PRESENTERS BY DISTRICT SIZE

SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE
University	Teachers	University
Consultants	Curriculum	Teachers
Teachers	University	Curriculum
Administrators	Consultants	Consultants
TEC	Administrators	TEC
Curriculum	TEC	Administrators
Textbook	Textbook	Textbook

Both small and large districts rated university presenters as most important: large districts 71%, small 66%, and medium 32%. Small districts had to rely on university personnel and outside consultants, seldom having content supervisors of their own. Teachers in small districts had trouble overcoming "prophet in your own land" attitudes that were more common in small, rural districts. Large districts used university personnel most often because they most commonly chose district-wide approaches and present-and-leave program design with the "experts."

Large districts thought curriculum personnel most important in 57% of the responses; medium districts responded 50% and small districts 11%. Larger districts had more internal support staff which they used as staff development presenters. Small districts seldom had curriculum personnel and ranked them least important, 32%, as compared to 0% in both medium and large districts.

Medium sized districts came closest to best practices using teachers and curriculum personnel most often. They

were familiar with local problems, and usually available for follow-up.

Districts in the northwest rated outside consultants as most important, 71% as compared to 13% northeast, 20% southern, and 44% central. Most northwest districts were small and located far from universities. Attitudes and distances precluded teachers and university faculty from being most important. Northwestern districts used presenters that were available and inexpensive. Directors marked textbook representatives as most important in 29% of their responses as compared to 0% for all other state locations, and marked administrators as being most important in 43% of their responses as compared to 0% southern, 13% northeast, and 17% central.

When asked, "To what degree are presenters available for follow-up?" districts responded as shown in Table III-13.

Table III-13

AVAILABILITY OF PRESENTERS FOR FOLLOW-UP

	Number	Percent
Never	0	0%
Sometimes	11	29%
Usually	14	37%
Mostly	7	18%
Almost always	6	16%

Medium sized districts most often used teachers and curriculum personnel as presenters and had the highest ranking, 25%, in the "almost always" category of having presenters available for follow-up as compared to 16% of

small districts and 0% of large districts. Medium and large districts both had the financial resources to fund curriculum personnel, but large districts tended to rely mostly on their principals for follow-up.

Small districts, with their heavy use of outside consultants and university personnel, had a surprisingly good availability of presenters for follow-up with 32% marking they were mostly available, and 16% almost always available. This high availability was especially surprising since most small districts were not located near universities. Small districts sometimes had more latitude with released time and had developed more personalized relationships with their university contacts.

Southern districts had less luck in getting their presenters back with 40% marking "sometimes available" and 60% marking "usually available." Even though their presenters matched the composite in ranking, Southern districts had chosen university personnel as most important in 80% of the responses, much higher than the 55% average. Table F-13 in Appendix F contains the complete break down by district characteristics for availability of presenters.

In comparing those districts who marked "sometimes available" with those who marked "always," the "sometimes" districts had a heavier reliance on university personnel and outside presenters. This relationship matched the finding that districts with better follow-up more often

used teaching peers than administrators, or used sufficiently funded in-district coordinators or released time to provide the coaching and feedback.

Strong staff development program design means encouraging a long term change in teacher behavior or encouraging a large percentage of teachers to apply the innovation in the classroom. To do so, program design must include concept presentation, demonstration or modeling, practice, feedback and coaching. The districts that were able to present this kind of model tended to include a majority of six factors:

- a) TEC's made intensive use of in-district personnel -- teachers or sufficiently funded curriculum personnel -- to present and were thus usually available for follow-up activities.
- b) Funds were available for coordinators to come into the classroom and/or for released time to allow the teachers to participate in peer activities.
- c) The activities were school-based so peers or supervisors were readily available for technical and personal support.
- d) There was little reliance on the principal for feedback and coaching because he did not have the time or expertise to do this job sufficiently. He could provide clarity in goals, encouragement and recognition.
- e) Presenters were trained in powerful staff development design and adult learning theory.
- f) Organizational norms allowed for the other five factors.

Only a minority of Florida's TEC's were able to subscribe to these best practices. Without changing the

district norms, to allow for site based staff development or at least a more diffused power base and assuring adequate financial support, it is unlikely that the elements of powerful program design could be expected to succeed.

INCENTIVES

The literature notes several types of incentives that may be offered to encourage participation in voluntary staff development activities. Extrinsic incentives include stipends, advancement on the salary scale, certification for advanced positions, tuition reimbursements, inservice credits, and released time. Intrinsic incentives may include leadership status, increased involvement in decision making, technical assistance in terms of personal contact and interaction, but the most powerful is increased satisfaction. Personal satisfaction may come from increasing teachers' skills which lead to more positive behavior of students, academic growth of students, or conditions in the workplace that facilitate good student performance. Since teachers spend most of their time with students, better teacher-student interaction is the most rewarding.

Extrinsic incentives are not considered as powerful as intrinsic because they are not as long lasting, yet Florida's TEC's offered extrinsic incentives most often. Paying teachers for after school, Saturday and summer inservice participation had become institutionalized. Florida school districts paid teachers even when professional development was required to extend their

certificates. Table III-14 presents questionnaire responses concerning incentives that were offered to teachers.

The questionnaire item read, "Other than inservice points towards recertification, what incentives are offered to teachers to participate in inservice activities?"

Table III-14

INCENTIVES TO ATTEND INSERVICE

	Number	Percent
Stipends	22	58%
Intrinsic	10	26%
Assorted Benefits	7	18%
Recognition	6	16%
Advancement	6	16%
Released time	4	11%
Inservice days	2	5%
None	3	8%

Of 38 respondents to the open ended questionnaire item, 22 answered money. There were stipends for high priority off-duty training, for summer institutes, and a cumulative stipend. Six TEC's answered that teachers could meet advanced criteria, earn college degrees, meet new certification requirements, take State approved programs without cost, or have career ladder opportunities through peer training and coaching. Seven TEC's listed assorted benefits as conference attendance, tuition reimbursement, free materials, or refreshments.

Ten questionnaire responses cited intrinsic motivators such as increased knowledge and skills, exciting

training, pleasant interaction with peers, or classes appealing to teacher interests. Six mentioned personal recognition such as support for collegial/professional development, or tangible features such as certificates presented upon completion.

Five directors answered that additional time was a motivator. Three TEC's released teachers from their duties and provided substitutes. Another gave compensatory time if the teacher attended after school inservice activities. Two others listed inservice days. Time was such an important issue that it was addressed in the following section of this chapter.

In follow-up interviews, TEC's said they used incentives to a greater degree than was indicated on the questionnaire. Each used a form of stipend, most allowed released time and had inservice days to some degree.

There was, however, a wide discrepancy among districts on the use of intrinsic incentives. This discrepancy depended upon the complexity of their program designs and opportunities for leadership participation. Those districts who had a more complex program design were able to offer personal support through feedback and coaching. This personal assistance to the teacher provided a feeling of mutual interest in the project. Those districts who cultivated teacher-leaders provided an opportunity for professional growth and recognition. The

knowledge of TEC directors about powerful program design and the attitudes of TEC directors and district upper management about sharing power influenced these decisions concerning intrinsic incentives. Table III-15 gives a brief summary of responses gleaned during interviews.

Table III-15

INCENTIVES FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

TEC	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Stipend									
SI		Sa	AS	AS	CS	AS	AS	AS	AS
Leadership Opportunities									
few		Y	few	Y	few	Y	some	N	Y
Released Time									
N		Y	N	some	some	Y	some	Y	Y

Key: Sa = Saturday only
 AS = After school or Saturdays
 Y = Yes N= No CS = Cumulative Stipend
 SI = Summer Institute stipend only

Stipends as an Incentive

More detailed information concerning incentives was gathered during the interviews. Stipends were always paid for summer institutes and inservice classes taken in off duty hours were typically paid at the rate of \$10.00 per hour. TEC 1 did not offer stipends except for summer institutes. TEC 2 did not pay for after school workshops because critical classes were offered with released time.

"That's strictly a professional kind of thing." Several after school courses were very popular in TEC 2, and it was having no difficulty filling enrollment. The director was experimenting with Saturday stipend classes which were flooded with applicants. TEC 3 paid after school stipends of \$40 for six hours and \$12 per hour for summer institute. This TEC had no released time and needed the stipend as an incentive.

TEC 4 gave stipends of \$10.00 per hour but often struck deals with teachers. For a given price, the trainer might say he could only do a portion of the training, or could do it all if the students were willing to do it for the same amount. The result was volunteer time and the limited stipend was sufficient incentive. TEC 4 did pay a \$600 stipend and offer graduate credit for summer institutes which were very competitive, with only 200 slots for 1900 teachers. In some cases, such as Learning Channels, the TEC even charged tuition but gave graduate credit in addition to inservice hours.

In TEC 5, participation in staff development was encouraged by a cumulative salary stipend with no money received until 180 hours were accumulated. Teachers who accumulated 720 inservice hours or college contact hours over a ten year period received a \$1000 salary bonus for a ten year period. In 1987-88, in salary incentives and benefits, the district paid out over \$400,000 for a

district of 1700 employees. TEC 5 paid teachers their full salaries for curriculum development over the summer but summer institutes were so popular that teachers were willing to accept lesser stipends. TEC 5 was funded for 23 thirty hour participants but it had stretched its funds to include 196 participants chosen through the TEC Council.

Stipends were rare for after school or Saturday classes in TEC 6, and they were only at the rate of \$5.00 per hour, which had been negotiated with the union, and \$10.00 per hour for summer institutes. TEC 6 considered take home materials a major incentive and was the one incentive used more often than either stipends or released time. TEC's 7, 8, and 9 all paid stipends and TEC 8 director said, "If you don't give them a stipend, they won't show."

Monetary reward had become an expected incentive and the results could be seen. The substantial cumulative stipend in TEC 5 did encourage participation, and lack of financial reward in TEC 1 discouraged participation. However, the relationship between these two variables was not exact. TEC 2 could not offer attractive stipends but still had active participation and achieved the same or better results as TEC 5 did by using other incentives.

Leadership Opportunities as an Incentive

TEC 2 had teacher trainers in domains of teaching, teaching effectiveness and Assertive Discipline whom the community college appointed as adjunct professors.

It does a number of things for us. Number one, it gives our professionals a chance to be teachers of adults which this reading component has convinced me is wonderful. There is professional renewal for the person who teaches. Even if it's a paper thing, it's a wonderful thing for people to say that they're a teacher at the college."

Once teachers in TEC 4 were trained in a program, there was a potential to become a trainer, and TEC 4 made extensive use of teachers as trainers. Teacher trainers received course credit for training and were appointed as adjunct faculty by the university. "Our trainers kill for trainer positions for our teacher assessment system." The teacher trainers were also taught marketing strategies and were highly encouraged to call on their colleagues, give them tips, share best practices, and conduct whole PR campaigns to get people to register for their programs.

TEC 4 director felt that teacher participation was motivating. She said, "Teachers feel the glow of being included in the decision making process. They are excited to sit on committees with administrators." There were 1256 teachers out of 1900 who participated in one kind or another of district-wide activity in the last two years. This district encouraged shared decision making at all levels of management. Asking teachers to become trainers

was just another example of sharing the power base.

TEC 6 offered many opportunities for teachers to become trainers and had 13% of its staff participating as trainers, as peers in the BIP, or on staff development teams. TEC 9 used its "home grown talent" as trainers and believed it was a good economic investment. The staff went outside of the district to become trainers or to attend conferences and "brought back the word." Another professional growth opportunity was teaching the non-certified staff business English for secretaries or Assertive Discipline for cafeteria workers. If trainers worked during the school day, they were not paid, but if the workshop was held on holidays or vacation days, they were paid as consultants. According to the director, the trainers were only the stout hearted or the professionally motivated teachers.

There were few teacher leader opportunities except for peer teachers in the Beginning Teacher Program in TEC's 1, 3, 5, and 8. TEC 1 provided little assistance or vision for staff development, and TEC's 3, 5, and 8 had little shared decision making. Few opportunities for teacher leadership was just another example. In co-op TEC 7, leadership opportunities depended on the district.

Leadership opportunities were not only important as teacher incentives of increased status or involvement in decision making, they affected program design. Districts

that used teachers as presenters had better availability of presenters; had a higher degree of follow-up, feedback, and coaching; and cut costs of outside presenters and travel times. Large districts had fewer opportunities for teacher leadership and thus, also fewer of the characteristics listed above.

Released Time as an Incentive

Only TEC's 2, 6 and 8 made substantial use of released time. Time is such a difficult and expensive issue that it is treated separately in the following section.

Convenience and Program Design as Incentives

Convenience, low cost, and interactive program design motivated teachers to choose TEC courses rather than university courses. TEC 8 brought two TEC sponsored college programs to town because the university was 70 miles away. The director of TEC 4 felt that courses offered in the afternoon near the teachers' schools were an incentive. Coursework without tuition also was an incentive for using the TEC. Programs offered by the TEC could be tailored to local needs and requirements, and teachers preferred TEC courses because they were relevant. Another reason teachers preferred the TEC classes was given by TEC 4 director:

They don't see the universities making the change toward the adult training model [concept presentation, demonstration, practice, feedback, coaching]. They see lecture, lecture, lecture and they're sick of it. They can come to a workshop where they know there's going to be a model, either live-and-in-person or a video. They laugh sometimes at our locally produced videos, but they recognize the people on the video. She's in my school! It's the personalization and the variety of training strategies that appeals as an incentive.

Other Incentives

Encouragement of professionalism, teacher empowerment, peer pressure, group rewards and panic over recertification also functioned as incentives. The director of TEC 2 was one of the few who discussed intrinsic motivation at length, citing an increased feeling of professionalism that he attributed to teachers as trainers, a move toward school-based staff development, a representative TEC council of 17 members, and marketing of the TEC. "We now are so swamped." TEC 2 recently finished training in the Wisconsin Reading Program led by teacher trainers in which 512 teachers in a district of 2100 teachers came after school, without stipends, to voluntary programs.

The director's feeling of professionalism extended to the union which ran its own research course every ten weeks on best practices. The union reported they were turning people away. The union participated in the TEC Council and the president kept in touch with the TEC director at least once a week.

Even though intrinsic incentives were so obviously powerful, they were seldom used because a strong program design was required to provide incentive opportunities such as personal support through feedback and coaching or opportunities to become trainers. Few TEC's had the knowledge, desire or strength needed to focus staff development toward a coordinated goal and install powerful program design.

Peer pressure was a motivating factor, too. TEC 4 had been offering Project TEACH, Project PRIDE, and Teaching Through Learning Channels for more than five years, and over 1000 of its 1900 teachers were trained in each of the three programs. The TEC had originally trained 90 in-district teachers with a goal to train six participants from each building. There was such a good recruiting drive that there were building classes of 25-30 rather than six. The director said there was so much discussion, coaching, and financial support of these programs among the new teachers that the veterans in "the can't learn anything new mode" began to sign up, also. "It's hard to collaborate when you don't speak the same language as your partners in your department."

Schools in TEC 6 could become Meritorious Schools based on test scores and student participation or could become Schools of Distinction through teacher participation as trainers, workshop presenters, or participants in at

least 30 hours of inservice. TEC 6 did not pay individual salaries to trainers but paid the trainer's school, and the staff used it for materials, equipment, or staff development. This payment to the schools was a very unusual and powerful practice for shifting the reward from the individual to the school. TEC 6 used a strong school-based model for staff development and rewarding the school, rather than the individual, helped to build a collaborative team feeling.

With the changes in certification, many teachers felt panicked to recertify before July 1988 or they would "be in a terrible fix or it would be terribly difficult to do it in the future," and TEC 8 director admitted, "I did nothing to change the perception." This attitude encouraged far better participation in staff development activities.

Lack of strong incentives made a difference in staff development participation. TEC 1 did not offer a stipend for classes during the year. Few leadership opportunities existed to become trainers except for the Peer Teacher Program which only worked with beginning teachers. In this district of 700 teachers, there were only two State trained teacher trainers. Released time was hardly ever allowed. The superintendent "just doesn't see staff development as a goal." This lack of both extrinsic and intrinsic incentives may be the reason why the director

lamented:

We have many, many teachers that don't want it, period. They take off that one inservice day a year. They feel that they don't need it or they already know what's being talked about which is probably not true. If President Bush came to talk to them about whatever, they still wouldn't go.

TEC's that offered incentives in the form of professional growth through becoming teacher trainers, or being included in the decision making process did not have to rely on stipends as heavily as TEC's that did not offer those opportunities. The "participation" districts seemed to have a far higher rate of participation in staff development, greater than needed for certificate renewal, and a growing sense of buy-in and professionalism. The unique idea of paying the home school of the trainer rather than paying the trainer truly shifted the incentive to the group rather than to the individual and encouraged collaborative work.

TEC's using released time did not use stipends as much, but both released time and stipends were prohibitively expensive. Only those districts committed to a research based, powerful inservice model were willing to fight for released time. Those districts that offered no incentives found a noticeable lack of interest, buy-in, and renewed professionalism among their staffs.

Voluntary vs. Mandatory Inservice

Since most staff development programs in Florida were voluntary, the degree of participation depended on the strengths of the incentives. The typical exceptions were new mandates from the State such as suicide prevention, a mandated district-wide inservice day, or a mandate from a principal concerning a school-based project. Teachers requiring remediation could be placed in mandatory programs in some districts and all new teachers were required to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program to obtain their permanent certificates. For experienced teachers, districts depended on the various incentives such as peer persuasion, stipends, leadership opportunities, evaluation results, or the professionalism of the teacher.

This review of TEC practices confirmed conclusions from the research; intrinsic incentives in the form of being a teacher trainer, coach, or participant in planning teams or being involved in interactive program design increased inservice participation more than receiving stipends. TEC's that removed the disincentives of inconvenient time or location or irrelevant coursework also encouraged participation. Measuring teacher satisfaction due to increased skills or improvements in the workplace was outside the scope of this study but can be inferred by the increased voluntary participation in some TEC's.

TIME

Staff development takes time, time for practice, time for building communication and interpersonal support, time for reflection, time for planning, time to decide how to locally adapt an innovation, time to change attitudes, time for coaching and regular and consistent feedback, and funds to access that time. Best practices say that time is needed for all these activities as well as time for presentation. Unfamiliar and complex practices take more time than familiar and simple concepts. There is no agreement as to whether time should be outside of school hours or teachers should be released from duties.

Time was often cited both on the questionnaires and in the interviews as the greatest impediment to inservice activities and it became a greater problem since passage of the Rays Bill in 1986 which mandated 300 minutes of student contact or engagement time per day. The impact was felt on parent conference days, pep rallies, and extracurricular activities as well as on shortened-day plans for inservice.

Florida districts scheduled 0-4 inservice days into their calendars during the year. Some districts coordinated these with State Conference Days which were a Friday and Saturday, usually during October. On Friday, students were not in attendance and teachers could choose

to attend the conferences, usually held in Orlando. Each district set its own calendar and each TEC its requirements for reimbursement. In addition, many districts had pre- and post-student attendance days in their calendars that were partially used for inservice.

Released time for inservice activities during the regular school day was a highly divisive topic; are benefits from staff development worth interrupted class time? It had created political turmoil in some districts as had contract negotiations over inservice days and pre- and post-planning days. Questionnaire responses about time logistics are presented in Table III-16.

The questionnaire item asked, "When do teachers attend inservice programs that are sponsored by the TEC? Check all those that apply. Write "M" next to the most frequent time and "L" next to the least frequent.

Table III-16

INSERVICE TIME LOGISTICS

	Number	Percent
After school hours		
Check	37	97%
Least	9	24%
Most	21	55%
During school hours		
Check	37	97%
Least	7	18%
Most	20	53%
In the summer		
Check	36	95%
Least	5	13%
Most	14	37%

Table III-16 -- Continued

Weekends		
Check	33	87%
Least	27	71%
Most	1	2%
Other:		
Inservice days	1	2%

Upon breaking down questionnaire responses by district characteristics, district size made the most difference. Table F-16 of responses by district characteristics is located in Appendix F. Large districts were much more likely to have inservice after school, with 87% of the large districts reporting it was the "most frequent" pattern as compared to 75% of medium and 32% of small districts. Weekend and summer patterns were nearly equal. The cost of providing substitute teachers in a large district was phenomenal, and bureaucratic finagling for funds was already at a fever pitch. Departments in TEC 3 put on elaborate presentations to try to convince the Council that their projects merited funding. Board policy, a belief that the teachers were most beneficial when they were in the classroom, and the difficulty and cost of procuring substitutes made large districts choose after school time for staff development activities.

Teacher only TEC's rated during-school time as most important in 66% of the responses as compared to 43% of TEC's that also served administrators and non-certified staff. Their sole focus on instructional effectiveness

made them choose a mandatory and more powerful design. Southern districts more often chose after school hours, again, probably more a function of size than location. Other areas of the state followed the general questionnaire composite.

Amount of Time Spent on Staff Development

Since 1982-83, when the State evaluation report announced that more than one half of training time was spent in training of one day or less, the legislature imposed the ten hour rule: to count inservice hours toward recertification, the staff development activity must be at least ten hours long. Some districts used ten hours of presentation, some used five hours on an inservice day and had five hours of "homework," and some split it up into five two hour sessions or ten one hour sessions.

Districts had opposing views on the ten hour rule during interviews. Some found it inconsequential since they tended to focus on college equivalent courses - 60 inservice hours - in Project TEACH or POWER. Some bemoaned the loss of one or two hour awareness sessions, such as TEC 7. To make ten hours, others put several topics under one umbrella, and one director said he just dragged out five hours worth of instruction into ten. Questionnaire responses concerning the length of inservice activities are shown in Table III-17.

How long do your teacher inservice activities last?
Check all those that apply. Write "M" next to the most
frequent time schedule and "L" next to the least
frequent.

Table III-17

LENGTH OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Over several weeks		
Check	36	95%
Least	5	13%
Most	25	66%
4-8 hours		
Check	32	84%
Least	9	24%
Most	13	34%
A semester		
Check	33	87%
Least	13	34%
Most	5	13%
A year		
Check	32	84%
Least	13	34%
Most	5	13%
1-4 hours		
Check	27	71%
Least	10	26%
Most	8	21%
Over several years		
Check	23	61%
Least	21	55%
Most	0	0%

The result of the ten hour rule was clearly evident; most districts spent ten hours on staff development activities. All TEC's, regardless of district characteristics, chose "several weeks" as being the most

frequent pattern. Medium sized TEC's had a slightly higher response for "a year," large TEC's for "a semester," and small TEC's for "over several weeks." Most of the year-long programs were Beginning Teacher Programs or school-based improvement projects. TEC 7 chose not to make multi-year plans because the legislature funded all projects on a year to year basis and the director feared the uncertainty of funding. Some long term programs may not have been included due to wording in the questionnaire. For example, TEC 5 had been doing TEACH, PRIDE, and Learning Channels for five years, but any one session only lasted for 60 hours.

Ten hours of instruction and 50% of the districts doing follow-up "sometimes" did not make for a very powerful change design. Accessing teacher time is expensive, and there is little use paying for that time unless a powerful program design is attached to increase classroom transfer of the concept. Buying more presentation time is likely to have little result but buying time for feedback and follow-up could have multiple benefits in stronger program design and climate improvement through personal support. The more effective TEC's combined released time and inservice days to show district support with teacher buy-in and voluntary time achieved through participatory techniques and other incentives. More effective TEC's used fewer but longer term activities.

TEC's Handled Time Constraints Differently

TEC 1 had one inservice day each year that was used for school-based programs and was mandatory. There were three pre-planning days of which one half day was used for district orientation inservice. The director was able to add an additional day for new teachers. By contract, teachers stayed 30-45 minutes after the student day, and some inservice occurred then. On released time, "We don't do it, period," was the response of the director.

TEC 2 allowed for released time for peer observation and the director felt the district had done very well with that. "The district has been very generous with substitute money...It's just so terribly expensive." Reading and math coordinators met with content teachers and elementary representatives for a half day every quarter. "When a new technique comes out, everybody hears it at the same time, but that is a tremendous cost, \$80,000 in substitutes. It gives the message that instruction is important." The TEC was experimenting with Saturday workshops with an \$11.00 per hour stipend rather than released time and "have more than we can handle saying yes. We're flooded." There were three district inservice days in TEC 2's calendar but it was talking about doing away with them for district inservice. "Supervisors waste that day."

TEC 2 had used a plan where teachers came in early, with the first ten minutes of class covered by paraprofessionals, custodians and administrators. It gave the schools a one hour session on those days but was eliminated by the Rays Bill. The TEC Council was looking to find alternatives for time since released time was so expensive. It was talking about having new teachers come in three days early which would give the district a chance to raise the new teachers' salaries and advertise the higher rate. The union was extremely positive about that. TEC 2 already had three pre-planning days.

In TEC 3, the Board decided that there would be no released time for teachers. A committee decided released time teachers were clogging the substitute calling system for which principals were responsible. Thus, no inservice was offered during the day except for very high priority programs.

This policy had considerable impact on the district. Since teachers could not be released, it was decided to train the principals who were to go back to the schools and train the teachers. Consequently, principals were seldom in the buildings because they were being trained. Not all principals were effective presenters. An elite rather than collaborative feeling was growing among them. It affected the teachers too. Only those teachers with a professional attitude came to voluntary inservice

sessions after school or on Saturdays. TEC 3 considered a recent session successful when 150 teachers, out of a district of 5,200, came on Saturday. Those who would not come on their own time never received the training.

TEC 3 had two mandatory inservice days each year in addition to State Conference Day, but they were controlled by Curriculum and Instruction and teachers were required to meet with their subject area groups. Inservice days were never on generic or school-based topics. The TEC had no control over content since it was now part of the Human Resources Department and not part of Curriculum and Instruction. There were five pre-student attendance days, but the union negotiated that teachers were not to leave the school. Thus, no district-wide staff development could be done on those days, and little staff development was school-based.

TEC 4 wrestled with the problem of released time trying to balance the idea that a day away from the classroom could be a source of renewal and morale building, but on the other hand, it was an interruption of instruction. The district was trying to avoid released time and typically only used it for mandatory State or district goals. Ninety percent of inservice was voluntary after school and some on Saturdays. Principals could mandate up to 12 hours of inservice but very few did. The district had four inservice days each year, but there was

fierce competition for teacher planning, school-based planning and workshops, and district-wide activities.

TEC 5 allowed released time for a required activity but found it very expensive. School-based TEC funds were also used to release a teacher to attend a conference, or in case of a district need, TEC office substitute funds were used. This district had the most problems in getting supervisors to release secretaries and teacher aides. Because of the cost, TEC 5 was planning more evening and weekend workshops.

In TEC 5 almost everything was voluntary, even a school-based program, but, "we don't have to push a lot because that \$1000 incentive is out there." The only mandatory area was a performance deficiency. Subtle coercion was occasionally used. For a voluntary workshop on the rights and responsibilities of alternative school teachers, two teachers declined. The TEC director informed the union, "If something goes wrong that the teachers should have known about, the District will disavow any knowledge of their existence, and they are not going to be protected or backed." The teachers made workshop arrangements the next day.

TEC 6 provided released time for the most critical workshops because "we know we'll get teachers fresher." It battled constantly with the Board who believed that absolutely nothing should interrupt the instructional day.

The TEC director had fought with the Board to see that, "When we do that, it's critical, it's important, and the kids will benefit." To make the released time more productive, the TEC trained substitute teachers.

The rest of our program is committed volunteers and we believe that is the best way. As a group in your school, of committed volunteers, they draw others in, and we found that works, but we do not mandate our programs beyond what I've described. [required remedial teacher technical assistance and BTP]

There was only one inservice day a year in TEC 6. There were more, but the days were negotiated into paid holidays ten years ago and would never be renegotiated back. There were three duty days, but the union had negotiated that no staff development could be done in the mornings of those days. "We've got to get inservice days back. We can't afford to do release time. You're in a no win situation. Accelerated days seem to be the most logical."

The director of TEC 6 had been trying to get "accelerated days" when students come in late certain days on a regular schedule. Accelerated days would allow for ongoing school-based inservice, or they could be tied into duty days. The entire rest of the week would have to be restructured and lengthened to allow for sufficient student contact time to meet the Rays mandate. The director thought this could be accomplished four years ago when the union, through the TEC Council, and administrative staff, through the TEC director, both proposed the same plan. The

proposal was denied by upper administration. The problem was transportation. They could not get the busses.

The director had been working on district administrators to extend the school year for inservice training. She would even accept three extra days although she would like 60 hours. The Assistant Superintendent "thinks it's hysterical" and the costs would be phenominal to pay 2300 teachers.

TEC 7 had one cooperative inservice day with decentralized locations for its nine districts but beyond that inservice day, it depended on the county. Inservice days were only mandatory in two of the nine counties, but those two counties had the highest inservice evaluations from teachers. The director would like more mandatory involvement. He had difficulty in getting about 1/3 of his staffs involved who "have been there 25 years and have taught it that way for 25 years and they don't see a need for it and this is just a waste of their time." Each district had two, three, or four pre-planning days typically tied up with district meetings allowing for no more than one half day of staff development time. Some districts had additional days for beginning teachers when an Assertive Discipline course and BTP classes were held.

Released time was allowed as long as there were TEC funds to pay for it, with an occasional use of district funds. Some counties provided released time for mandatory

programs. Assertive Discipline was mandatory in the TEC's home county and discipline concerns dropped from number one on the needs assessment five years ago to being ranked fifth or sixth. It was a good example of the strength of a mandatory-released time combination. When everyone in a school is trained in a procedure, there is peer pressure and support for its use in opposition to the "buckshot" approach of which TEC director 2 spoke.

TEC 8 director said, "The district has never had a problem with release time to speak of." This district allowed released time to attend conferences, for observation, and for peer activities. Either the school paid or the TEC paid, but the district was so small that it more often sent teachers out than had programs within the district.

Next year TEC 8 will have new inservice days, one in pre-planning and one in the fall which was seen as a "huge improvement." The pre-planning day was not an addition to the calendar but was taking the place of a county meeting. By contract it "could not ask teachers to do anything on a work day but have made the decision to go ahead." The director had been working with the superintendent and the union, which he considered not very effective, to alter the contract. Prior to the Rays bill, schools skipped a period and had half a day during the week for a variety of activities, including curriculum planning

teams which was now eliminated.

TEC 9 held after-school school-based projects, used before school time, and used released time. TEC 9 preferred not to use released time very often but sometimes could not avoid it because of the limited availability of quality presenters. Being a very small district, it could not demand time or pay presenters as large districts did. The TEC used after school activities very seldom; being a small, rural district, extracurricular activities were extensive and many teachers were tied up as activity sponsors and coaches.

TEC 9 had pre-planning days but no inservice days during the year although the State recommended they be added. The director felt there were few generic programs that could be used district-wide that would meet the needs of 150 teachers in K-12. The district had begun a two day orientation for teachers who were new to the district. Mandatory programs in TEC 9 were State mandates in suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse, child abuse recognition, and the Beginning Teacher Program. A principal could decide a school-based project was mandatory, but this entailed only a small portion of staff development activities.

Comparing TEC's 1 and 4 demonstrated the spectrum found in time and incentives for inservice. TEC 1 had one

inservice day, no released time, no stipends for off duty hours, had no career opportunities for teacher leaders, short inservice activities, and lax superintendent support. TEC 4 had four inservice days, released time for mandated projects, paid \$10.00 per hour stipends, paid \$600 for summer institute and gave graduate credit, trained a large number of personnel from its staff as presenters, arranged for staff personnel to become adjunct faculty, used all the elements of program design, had many 60 contact hour activities, and had superintendent support. The result in TEC 1 was the teachers would not show if George Bush came, and in TEC 4, 1256 out of 1900 teachers participated in district activities in the last two years.

Not allowing released time had significant impact. Only the teachers with a professional attitude or a desire to know attended. Some could be motivated by stipends but others were never trained and updated. If a district needed to have total teacher participation in a goal, it could hardly do so without released time. Released time gave a signal from the district that staff development was taken seriously. Districts that were adamant about not releasing teachers also lost program design benefits of having teacher-trainers.

When time just could not be bought, volunteer time could be encouraged through the use of shared decision making, participation in planning, and the use of teachers

as trainers. Only two of the nine interviewed districts made any attempt to find alternate ways of finding time, and both had many obstacles in their paths.

To overcome the school norms of teacher isolation, cynicism of new programs, acceptance of the status quo, resistance to outside experts, resistance to change of classroom routine, and the acceptance that all styles are equally effective, the district must provide time - time to plan and reflect, time to change attitudes, time to adapt new concepts to local conditions, time to practice and preferably, time to collaborate and have the personal support so necessary for making changes. Although it is expensive, the comparison of TEC's 1 and 4 demonstrated the results. Few Florida TEC's were able to follow best practices in time and incentives as well as TEC 4.

PROGRAM CONTENT

Joyce and Showers divide content into four categories: academic content, content about the teaching process, content about students, and technology. (4) During interviews, Florida TEC directors said they offered all of these. There were academic content courses similar to university courses, since half of inservice hours necessary for certificate renewal had to be academic content hours. However, many TEC's specialized in staff development classes about teaching, students, or technology because they could not offer the variety of courses necessary in academic content. In the large districts, the curriculum department offered specialized content classes, and in the small districts, universities met the need.

A second way to categorize content was by the purpose it served and the amount and quality of the change in teacher behavior that must accompany it. Schlechty and Whitford use maintenance, enhancement and establishment levels. (5) Maintenance programs kept current practices going and enculturated new staff members. Enhancement

(4) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement Through Staff Development, p. 27.

(5) Schlechty and Whitford, "The Teacher as Adult Learner," pp.76-77.

programs sought to fine tune existing skills and required no value changes. Establishment programs focused on the new rather than the existing and were the most complex because they required changes in values. This classification may be used to expand Joyce and Shower's model and is not in conflict with it. For example, inservice may be offered to maintain a teaching process, to enhance a teaching process, or to establish a whole new approach to a teaching process. On the questionnaire, TEC's were first asked about maintenance programs. Their responses are shown in Table III-18.

The item read: If program content were to be divided by the definitions below, what portion of your teacher staff development programs would come under each category?

Table III-18

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DIRECTED TOWARD MAINTENANCE

Maintenance programs: trying to get rid of undesirable teacher or student behaviors or to maintain current practices, i.e., discipline techniques, teacher orientation.

	Number	Percent
None or few	11	29%
Less than half	20	53%
Half	6	16%
Most	1	2%
Almost all	0	0%

Information from the interviews provided interpretation of the data. Many of these maintenance programs were associated with the Beginning Teacher Program

which helped inexperienced teachers or those new to the state with essential skills and mandate expectations. BTP could represent a sizable number of teachers; the stable districts experienced about a 10% yearly turnover and the large, growing districts had up to 600 new hires a year.

When the data were broken down by district characteristics, differences appeared in both district size and geographic location. The breakdown of questionnaire composite responses appears in Appendix F, Table F-18. Large districts had fewer maintenance programs with 57% reporting none or few, and 43% reporting less than half. This lack of maintenance programs may not be productive. Large systems were experiencing the most severe problems. In Broward County's last needs assessment, following the desire to learn how to use computers was the need to learn stress management techniques at elementary, middle school and high school levels. Schlechty and Whitford stated, "An organization that can not keep things from getting worse is in no position to make them better." (6) Large districts needed to stabilize and maintain first. The large districts also showed the highest rate of establishment programs, the most complex and difficult to accomplish, combined with the least powerful program design. They may

(6) Schlechty and Whitford, "The Organizational Context of School Systems and the Functions of Staff Development," p, 82.

need to retrench and stabilize before working toward mass innovation.

The northwest showed the highest rate of maintenance programs with 14% reporting that most of their programs were maintenance. Classroom management programs seemed to be strongly supported in this part of the state, perhaps due to small town expectations about student behavior. The director of IEC 8 declared, "The worst kid in the class says, Yes, Ma'm and Yes, Sir." Directors in the northwest were also most concerned with teacher deficiencies. The south had the lowest rate of maintenance programs with 60% reporting none or few. This was most likely a reflection of district size with three of five southern districts being very large.

In healthy school systems, it would be expected that most of the staff development programs would be enhancement programs, working to fine tune an organization already running well. Joyce and Showers state that the increase in student achievement due to enhancement programs is often quite small, but the potential number of students that could be affected is very large. These types of programs are based around the effective teaching and schools research, and they often do not require extensive training. They are easily implemented since many can be accomplished without changing the culture and values of the

school. (7) TEC directors' questionnaire responses about enhancement programs are given in Table III-19.

Table III-19

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DIRECTED TOWARD ENHANCEMENT

Enhancement programs: activities that enhance teachers' existing skills to fine tune their classroom performance, i.e., how to increase student involvement.

	Number	Percent
None or few	0	0%
Less than half	7	18%
Half	13	34%
Most	16	42%
Almost all	2	5%

Eighty-one percent of responses indicated that half or more of their programs were enhancement programs. Considering the relatively weak program design state-wide, enhancement programs had a chance for succeeding since they did not require value changes. The chances for fine tuning a large number of teachers' skills were reasonably good.

Medium sized districts, which seemed to have the most potent inservice practices, had the highest rate of enhancement programs with 50% of the districts reporting that most of their programs were enhancement programs. No large district reported programs in the none or less than half category. Eighty percent of southern districts said that most of their inservice programs were enhancement

(7) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, pp. 50-56.

which was encouraging considering the less than average strength of southern program design. However, since three of five southern districts were very large and besieged with big city problems, they may have to back up even further to maintenance programs to keep their organizations healthy. Table F-19 gives the breakdown responses.

On the questionnaire, TEC directors were then asked to respond to establishment programs. Their responses are shown in Table III-20.

Table III-20

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DIRECTED TOWARD
ESTABLISHMENT

Establishment programs: a significant change in the structure of existing patterns, behaviors, or attitudes toward an organizational goal, i.e., implementing school-wide change.

	Number	Percent
None or few	6	16%
Less than half	23	61%
Half	7	18%
Most	2	5%
All	0	0%

The data showed there were few major innovations going on through the TEC's. This lack of establishment programs could be a sign that nothing further needed to be done, but since Florida had the highest drop-out rate in the nation, that was not a feasible explanation. There were three likely and interconnected explanations: goals were diffused within the TEC's which diluted any single

program, organizational norms inhibited the strong program design necessary for radical change, and school-based inservice, which has a design capable of producing significant changes in behaviors and values, was infrequent except in districts where a zealous research oriented director had made it a priority.

Massive establishment changes are impossible to accomplish on a piecemeal basis or through a "buckshot" district-wide inservice. The ten hour rule had become the accepted norm, and complex changes could not be accomplished in that time frame. The design of programs most often remained in the lower end of the hierarchy and included only presentation and modeling. All of these factors made it extremely difficult to attempt establishment type programs which are the most powerful if done correctly, but also the most difficult to accomplish.

Large districts attempted establishment programs most often; 43% said that half of their programs were establishment programs. Large districts' highest ranked goals were to implement a new program, which they tended to do district-wide rather than school-wide as smaller districts did. Their program design was considerably weaker than smaller districts with infrequent follow-up or coaching spread over the entire system. The principals were mostly responsible for that follow-up and they already had the responsibilities of large urban schools. Large

districts tended to rely on university presenters and had a hard time getting consultants back for coaching. They seldom allowed released time for staff development activities and relied on those who were motivated enough to come after school. Large districts aimed for establishment type changes but had not supported the components necessary for a complex change process.

Specific Programs

During the follow-up interviews, specific programs were discussed in response to the questions, what programs do you spend the most time on, what programs do you believe had the greatest impact on teachers, and what programs do you believe had the greatest impact on students.

Impact of Content on Teacher Behaviors

Seven of nine interviewed districts believed that courses based on the effective teaching research had the most impact on teacher behavior. For most experienced teachers, these represented enhancement type programs, but for most new teachers, they would be establishment programs.

The Beginning Teacher Program, BTP, and its cousin the Florida Performance Measurement System, were often cited as having impact on teachers. BTP was begun eight years ago and covered most aspects of the effective

teaching research such as introductions, summarizing, variety of materials, levels of questioning, planning, previous student knowledge, sequencing, material distribution, review, practice, clarity of presentation, testing, classroom management and others. The design of the BTP was strong, including presentation of the concepts, observation, feedback and coaching when necessary. Sometimes principals took full responsibility for follow-up with BTP teachers, but in other districts, teachers were trained as peers and whole remediation teams were sometimes accessible. Thus, content itself was only partly responsible for its success. TEC 5 director explained the connection to FPMS:

The greatest impact on teachers has been the Florida Performance Measurement System. It developed from the evaluation in the Beginning Teacher Program. It's an observation-evaluation system. It was developed through State grants with a lot of work through the University of South Florida. It is the system that will be utilized in a vast majority of the districts next year for teacher evaluation. There's a lot of concern now that I'm going to be observed on this and I don't know what it is.

TEC 6 had expanded upon BTP-FPMS in a program they call POWER:

POWER is a research based program that ties in how we evaluate our beginning teachers and the teacher assessment system but it's much broader than that. It also brings in Madilyn Hunter pieces. It is a 10-32 hour program and you can go to sessions depending on interest and need. Our beginning teachers have to go to 10 hours and they can opt to go to all 32 hours and it's open to other teachers. We've had up to 130 participants, but we try not to have that many in one session. Besides dealing with the domains that are in

the Florida Performance Measurement System, we do a lot with concept development; we do a lot with behavior management, beyond those very simplistic things. We tie in the Assertive Discipline.

TEC's 1, 6, 8, and 9 spent most of their time on BTP, FPMS, or POWER and TEC's 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 believed that those programs were among the ones that had the most impact on teachers. These districts represented small, medium, and large districts and all geographic locations. TEC director 9 claimed:

FPMS reemphasizes a lot of the positive teaching behaviors. Teachers know when they're effective or ineffective when you get right down to it. When you can get them trained to the point where they rely on this to do these things, you have a lot less problems with poor evaluations and poor performance expectancies. They have a higher expectancy of themselves.

Three other districts used different teaching effectiveness programs most often: TEC 3 developed ACTT-TIME in the district prior to the BTP, and TEC's 2 and 4 used a packaged system - TEACH, PRIDE, and Teaching Through Learning Channels from Performance Learning Systems Company in New Jersey. TEC 2 found the PLS programs, especially Learning Channels, to have great impact upon teachers as did TEC 4. ACTT-TIME was an alternative teaching styles program that appealed to modalities of students based on neural differences. It put the teacher in the same place as the students. None was tied to evaluation as FPMS was.

POWER seemed to be the best choice because it

incorporated the BTP, the FPMS, and the research under one umbrella. Other districts were forced to try to mesh their popular effective teaching inservice programs with State requirements in teacher evaluation if they chose to even bother to try to coordinate philosophies.

Classroom management was important, and Assertive Discipline was cited as having great teacher impact in TEC 1. TEC's 2 and 7 said they spent a great deal of time on classroom management training and TEC 7 found that it had impact on student and teacher behavior.

Two districts, 3 and 5, spent most of their time on district or State mandates. TEC 5 mostly did generic mandate programs: environmental education, computer programs, alcohol and drug abuse prevention, AIDs education, and suicide prevention.

While it was obviously true that testing and State mandates wagged the rest of the educational dog in Florida, many districts found that they liked some of the results, as with the BTP and FPMS. Only in TEC 7 was a bit of rebellion to be noticed. It had been using CRISS most often, Content Reading Including Study Systems, from the National Dissemination Network which the director believed teachers could use creatively in the classroom. The director was very pleased with this program and mentioned it in response to all three questions - most time, student impact and teacher impact. CRISS was most often presented

in TEC 7 in a school-based model.

Teachers in Florida are looking for creative teaching strategies. Teaching in Florida has become very prescriptive. The art of teaching has become more of a science. Through our Beginning Teacher Program with an emphasis on direct instruction, with an emphasis on subject area content, with an emphasis on performance standards, with the State assessment test that compares schools and districts on how your kids did on this assessment test, teachers are under the gun to cover all these skills and standards and so let's lecture and test, let's lecture and test until teachers become tired of it and so are the kids. We're getting a lot of requests for show me another way to teach this content where I still cover my skills and standards but the kids are more involved and we use some different strategies, so CRISS has been very effective in that.

Almost all of the programs mentioned above by Florida TEC directors as effective were process rather than academic content programs. Their generic nature made them adaptable to all types of teachers and suitable for certificate renewal. Most could also be characterized as enhancement programs and could be implemented relatively easily. The lack of time and strong program design experienced by most districts made these enhancement type programs successful, as they could be accomplished within the existing limitations.

Directors mentioned additional programs with which they spent considerable time such as a new language arts program, writing skills, thinking skills, cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, or that impacted upon teacher behavior such as whole language training, or motivating professional pride. It was TEC 1 that spent as much time on CPR as on FPMS, a thought that the State ought to find disturbing.

The director of TEC 6 had a quite different answer to the question of what content most affected teacher behavior, for she included a process. Effective staff development, to her, depended upon the delivery process as much as upon the content:

What affects teacher behavior is the school improvement process, totally. School improvement is a process just like staff development, but what that does is empower the teacher. It makes them feel as if they really have a say in their own professional development and the school's success, so the combination of those two things [POWER and school-based planning for improvement] has made a real difference, and the climate surveys, the data base we have for that, is really telling.

It would behoove staff development content specialists to notice that almost all of the programs mentioned as impacting upon teacher behavior had sufficient program design as well as relevant content. Most programs affected a large number of teachers so that collegial support and student reinforcement were possible. Most of these programs also extended beyond the ten hour minimum requirement. Another aspect of their strength was that they were found effective in every type of district.

Impact of Content of Student Behaviors

When questioned about the impact of staff development training upon student behavior, the answers became much more vague. The directors of TEC's 1, 3 and 4 said they really could not tell. TEC 4 director declared:

We do not make a direct correlation between

student test scores and staff development. The bottom line is we think it's impossible. I would love to say that major, major changes have improved test scores as a result of my training but I'm not sure I can do that...partly for the reasons we talked about: student movement, trained teachers getting moved. As fast as I identify key trainers out in the schools, they transfer all over the place and move from school to school, so I'm constantly in a retraining mode from year to year. [This district has been opening new schools every year and boundaries change constantly.]

The director of TEC 5 could only cite soft evidence. "When the teachers say, 'That really helped me,' it's the strongest evidence that you've got that they are using it and it has impacted students."

Other directors cited particular programs impacting students: student writing in TEC 2, CRISS in TEC 7, BTP in TEC's 7 and 8, FPMS in 7 and 9, and POWER in TEC 6. TEC 9 director commented:

I think that since the implementation of FPMS and the effective teaching methods that have evolved through this training, it probably is impacting student performance more than anything we've done in Florida for a long time and a lot of it has been indirect, but it's the effect of the system itself, having a systemic way of going about things. We all formulate ideas and habits and if we get into good habits, our more positive habits make for better learning situations. I think this is one of the reasons for higher performance levels in our schools.

The only program that showed hard evidence of student achievement was the writing program in TEC 2. The other staff development programs did not directly lend themselves to testing or the producing of products because they were all process programs. Student achievement should show an improvement if the process becomes more potent, but

the connection was indirect as TEC 9 director said.

It seemed apparent that strong content alone was insufficient. Content aimed at producing significant change, such as the large districts had chosen to do, needed to be accompanied by strong program design which large districts had not provided. The only outstanding establishment programs that had both content and program design and were cited as successful in changing teacher behaviors were BTP, and POWER when it was combined with the school-based improvement process in TEC 6 which sought to change school-wide behavior.

The types of programs that were most successful in Florida's TEC's were the enhancement-process types, FPMS, BTP for experienced out-of-state teachers, CRISS, TEACH, PRIDE, Teaching Through Learning Channels, ACIT-TIME and Assertive Discipline because it was possible for these programs to achieve their goals within the existing constraints and organizational norms. Content aimed at fine tuning existing skills does not produce dramatic results, but has the potential of affecting a large number of students and teachers. These less than dramatic results were very difficult if not impossible to assess especially when considering Florida's growing population and high rate of student and teacher movement among the schools. The mandated type programs such as suicide prevention were

information only programs with weak designs and no one mentioned them as being effective with either teachers or students.

MANDATED COLLABORATION WITH THE UNIVERSITIES

Perceptions of Practicality

University personnel are often perceived as theoretical by teachers, and teachers perceived as unwilling to learn to apply general principles by university personnel. Lanier recalls a collaborative project.

A fair summary would suggest that the exchange of concrete classroom experience with the teacher educators, like the exchange of abstract ideas with the teachers, was not generally received with great enthusiasm. (8)

The literature concludes that collaborative relationships joining two viewpoints are beneficial if given sufficient time. Most TEC's had collaborated with the universities for 16 years, and results from the questionnaire suggested a more positive perception than in Lanier's study.

The Florida State statutes governing TEC's provided an avenue for collaboration with the universities by allotting funds to the universities that could not be used unless a service agreement was drawn up between a TEC and a university for "TEC hours". In effect, the TEC used the

(8) Lanier, "Tensions in Teaching Teachers the Skills of Pedagogy," pp. 130-133.

services of the university without cost up to a certain limit of hours. However, collaboration had been narrowly interpreted in past and current situations. University personnel had been mostly employed as presenters and their influence on the TEC Council had been weak. The 1983 State evaluation reported university faculty spent 50% of their time in program delivery, 25% in travel, 10% in program planning, and 5% each in needs assessment, program development, and evaluation. Although university contacts and TEC Council representatives were not polled for this study, directors' questionnaire responses indicated that university personnel were still being mainly used as presenters. Questionnaire responses about practicality and strengths and weaknesses must be generally interpreted on the basis of university personnel as presenters rather than as collaborators. The directors' perceptions are presented in Table III-21.

Table III-21

ARE UNIVERSITY PRESENTERS PERCEIVED AS PRACTICAL?

In general, university presenters are perceived as providing practical programs by those who attend the presentation.

	Number	Percent
Never	0	0%
Sometimes	12	32%
Usually	12	32%
Mostly	11	29%
Almost always	3	8%

There was more acceptance of university personnel than in Lanier's study, but the directors were not wildly enthusiastic about faculty presenters. When questionnaire results were broken down by district characteristics, teacher only TEC's found greater satisfaction with university presenters than did TEC's serving all personnel. They could devote more time to understanding and communicating their instructional needs to the university, resulting in greater satisfaction. The complete table of composite answers broken down by district characteristics is located in Appendix F, Table F-21.

Large districts were less satisfied with university practicality with 43% reporting sometimes, 43% usually, and 14% mostly. (Large districts relied most heavily on university personnel as presenters.) Small districts were the most satisfied with 16% reporting almost always, twice the questionnaire average. Several directors commented that their small size made it easier to pinpoint local needs, and they had established personal relationships with the university contact person. Districts in the northwest were most satisfied indicating a good relationship with their university or perhaps it was just a function of their small sizes.

Strengths and Weaknesses of University Participation

When asked an open ended question on the survey

about the strengths and weaknesses of university participation, 15 TEC's responded that the strengths of university personnel were their expertise and familiarity with recent research. Seven thought the lack of cost through TEC hours was a strength. Two TEC's said they were very satisfied with university presenters because they had already screened out unsatisfactory ones. Those presenters who remained on the list were dynamic and available. A small central district responded:

 Ten years ago there were few strengths. It was mostly present and leave. Today presenters are well prepared and up to date on issues, entertaining and available for consultation and follow-up.

 The common threads of seven satisfied responses were the development of mutual understanding about the districts' needs and the knowledge that it would be a continuing relationship not a one shot presentation. The continuity had fostered close cooperation and lines of communication for both preservice and inservice. Collaboration with university personnel through TEC Council membership had also been helpful.

 The complaints, on the survey question however, were more numerous. Six TEC's cited the distance to the university, with the nearest being 100 miles away in one case, and the accompanying cost of travel expenses by the consultant. Distance and travel expenses hindered program design when trying to get the consultant to return for feedback or coaching, or for a series of one or two hour

presentations with practice between. The problems of time and distance could not be eliminated, but small TEC 9 had developed a solution. It always contracted with a consultant for two days, the first for presentation and the second for follow-up in the classroom. "We make them feel at home. We're pretty folksy up here and the teachers love for those people to come in and do the workshops."

Six TEC's mentioned that consultants were not available for presentations or follow-up, or that scheduling was difficult. TEC's were frustrated when they could not procure presenters from other universities because of service contracts even though their local university had no expertise in the needed area.

A certain lack of enthusiasm to conquer availability problems came from the universities. TEC directors who were interviewed believed there was a lack of incentives for being a TEC consultant. Consultants were looked down upon at the university and often not directly paid. Some were paid for contact time only, others for travel time only, and others received compensatory time. Universities' accounting practices and procedures differed considerably. "The research people are the ones receiving promotions within the university rather than those doing the dirty work in the schools," remarked TEC 3 director. TEC 2 director claimed some professors objected to being paid with TEC hours as they could earn more as independent

consultants. TEC 5 director stated, "It does not pay for individual instructors to take on an assignment this far away, so you can't blame them for not doing it. It impacts their teaching loads on campus, which impacts their salaries."

The complaints continued from the survey question. Ten districts had trouble in matching the expectations of the district to that of the consultant, with one saying, "They won't do what they're told to - hard headed. They lecture too much." University personnel were seen as unfamiliar with the schools', students', and teachers' needs or unable to meet them, as lacking recent experience in the schools, wanting only to get involved with planning, and being inflexible. Seven TEC's thought university presenters were too theory based and unwilling to work in the "real world." Six TEC's found the consultants ineffective in their presentations, poorly trained to teach adults, unfamiliar with collaborative techniques, or unfamiliar with current practices such as process writing.

This lack of mesh in expectations had developed from lack of joint planning and insufficient contact time to develop mutual expectations. TEC's saw the university consultants basically as presenters or outside technical assistants. There was little collaborative program development, collaboration on needs assessment, collaborative research, collaborative evaluation or

collaboration for preservice programs.

This lack of collaboration stemmed from practices by both the districts and the universities. District program design was often short term, perhaps just meeting the ten hour requirement or at best a series over several weeks. Consultants were brought in for specialized services and never used again. Universities did not offer incentives to their faculty members that would encourage long term consultation by one member with one district, but instead penalized them by lack of direct payment or lack of recognition for TEC service. To improve, districts would have to make long term plans and stay with one consultant to firm up a relationship, develop familiarity with local needs, and establish mutual expectations.

During interviews, it became clear that districts who had developed satisfactory relationships with university faculty had done so in two ways, by either clearly stating their expectations or through personal relationships that had been nurtured over a long period of time so as to develop mutual understanding. One director and contact person had known each other for 20 years, at the State Department of Education, as the university contact, as the consultant who helped organize the first TEC Council in the district, and as a workshop presenter. This TEC had a higher ratio of TEC hours to number of teachers than any other interviewed TEC. It is through

this long term contact that the district and university can learn to meet each other's expectations and learn what will be perceived as practical to both.

Although relationships had developed between some TEC directors and university contacts, in most cases, relationships had not developed between the teachers and the university consultant. Only in a few school improvement projects, was the consultant contracted to work with one group over the long haul. An exception was a university consultant to TEC 2 who had attended every faculty meeting who the director described as "doing really good things."

Districts without this long term contact saw consultants as technical assistants and presenters rather than as collaborators. Distance, university red tape, travel expenses, conflicting policies at different universities, and lack of consultant incentives made it too difficult to contract with them for the kind of hours needed to establish a relationship.

The second factor in districts that were experiencing success, even in the short term, was making expectations and needs clear to the consultant as TEC 9 had done.

They come in and we kind of honor them. We say you're going to be looked at. We want a good program and this old lolly gagging stuff and having a big time for a few days won't cut it. And they don't get asked but once. This is big bucks.

Small districts seemed to be at an advantage in clarifying needs and desires because directors often knew all the teachers personally, knew the requirements of the entire school system, and also heard every presenter before inviting him to the district, as not that many presenters were invited. Small districts also needed to be especially cautious. "If you had a bad experience, the ramifications in a small district are significant, and everybody, even if they (sic) weren't involved, soon knows and is aware of what happened, so I'm very careful there," observed TEC B director.

The collaboration intended by the State was working in some cases. Those with long term relationships, those who located consultants able to work collaboratively, those who compensated for long distances from the university, those who screened presenters, those who used faculty in planning, research, and evaluation, and those who clarified their needs to the consultants were getting the kinds of results intended and the broadening of perspective that best practices can deliver. Smaller TEC's were better able to conform to these best practices.

Would TEC's Choose to Continue the Relationship?

When the directors were asked during interviews if they could have a choice between additional funds or TEC hours, which were equivalent to \$30.00 per hour, choices

eried. TEC's 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9 would continue to use university consultants as much or nearly as much as they had, but several qualified their answers by saying they had already screened out consultants they did not wish to continue to use.

Other directors preferred outside presenters. TEC 8 preferred outside consultants and found a loophole. If the presenter wasn't a district or Department of Education employee, the director asked that he be made adjunct faculty by the university and then paid the presenter with TEC hours. TEC 1, in spite of TEC hours, had 70% of presentations made by non-university personnel. The director thought the legislation provided jobs for university faculty, and they did not present well despite their knowledge. He used the one and a half hour distance from the university as an excuse to hire others.

Only one director expressed satisfaction with the university-district relationship as a whole. TEC 7 director would continue with 90% of the university consultants and had been recently pleased with the universities' willingness to come out to his rural districts even though some were more than 150 miles away. He believed university personnel were now more receptive to school-based inservice, were becoming more familiar with the daily needs of schools, and passed that knowledge along to their undergraduates.

The director of TEC 6 had chosen to use university personnel as consultants rather than as trainers, as the TEC was building its own in-house capacities for training. She believed that consultants kept the district from being too insular, and she used large blocks of TEC hours to make sure the consultants had "a base of knowledge and understanding of the district." After developing a long term relationship with a consultant, this district used consultants as trainers in school-based improvement projects. It did use content area specialists from the university for training, especially for keeping current in summer institute content sessions, but "if we're looking at the generic, broad things that we're trying to do, we just have to get them for consulting."

Collaboration on Other Levels

Those directors who were dissatisfied with university collaboration still saw benefits from collaboration within or among districts. These were the directors in small and medium districts who had a history of networking and cooperating. The director of TEC 8 remarked, "The action is in the districts, not at the university or the D.O.E." Very small districts could pool funds and trainers and offer more programs and better quality programs than they could on their own or through a university consultant. TEC 9 director agreed.

We don't ever get crossed up like that, us against you, you against us. They have programs and I send my people to them sometimes. I have programs and I invite their people in. We have to pool our resources.

These small district directors both used university personnel but found it more practical and economical to collaborate among districts than with the university.

In the large district, TEC 3, the director believed that departments within the district were more cooperative and collaborative than they used to be. "Collaboration has created more initiation from within at all levels rather than just depending on State mandates for goals and projects." TEC 6 director saw the benefits of mandated collaboration in the TEC Council rather than in the university-district relationship. She said:

It was the greatest thing that has happened to staff development in Florida and certainly in our district... It has created buy-in and support from all the groups because they're really in on every piece of our development.

The legislation in Florida had provided an opportunity for research to be involved with practice, but it was difficult both philosophically and logistically to form a working collaboration. This type of "getting dirty work" as TEC 3 director called it, must be made more appealing and rewarding to university personnel to get their buy in and free up their time for long term collaborative relationships with the TEC's.

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Best practices in evaluation of staff development are seldom followed because of the difficulty of establishing a cause and effect relationship, the cost of trained observers and analysts, the amount of time staff development activities take before any student results can reasonably be expected to be seen, the baseline data that needs to be gathered, and the lack of time and funds to support complex evaluation. Not only do inservice planners not know if what they intended was achieved, they do not know what parts of the plan were successful or unsuccessful or where modifications or additional support are needed. Without accurate knowledge of results, support is often lacking from superintendents, Boards, and even teachers themselves.

Florida was no exception; TEC's gathered very little hard data due to the usual problems of evaluation plus a problem with high growth rate. TEC's did gather perceived evaluations, but little of this was useful for predicting behavioral changes or making program modifications.

Evaluation in the TEC's has traditionally meant attendance and opinionnaire records. In the 1983 TEC evaluation study, 99.8% of the TEC's kept attendance

records, 95.3% kept reaction surveys, 10.3% kept skills check records, 5.3% kept records concerning follow-up in the classroom and .2% tracked student change. In this study TEC's were asked in the questionnaire about formal evaluation of inservice in relation to student achievement, teacher behavior, and student and teacher attitudes and about informal evaluation.

Staff Development Impact on Student Achievement

To establish causality between higher student test scores and staff development, one would need to look at: initial teacher and student skills and knowledge as a baseline, correct interpretation and application of the concept in the classroom, and student behaviors in applying the concept to understand not only if there was an effect but what caused it. The cost of trained observers and data gatherers would also need to be justified. Howey and Vaughan have stated:

No appropriate and feasible methodology exists for exact tracking of these relationships on any large scale. Those who have done it have done so on a limited basis with tight experimental controls and at a relatively high cost. (9)

TEC directors were asked on the questionnaire how often they measured changes in student achievement due to

(9) Howey and Vaughan, "Current Patterns of Staff Development," p. 106

staff development. Their responses are shown in Table III-22.

Table III-22

EFFECT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities is the effect on student achievement or student behavior formally measured?

	Number	Percent
None or few	21	55%
Less than half	16	42%
Half	1	2%
Most	0	0
Almost all	0	0

Although the bottom line of staff development was to increase student achievement, there was little formal proof that this increase was being accomplished. It was so difficult to establish a cause and effect pattern that most TEC's had not even tried. Large districts tried the least with 71% reporting that none or few measured changes in student behavior or achievement as a result of staff development. The complete breakdown of the questionnaire item by district characteristics may be found in Appendix F, Table F-22. Looking for changes in student achievement may not even be appropriate evaluative criteria for enhancement type staff development activities, which Florida offered most often. It may also be unrealistic to expect student changes in less than the 4th or 5th year of an inservice program.

Interview data supported the questionnaire data concerning the infrequent evaluation of student achievement for judging the impact of staff development. TEC 8 was basically a one man operation and the director admitted he did not have the time to do student evaluation. "That certainly has not been a priority to judge student impact. Of course, in theory, impact on students is why we're in business, so we just assume that there is impact." TEC 9 director concluded, "Our achievement levels seem to be meeting the expectations that are being put forth in staff development."

Those who did more than just assume monitored student test scores and used the data for needs assessments, but they were not connected to staff development impact. The director of TEC 3, with 5200, teachers said that the county was beginning to use data from test scores for a year to year comparison. There was some irritation on the part of TEC director 5 who believed that testing in Florida was "going on just for the comparison of schools and districts, not for improving instruction or for improving the competencies of that child."

Even in districts that would have liked to make an effort to evaluate staff development through student achievement, there was a problem due to the growth rate in most areas of the state. TEC 4 director explained the

magnitude of this problem.

The thing that obviously impacts is the building of new schools in a growing district like ours. It implies redistricting and new boundary lines, so just taking in one whole neighborhood of high achieving kids can significantly impact your school and you have no control over it. It doesn't have anything to do with the teaching practices that went on in your school in the last year...That's how it is here, a revolving door of students, and we have a hard time planning because it's hard to figure out what's due to your efforts. We're projecting opening 9-10 new schools in the next five years; Hillsborough is going to build 22 new elementary schools. So when you're looking at a five year time period, kids don't stay longer than a year or two and then a quarter of them are forced into the next school.

Even when student evaluation was attempted, other questions remained such as what portion of the staff development training was mostly responsible for student change, was the change of sufficient magnitude that continued expense was justified, and what modifications and support mechanisms were still needed. Because causality was tenuous and logistics difficult, staff development impact on student achievement was seldom attempted.

Staff Development Impact on Teaching Behaviors

Follow-up evaluation of changed teacher behaviors in the classroom is costly because the time of trained observers is needed. Joyce and Showers believe self evaluation is difficult and inaccurate because teachers have little opportunity to see others teaching and do not

have the basis for comparison. (10) Observers must be aware of base line behaviors, have precise criteria for evaluation, and be aware how various teacher stages will affect behavior. It is difficult to justify continued staff development without having proven results. TEC directors were asked on the questionnaire how often they evaluated the effect of staff development on teacher behaviors. The responses are shown in Table III-23.

Table III-23

EFFECT ON TEACHER BEHAVIORS

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities is the effect on teacher behavior formally measured?

	Number	Percent
None or few	8	21%
Less than half	13	34%
Half	3	8%
Most	7	18%
Almost all	7	18%

The distribution of questionnaire responses resulted in an inverted bell and the pattern was the same in each category when district characteristics were examined. This distribution was most likely due to a discrepancy in definitions that had been instigated by the State mandate for post-testing. Those on the left half of the U distribution most likely meant that they sometimes

(10) Joyce and Showers, Student Achievement, p. 9.

evaluated changed teacher behaviors in the classroom, and those on the right side of the U most likely meant that they almost always gave a post-test or opinionnaire. Every staff development activity in Florida must have a post-test to show that the participant has gained on 80% of the component objectives. The law does say "or other measures" to evaluate staff development, but TEC 4 chose mostly to do opinionnaires because, "that's easily logged in the computer and we can crank out reports that say, yes nine out of ten teachers said they'd go back and do this."

Post-testing made a significant impact, mostly counterproductive. Teachers did poorly on the pre-test to make sure that they showed growth, creative thinking classes and music classes had been dropped because it was too difficult to create a cognitive posttest, and most damaging some attempts to do follow-up, feedback, coaching, or evaluation had been abandoned because the letter of the law had been met. The director of TEC 4 said, "The post-test is the easiest way to measure, but it only measures if they understand it. It doesn't measure if they can do it." TEC 2 director summarized the issue.

We [staff development directors] have sent a petition from the TEC's to stop this pre- and post-testing. I don't know that it will ever come to pass. It's denigrating and a put down. It's the antithesis. We tolerate that and quite frankly it's there. It gives us more paper.

Florida's TEC's experienced problems in evaluating changed teacher behavior. During interviews, directors

cited lack of time, trained observers, and money, and only in a few cases where it was the philosophy of the TEC to include follow-up in program design, was it even possible to consider evaluating changed teacher behavior in the classroom.

Staff Development Impact on Student Attitudes

There was even less of an attempt to measure student attitudes. Causality and evaluation design remained the problems. The directors missed a valuable source of information. The directors' responses to the questionnaire item are given in Table III-24.

Table III-24

EFFECT ON STUDENT ATTITUDE

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities are attitudinal effects of the students formally measured?

	Number	Percent
None or few	21	61%
Less than half	15	39%
Half	0	0
Most	0	0
Almost all	0	0

Staff Development Impact on Teacher Attitudes

TEC directors were asked on the questionnaire how often they measured the changes in teacher attitudes due to staff development activities. Their answers are presented in Table III-25.

Table III-25

EFFECT ON TEACHER ATTITUDE

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities are attitudinal effects of the teachers formally measured?

	Number	Percent
None or few	3	8%
Less than half	13	34%
Half	2	5%
Most	6	16%
Almost all	14	37%

Differences in semantics probably accounted for this unusual distribution with those reporting in the "almost all" and "most" categories meaning that they did an opinionnaire at the end of each activity. If student achievement and teacher behaviors were seldom formally measured, it is unlikely that the TEC's did formal teacher attitude measures on standardized instruments. Only two TEC's in in-depth interviews mentioned climate and only one of the two did a formal climate survey.

Opinionnaires are simple, inexpensive, easy to tally, and are suitable for assessing attitudes although not a good predictor of implementation practices. End of session questionnaires can easily be tied to a cognitive post-test that measures depth of understanding of concepts presented, but neither must be mistaken for measuring change in the classroom.

Most Florida districts depended on these

questionnaires and opinionnaires for they considered teacher perceptions good indicators of a program's acceptance. TEC 7 director said, "The hard data would be test scores and the soft data are word of mouth from teachers and administrators. We may be spread apart, [distance between districts] but phones are quite busy."

Informal Evaluation

When asked on the questionnaire how evaluation was done if not by formal measures, TEC's had many techniques, but the most important was teacher satisfaction. Table III-26 presents the results.

Table III-26

INFORMAL EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

When formal, measurable evaluations are not done, how are perceived effects measured? Check all the methods that will be used in 1988-89. Write "M" next to the most frequently used and "L" next to the least frequently used.

Teacher satisfaction with the inservice activity

Checked	35	92%
Least	0	0%
Most	31	82%

Perceived teacher improvement by supervisor

Checked	33	87%
Least	6	16%
Most	13	34%

Table III-26 -- Continued

presenter satisfaction with the inservice activity		
Checked	33	87%
Least	11	29%
Most	6	16%
School climate		
Checked	26	68%
Least	14	37%
Most	4	11%
Perceived student improvement by teachers		
Checked	24	63%
Least	8	21%
Most	8	21%

After finding objective measurement fraught with difficulties, the TEC's relied on subjective evaluation, and the opinions of teachers counted most heavily with 82% of the TEC's reporting it was the technique used most frequently to informally evaluate staff development activities. Teacher satisfaction did indicate acceptance but not necessarily action. Large TEC's used teacher satisfaction most often with 100% reporting it was the most important, 83% in medium districts, and 74% in small districts. The complete breakdown of this questionnaire item by district characteristics is located in Appendix F, Table F-26. It was possible to obtain personal feedback in small districts from teachers, supervisors, and administrators, but large districts seemed to rely on paperwork that could be tallied.

The TEC's also relied on supervisors' perceived

evaluations, but not as heavily. Large districts were slightly more likely to use supervisors' perceptions, 43% reporting most important, as compared to 25% in medium and 37% in small districts.

Some TEC's during interviews said they had formalized plans to gather supervisors' perceptions and others just noticed a difference as a result of certain of their staff development activities. TEC 4 had a formalized plan - competency checklists done by the principal, and attachments to teachers' Professional Development Plans, outlining the proposed results of the training to be evaluated by the principal.

TEC 9 director noticed a difference in positive attitude between schools who had participated in FPMS training and those who had not. TEC 7 director saw changes that he directly attributed to Assertive Discipline and CRISS training. TEC 1 director relied on principals' informal perceptions of changed behaviors to evaluate his programs. He realized the limits of post-testing and opinionnaires. "You can get your return at the end of the day on the evaluation, but it's not true follow-up," so he asked the principals. No interviewed TEC had ever tried to do a comparison at any level between teachers who had participated in particular staff development programs and those who had not.

Some TEC's assessed climate, recognizing that

motivation and a supportive school system may make a greater difference than the content training and that a support system was critical for carry over of the training. Only two TEC's, 4 and 6, mentioned climate as part of their goals. TEC 6 used the IDEA climate survey as baseline data and as part of formative evaluation. TEC 4 included improving climate as one of its basic goals.

Program Evaluation

No TEC did complete staff development program evaluation, for the sake of evaluation - assessing the effectiveness, adequacy and relevancy of its offerings against the goals of the State and the district, but some TEC's used that type of information as part of the planning procedure, thus initiating the next cycle, rather than just concluding the previous cycle.

Florida's TEC's struggled to evaluate the effects of their staff development programs within financial, logistical, and time constraints. They did not have many definitive answers about actual change in students or teachers nor about how to modify future activities. Directors relied mostly on perceptions and felt little pressure to gather even a sampling of hard data because the State did not require anything beyond post-testing. Educated perceptions may have helped some directors make

decisions, but lack of hard data contributed to the lax superintendent and Board support of staff development in many districts. However, the TEC system for staff development was perceived to be meeting general expectations.

FINANCING STAFF DEVELOPMENT

A European inservice report concluded, "Inservice which aims to improve the complex business of teaching and learning can only be effective if it is relatively lengthy, labour intensive, and therefore, expensive." (11) American inservice costs have been estimated as high as \$1000-\$1700 per teacher per year but included prorated salaries of personnel already employed, speaker fees, materials, rentals, travel, clerical, equipment, and substitutes who can be very expensive. In an Australian study, substitute salaries were 60% of inservice costs. (12) It is very difficult to give average dollar amounts because costs are not clearly separated and usually poorly recorded.

Cost efficient practices include using school-based inservice and giving inservice credits rather than graduate credits which could be applied to the salary schedule or training in-house personnel so outside presenters are reduced. However, neither addresses the major costs of substitutes for released time or for stipends if teachers attend activities in off duty hours.

(11) Centre for Educational Research, Inservice Education, p. 57.

(12) Ibid., p. 39.

State Funding

In Florida, State inservice funds were allocated to the districts on the basis of student attendance: \$3.00 per full-time equivalent student must be provided to a TEC. Usually \$3.00 was allocated for teacher only TEC's and \$5.00 for TEC's providing inservice to all staff. Small districts received at least \$5000.00. Out of the three or five dollars per student, \$1.70 was to be used for the Beginning Teacher Program. Additional funds were allotted to universities if they entered service contracts with the TEC's. The State also funded summer institutes, often at a higher level than the entire year's TEC budget. TEC 4 received \$170,000 for summer institute alone. No questionnaire item on funding was included because of the standard formula throughout the state, however, it was learned during interviews that some districts also received funds directly from the district and/or grants from the State.

The director of TEC 6 explained her expenditures. About 20% of the budget was spent on budget monitoring, keeping recertification records, management training, secretarial services for the programs, TEC Council activities, development of the Master Inservice Plan, Beginning Teacher Program, research and recommendations, grant development, and middle grades generic and specific

training. Thirty-one percent went to teaching effectiveness, and 30% into leadership and school improvement. The remainder was in salaries. The state-wide average in 1981-82 was 20.3% salaries, 3.5% operating expenses, .2% rental, 71.5% training and .1% other. Five small TEC's, in 1981-82 spent more than half of their State funds on salaries.

District Funding

In some districts, State funds comprised the total budget. In the cooperative, TEC 7, districts gave their State funds to the co-op but nothing else. "Our districts are poor, very poor, so we get moral support. They actively participate." Other districts gave additional financial support to staff development, up to three times the amount allocated by the State. TEC 4, with 1900 teachers had a total staff development budget of almost half a million dollars for teachers, administrators and noncertified staff.

The most common type of financial support was district paid salaries of the director, staff and secretaries. All of TEC 3 and 4's salaries were supported by the district. Half of TEC 6's salaries were paid by the district, and part of TEC 5's salaries as well as office operation's costs were district paid. About 3/4 of the salaries of TEC 8 were paid by the district, but the staff development office also coordinated volunteer programs,

artist in residence, adult education, cultural events, district newsletter, and the annual report.

The directors of TEC's 1 and 2 said they had no superintendent support for staff development and thus received no extra funds. Lack of superintendent support was also seen in TEC 1 in the denial of funds for released time. The director of TEC 2 lamented, "We do everything else first!" Part of strong program design in staff development is changing district norms, and the directors of these two TEC's had not been able to cajole, wheedle or educate their superintendents. Lack of hard evaluative data concerning the effectiveness of staff development programs certainly did not help. Positive changes in staff development in TEC 8 had not happened until a new superintendent was elected, and negative changes were expected in TEC 5 with its new superintendent. Support of upper management is absolutely critical to staff development.

Additional Funding

The other method of financial support was through State grants, which were described as competitive, but were usually available through lengthy application. TEC 7 received a \$100,000 grant for middle grades training from the Department of Education for a recent mandate in certification. It had a multi-agency Coordinating Council

grant and a science education grant from the D.O.E. Each grant supported staff people and secretaries as well as training. TEC 4 received grants for PREP - Primary Education Program - and PRIME, the middle school recertification component.

Uncertainty About Funding

There was an uncertainty about funding, especially summer institutes and some mandated programs. TEC 7 director said, "Summer institute is a year to year project because the legislature appropriates funds each year. Long term for us is one year." A change in superintendents could signal the end of district paid salaries. This uncertainty about funding discouraged long term planning which was needed for coordinated staff development. TEC 3 director, one of the pioneers in the TEC movement said:

There is not a strong belief among TEC directors that the State is going to fund even a highly successful program for the next year. Thus, there is disillusionment and an unwillingness to document and plan carryover or to map out long term projects. The paperwork is already phenomenal.

Other Factors Influenced Funding and Expenditures

District size made a difference in how funding was handled. Big districts such as TEC 3 fought internally, and the TEC Council had to be very carefully balanced for representation from all departments to insure appropriate

allocation of funds. Even with this representation, the allocation for teacher training required by the State was not being met because the district had decided to train the principals in mandated programs and charged them with training the teachers in their buildings. In very small districts such as TEC 8, there was no infighting for power.

There's no problem with turf around here. It's all mine. I couldn't get rid of it if I wanted to. I'm stuck with it anyway. If for no other reason except for efficiency of time and resources, you end up combining all of it.

Districts that seemed to get the most out of their funds, coordinated or put their programs under one umbrella, justifying encumbered funds within a wider scope. Only small and medium districts had the flexibility to do this. TEC 4 supported TEACH, PRIDE, and Learning Channels under the Beginning Teacher Program because most of the participants were new teachers, but the programs were open to all. TEC 8 director umbrellaed programs because it was efficient, but found it an advantage because the overall program had more unity:

Because I'm in charge of a number of different things, I'm able to go ahead and borrow from this one to support that one. We are going to use the dollars that we have available from management training and those resources to support our staff development and school improvement programs. They're all one...In other places they really are two separate activities and staff development becomes a teacher activity and HRMD [Human Resource Management Development which is administrator training] becomes an administrative activity, and frequently there is no linkage which is absurd...School improvement becomes the umbrella.

The director of TEC 9, another very small district, had the same advantage.

We have been fairly successful through conning, connivery, and just outright stealing. We'll do anything to get our programs in, but we've been fortunate. Some of the little counties can pool money from all sources and put it where it's needed. There are not departments pulling. The big departments [in large districts] fight with each other constantly. The odds diminish tremendously when you get into a district that size.

We go as far as we can go and then when we run out, they [the State] say all right, now you all got to spend your own money. I'm on them all the time about money. Usually I fuss enough to make it through the year with enough to go around. We don't have a lot of waste and we try to be as particular as possible. I travel extensively and I guess I haven't used 1/2 or 1/3 of the money that's been put in my budget for travel because I'm always conniving. I get it here, there, or someplace else. You learn to do that and you teach others to do it.

Political Problems Concerning Funding

Funding has caused political problems. When the TEC's were being reviewed in 1983 by sunset legislation, a ten year limit on the program which required a review before funding was renewed, some superintendents wanted the TEC's eliminated because they imagined control of the non-discretionary staff development funds. They did not get it.

Now political problems revolve around how the money is to be divided. TEC 3 director said the reason that some districts had TEC's for teachers only and others had them for teachers, administrators, and noncertified staff was

administrators wanted the money for administrative training but could not get the TEC Council to divide up the funds according to their wishes. Thus, some districts opted to keep administrative and teacher training separate.

In one TEC, the the previous superintendent had spent a large amount of TEC funds on conferences and travel. The director, preserving his own job, suspended the Council for a number of years to keep expenditure records from being made public.

The best practice of sufficient funding was met better in some TEC's than in others. TEC's had more State money available to them than many districts in other states and could be reasonably confident that basic funding would continue, but the State needed to provide greater certainty over particular programs to encourage long term planning. Support of staff development by the superintendent was shown by additional district funds to the TEC office. Those TEC's that had local financial support or were adept at grant writing were able to provide greater services.

Yet, TEC's had to make judicious use of their funds to cover the myriad of activities that emanated from their offices. Some invested in training teachers as presenters which was cost efficient as well as good for program design. One TEC gave salary schedule increases for staff development for only ten years rather than the entire

career of the teacher. Small and medium districts sometimes combined programs objectives and had access to otherwise unusable funds. Political problems caused in-house fighting over allocations, but in more successful districts fighting was eliminated through the collaborative TEC Council. TEC's following these practices were able to make more efficient use of funds than others.

ADAPTING TO STATE MANDATES AND IMPEDIMENTS TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Two areas of inquiry during the interviews, in addition to those reported in the literature, were how TEC's reacted and adapted to State mandates and what impediments were the hardest to overcome. Both provided interesting answers and insights to particular problems in Florida.

State Mandates

The State mandated TEC organization and duties. Each TEC must develop a five year Master Inservice Plan which included:

A. Teacher inservice plans - needs assessments, general program objectives, specific component descriptions of objectives and activities, data collection, evaluation plans, and recommendations of the collaborative TEC Council, (The teacher plans included Beginning Teacher Program, components for certificate renewal, and add-on certification.)

B. Noncertified plans,

C. Summer Institute plans,

D. District Management Training Plan, and

E. Service agreements with the university.

Funds must be spent in accordance with State statutes and data analyzed and reported to the D.O.E.

The TEC's did not have problems with the basic plan, and several TEC's said the district would not have

included all the elements if left on their own. However, there were wide-spread frustrations with particular elements, especially certification/recertification, post-testing, the ten hour rule, upgrading high school requirements and the amount of paperwork.

Recertification

The newest mandate that was causing headaches was upgrading recertification requirements. The increased requirements will affect every teacher in the state within the next five years when certificates are due for renewal. The TEC's have been required to react. TEC 5 dropped everything. "Last year that was our focus, and most other things, because of the rule changes, were set aside and we hit certification." They provided 63,000 contact hours of inservice in 1987-88 in a district of 16,000 students. TEC 2 director anticipated 1050 man hours over the next five years working with the longer recertification forms and more complex computer entries.

The recertification is taking up our time. They're changing the rules... It's the only profession I know of where your certificate was OK five years ago, and now it's not all right. It's awful.

Providing a substantial part of the coursework, keeping the records, and counseling teachers was the job of the TEC. These tasks took an inordinate amount of TEC time and detracted from other focuses that had more positive impact on the schools.

New Certification

First time certification for middle school teachers was upgraded in math, science, social studies and English. Math certification included courses in trigonometry, precalculus, calculus and the history of math. The director of TEC 4 wanted teachers to be academically prepared, but believed developmental and social needs of middle school students were more important. She was delighted to see the middle school movement take off in Florida, where the National Middle School Center is located, which included a commitment to training the middle grades child differently. But then, "We have the State drop by and say, by the way, content is most important." TEC 7 director reported, "The math requirements are ridiculous. We're trying to get a one year moritorium on the middle school math certification requirements." At a recent state-wide meeting, TEC directors were so frustrated that they proposed sending a lobbyist to Talahassee to procure changes in middle school certification. Another director said, "They used nobody who knew a damn thing about middle grades education when they developed that certification."

The directors of TEC's 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 understood the desire to raise teacher standards, but not in the middle of a critical teacher shortage, both in terms

of new teachers and retention of current ones. TEC 7 director stated, "We're having a teacher shortage and we're making it harder to get certified or recertified and it's crazy." TEC 2 director believed the requirements were keeping out-of-state experienced teachers from trying to enter the Florida system. TEC 7 director continued discussing certification.

You have to take the Beginning Teacher test, the subject test, and probably courses that you don't have. It's crazy. We quarrel with the Department of Education frequently. Our legislature gets too involved with education and educational policy. They're setting these standards. It sounds good that Florida has very tough certification requirements, but what it does is make it difficult for new people to get certified. It exaggerates the teacher shortage.

Small districts were thwarted when the State declared in which subjects there were critical teacher shortages and offered incentives only in those content areas. "In smaller counties, your critical teacher shortage area is whatever you don't have a teacher for, because they're hard to get in any event," noted TEC 8 director.

Certification mandates were causing mixed results. Some teachers were forced into taking more training to improve their content background if they wished to keep multiple certificates, but others dropped certificates giving districts less latitude in reassigning staff. Sixth grade teachers at middle schools could not be assigned seventh or eighth grade classes unless they added

the middle school certification. New or experienced out-of-state teachers were deterred from teaching in Florida at a time when multiple county co-op's were holding out-of-state recruiting rallies. Recordkeeping and counseling took up a considerable amount of secretaries' and directors' time and kept financial and time resources away from training activities. No additional State funds were allocated for these increased TEC duties. Relations were worsening between the Department of Education and the TEC's. TEC 1 director declared education was run by the legislature, not the Department of Education. "Our D.O.E. is very weak." Certification legislation was creating more problems than it was solving.

Other Mandates

Another recent mandate concerned upgrading high school graduation requirements. The directors of TEC's 7, 8, and 9 complained that all of their students were not college bound, especially in rural districts, and the increased requirements forced students out. Following upgrading changes, the State then instituted a drop-out prevention mandate. An increased student contact hour mandate eliminated the possibility for any shortened days for inservice. Pre- and post-testing and the ten hour rule had also created dissatisfaction.

Working Within and Around Mandates

Many directors saw mandates as something that had to be put up with and tried to steer a course toward what they considered effective staff development to include the mandates without getting bogged down in them. TEC 2 director amplified.

State mandates are done by lawmakers with closed trap minds...I do think it tends to limit and destroy enthusiasm. Essentially, I look at State mandates as, OK, how far does it take you? What do you absolutely have to do to meet it? How do we meet this and still do all these other things? That's the only way you can do it...Now I take State mandates before the TEC Council. Here it is. How do you see that we can best accomplish this and still keep going? You just do, and don't worry that I shouldn't really approve that. It really doesn't fit the mandate.

The directors of TEC's 4 and 6 were more positive about including mandates with TEC 6 director saying she could mesh mandates with staff development goals of the district. "I've had no problem, but I've had to be creative." In TEC 4, the director confided that she worked with the mandates and in some cases worked around them. "It's not worth the loss of funds."

Other directors, while still maintaining a tinge of cynicism, especially about funding, realized that districts would not have initiated programs by themselves such as BTP, FPMS, HRMD - the administrator training and selection program - or attained collaboration among teachers, administrators and the universities. The director of TEC 8 saw HRMD as ultimately having positive significant impact

in Florida and wished it were extended to all administrators, not just school-based administrators. The director of TEC 6 was a supporter of mandated collaboration through the TEC Council.

Legislation does make a difference. Now it doesn't make a difference in every district, but it has changed the world in this district...This [Council collaboration] was going to make in major difference in how staff development was conceived and it has in this district, even at a time when having strong teacher involvement has not been politically efficacious. We still have an extremely strong Council. We have an extremely hard working group of school contacts. We have bonded those groups. We listen to them. They develop and do our needs assessment. It has made an extremely big difference in our district.

Most TEC directors were more optimistic than they were a few years ago. TEC 5 director believed there was less cynicism about State mandates because major mandated programs have survived. "Administrators and teachers thought FPMS and the Beginning Teacher Program would be gone in less than five years, but instead have become stronger." TEC 7 director was a little more hopeful than he was six years ago when he considered mandates a pain. He felt that he had become more familiar, found ways around the system, and the legislature had eased off.

Educators were ready to revolt with all this reform stuff, so they [the legislature] slowed down on the change process...There's a fair amount of cynicism; I think that's fair to say. The State mandates a program and then doesn't fund it and if they do fund it, it's underfunded. There's some mandates that are on the book that are never enforced or audited so it becomes a game playing situation.

Learning to Work with the State

The director of TEC 4 saw some improvement in regard to State collaboration with the TEC's because the D.O.E. was requesting more task force participation from TEC's and principals. "We're beginning to see some doors open, some changes happening." TEC 2 director disagreed. He recently returned from a meeting of the TEC directors and the State Department of Education. "It's just deadly and it doesn't work. I came back with a raging headache and angrier than I have ever been." Even in those TEC's that believed State mandates have done what the district could never have achieved alone, there was still amazement at some of the rulings. One supporter said, "Some goals do just come right out of the sky. It's called the D.O.E."

District Size Affected Mandate Implementation

Small districts sometimes felt left out when mandates were enacted. The mandates may not have been aimed at small districts, or small districts could not contribute the extra funds to implement a program when the State had insufficiently funded the mandate. TEC 9 director sighed, "So if I can't take it from someplace else, a lot of times I have to say, I'm sorry. I won't play. Rains took the place of the game today."

Small districts were inundated by required reports. In TEC 8, the director was responsible for inservice for

teachers, administrators, and noncertified staff; Beginning Teacher Program; HRMD; Summer Institute; the literacy program; adult education, and community education. While it was sometimes a benefit to be able to intermingle funding and purposes, each program had gargantuan reports and five year audits to be filed with the State. He did them all. He had encountered particular problems with the literacy program.

We just finished our literacy plan. Out of 67 districts that submitted them, only one was approved which implies a problem on D.O.E.'s part. The legislature has determined that the school districts will be responsible for the literacy plan, all activities that take place in the county. I have to write a plan that coordinates all those activities, but it puts me in a position of trying to have other agencies do our bidding. We have no control over the library or volunteer groups, but I have to account for everything that goes on. The point is there's no money provided to implement it, and no money for the bookkeeping, record keeping, and writing that goes with it.

The paperwork for procuring grants from the State also created some disillusionment. While grants are called competitive, TEC 8 director said they are not.

No matter how skilfully you write a grant or no matter how cleverly you attack the problem, you get not one dollar more, nor one dollar less. The entitlement is there, but you have to go through a full blown grant application process to get your dollars, so it means a considerable amount of paperwork. I'm one person and I have to go through all of it. I have all the paperwork that Dade County has. The only thing that's different is the numbers, but in the big counties there is a staff for each program. I do it all. I get bogged down.

Occasionally the director saw a benefit in being small. Usually small districts were late adopters, but TEC

g had a chance to become an innovator. They were in an ideal position when the D.O.E. asked for district-wide subordinate reviews. The director and a small team were able to review 300 employees in less than four hours and be first to return it. The new superintendent was able to go out into the state and be recognized as a leader. "One of the things that innovators get is dollars and support as long as you're politically connected and can tune into where folks in the State Department are headed."

Some TECS Adapted Better than Others

TEC directors had learned to live with State mandates, some more happily than others. Those directors tried to coordinate mandates with their own TEC goals, adapted them under umbrella programs, and changed their plans when there was no other way around. Some of the major programs such as BTP, FPMS, HRMD, basic planning requirements, and mandated collaboration were accepted as improvements that districts would never have attempted by themselves.

Certification and recertification changes, and pre- and post-testing were seen as counterproductive. Increased high school graduation requirements and student contact time were viewed differently by the TEC's depending on their student populations. All agreed that the paperwork was overwhelming for certification, recertification,

assessing needs, proposals to meet new mandates, writing components, keeping records of completed components and testing, keeping audit records, developing grant proposals, developing goals, writing yearly progress reports on the State Standards of Excellence, recordkeeping for noncertified staff, planning and keeping records for HRMD, and developing a Master Inservice Plan with a five year update. Nearly every TEC seemed chronically understaffed to meet these requirements. TEC 2 director said:

We do everything else first. There are 3000 employees in this district and my secretary and I. Every day that I come to work, my desk is stacked up. You are either committed to it or you walk away. Every time I reach the point that I can't do one more thing, I get these little thank-you notes from teachers. "We had the most wonderful time."

While most TEC legislation had made a positive impact on staff development in Florida, and considerable funding had been provided, the scope of responsibilities seemed to be growing without the commitment of additional funds. Regardless of directors' dedication, they experienced spurts of intense frustration.

Impediments to Staff Development

During interviews TEC directors were asked what were the greatest impediments to successful staff development. Although there were variations, the answers were time, money, and lack of commitment to change.

What irked the director of TEC 2 was lack of

commitment via personal support or funds from the superintendent to staff development as a way of improving education. The director of TEC 1 was in the same spot with the district unwilling to contribute additional staff to the TEC office. "We can always do more, but as soon as we do more, we do less of something else." TEC 3 director's frustrations came from the State which wrote components but did not fund them such as with the middle school components. The Board policy forbidding released time also handicaped this director. The director of TEC 6 said money was an impediment as well as other philosophical issues such as to provide substitutes or not. The director of TEC 8 said time was his greatest impediment.

Time represents dollars but even more significantly, even if we had all the dollars at our disposal that we required for substitutes, we're in the business of serving students. The way you serve students is to be in the classroom with them, so even if we had the dollars for substitutes, you're still taking away from students. Time is the biggest one.

Time for accomplishing the functions of the TEC office was a problem as well as finding time for training. The director of TEC 6 said her greatest problems were finding time for paperwork, especially for certification, and trying to find time to provide coaching when staff development was not school-based. In her final year before retirement, she regretted not having spent her time training trainers rather than doing reports. TEC 7 director said his greatest problems were time and money

with 1/2 of 1% of the budget put into staff development. Time and money were intimately connected. TEC's were not able to pay for additional man hours to complete all the functions. Neither were districts able to fund additional days to their calendars dedicated to staff development.

The director of TEC 5 found resistance to change the biggest impediment without question.

There's resistance to change and then turning it around to a point of saying you're just making it up; that's not the way it's going to be, ignoring the evidence, not looking at the documentation, simply setting it aside.

He found administrators more resistant to change than teachers because pressure could be put on teachers through the teachers' association. The past superintendent gave support to staff development and pressured administrators when necessary, but the current superintendent was not supportive. TEC 7 also saw commitment problems.

Getting all teachers to see the need for training, to use new techniques is a problem, especially at the high school level. High school teachers are so subject oriented. The subject comes first, and the kid comes second and the faculties are large.

Commitment could be considered a time and money problem. TEC's with well designed program components and additional funding from the district, such as TEC 4, had few commitment problems for it included communication, teacher and administrator involvement, and incentives, all of which take time and money to develop.

The questionnaire and interview data supported findings in staff development literature concerning purposes of staff development, needs assessments, focus, school-based staff development, program design, incentives, time, program content, personnel and evaluation. Florida added additional information to the literature with its use of mandated collaboration, considerable State funding, and an intricate webbing of State mandates.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

This study examined current practices in staff development in Florida. The State of Florida has had mandated Teacher Education Centers since 1973 which required collaboration among teachers, administrators, and university personnel.

The study was guided by the following questions.

1. What do authorities say are appropriate means for planning, executing, and evaluating staff development programs?
2. What do authorities say are appropriate procedures for school-based inservice and when is this procedure appropriate to use?
3. What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for planning, executing, and evaluating staff development programs?
4. What are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers for conducting school-based inservice?
5. Are the current practices of Florida's Teacher Education Centers consistent with the components frequently reported by the authorities?

Questionnaires were sent to the forty-five TEC's and thirty-eight were returned. TEC's were asked about

purposes of staff development, needs assessments, focus, logistics, program design, personnel involved, and evaluation. Follow-up interviews were completed with nine representative districts.

Conclusions

1. The purposes of most TEC's were so diffused that services were diluted and staff development offerings pulled at one another rather than supported each other. The Beginning Teacher Program, new certification, recertification classes and record keeping, teacher remediation, district goals, school-based goals, individual teacher needs, massive amounts of paperwork, and State mandates all vied for attention. Few TEC directors had the vision or knowledge to coordinate State mandates with district goals.

a. In general, district and school goals received a heavier weighting than teachers' perceived needs, but State mandates took priority over everything.

b. New recertification mandates strongly influenced inservice with an increasing emphasis put on offering appropriate classes for recertification. Recertification initiatives were diffused and individualistic and yielded no coordinated effect at the school or district level. Both recertification training and record keeping

took time and funds from district and school goals.

c. Only two of the nine districts that were interviewed made a proactive effort to coordinate staff development offerings, and both chose the school as their principal focus. Additional district financial support, lack of in-house fighting, creative tailoring of State mandates to local needs, a knowledgeable TEC Council, and directors who were versed in using best practices from the literature made this coordinated effect possible.

2. Florida TEC's did a thorough job on needs assessments, using multiple viewpoints of the TEC Council and multiple methods for collecting data. The heavy use of teacher questionnaires and teacher desires as a trigger for awareness of staff development needs may not be beneficial if school and district goals are not given sufficient weighting or teachers are uninformed about current trends or needs. Insufficient use was made of university input on needs assessment because most university personnel were seen simply as short term presenters rather than collaborators.

3. Most TEC's diffused their focus among school-wide programs, district-wide programs, curricular needs, and individual needs. Small districts focused more often on the school or individual. Medium districts were

most likely to choose a school-based focus. Large districts most often chose a district-wide focus to try to keep consistency within a large bureaucracy. Large districts, overwhelmed by just keeping up with mandates, tried to present inservice programs effeciently by presenting activities across-the-board.

4. School-based staff development existed on a continuum from simple delegation to the schools to a full blown model which included preparation for change and teaching of collaborative techniques.

a. Compliance with the full blown model depended on adequate funding, dedication by the director and Council to a school-based model, and use of long range planning.

b. Fully developed school-based staff development coincided with shared decision making, coordinated planning, use of a research base, use of in-district personnel as trainers, encouragement of peer support, and follow-up techniques.

c. School-based staff development provided a model powerful enough to produce change, improve climate, and encourage a sense of professionalism but was not considered the ultimate answer. There was still a need for short awareness sessions as well as a need for program and curriculum leadership provided by the district.

d. Problems in school-based staff development

encountered in districts using a partially developed model were not encountered in districts using a fully developed model. A school-based model that only used some components or did not consider needed changes in organizational norms created problems that outweighed the advantages.

5. Program design was generally weak, relying mostly on presentation and demonstration. Practice, coaching, and feedback were not extensively used because they were too expensive in terms of trained observers and time limitations and were not encouraged by the State which emphasized post-testing rather than follow-up. The choice of inservice presenters was most affected by district size.

Districts that had strong program design tended to include the following factors:

a. Intensive use was made of in-district personnel, teachers or sufficiently funded curriculum personnel, to present activities, thus, personnel was usually available for follow-up activities.

b. Funds were available for supervisors to come into the classroom and/or for released time to allow the teachers to participate in peer activities.

c. The activities were school-based so peers or trainers were readily accessible.

d. There was little reliance on the principal for feedback and coaching, although support by the principal

was critical.

e. Presenters were trained in staff development design and adult learning theory.

f. Organizational norms encouraged or allowed the other five factors.

6. TEC's that offered incentives in the form of teacher leadership or shared decision making did not have to rely on stipends as heavily as those TEC's that did not offer intrinsic incentives. The "intrinsic" districts had a higher rate of staff development participation and a greater sense of professionalism. Convenience, recertification requirements, released time, low cost, interactive program design, and peer pressure also acted as incentives for participation in staff development.

7. Most districts did not allow sufficient time for change - for learning, reflecting, practicing, or seeking collegial support. Districts that did not allow teacher released time for staff development or scheduled few inservice days into their calendars were not able to reach all of their teachers with training. Only teachers with professional attitudes or those motivated by stipends, peer persuasion, or leadership opportunities attended. Thus, participation depended upon the strengths of the incentives. The school-wide or district-wide impact of

having all teachers trained or informed was never achieved.

8. The district characteristic that made the most difference in staff development practices was the size of the district. Medium sized districts, followed by small and large districts, conformed most closely to best practices.

9. Most districts attempted few major changes of the establishment type. Their staff development design components did not support the conditions necessary for major changes, i.e., relatively short time allotments, buck shot district-wide inservice programs, little practice, follow-up or coaching, diffused purposes, and reliance on outside presenters.

Large districts attempted establishment programs most often but had staff development design components the furthest away from best practices, or in other words, they tried for the most difficult to accomplish goals with the least support.

Enhancement programs, those that were aimed at fine tuning existing skills and required no changes in values were most often cited as effective. Enhancement programs were able to operate within existing constraints of the organization. Those enhancement programs that were considered effective involved more contact hours and more

sophisticated program design than the average program and were often tied to evaluation.

10. Mandated university-TEC collaboration did promote contact with university personnel as presenters of inservice activities but did not necessarily promote collaboration between the university and the TEC. Insufficient time for contact and few incentives from the university contributed to this lack of collaboration.

11. Formal evaluation of the impact of staff development activities upon student achievement, improvement of teacher skills, or student and teacher attitudes was seldom attempted. Skill checks and teacher opinionnaires were almost always used but gave virtually no information about ultimate impact in the classroom.

12. Uncertainty about State and additional local funding discouraged long range planning. Small and medium districts made better use of their funds by reclassifying encumbered funds under broader categories.

13. Few directors had the staffs, time, ability and creativity to work State mandates into their district plans without being overwhelmed by the mandates. Nevertheless, State mandates forced districts to plan and

accomplish staff development goals that would not have been accomplished if the districts had been left to their own initiatives.

Recommendations

1. Teacher Education Centers need to do comprehensive, proactive, coordinated, long-range planning to avoid being pulled in conflicting directions and making no impact in any area. Best practices, State mandates, and district goals need to be coordinated and the results made available to teachers when they are assessing their personal and school needs.

2. A fully developed school-based focus should be encouraged by TEC directors and the Department of Education. School goals should be developed within the framework of district and State goals and not solely in consideration of school needs.

3. Stronger program design to insure carryover is needed. Practice, feedback and coaching should be an integral part of most staff development activities. Operating within temporal and financial constraints, TEC's may have to offer fewer choices but develop programs which include higher level components of program design and

longer time periods to encourage change rather than just awareness.

4. Teacher-leaders should be trained in powerful staff development designs and adult learning models as well as content. Teacher-leaders should be used more extensively to provide an empowerment incentive and promote better follow-up.

5. If the State continues to legislate increased TEC responsibilities, such as the recertification mandates, and/or inflation continues to raise costs, additional funds should be allocated by the State. If funding is not available, responsibilities should be reduced.

6. District leadership is needed to find methods of procuring sufficient staff development time through released time, inservice days, creative scheduling, or encouragement of a sense of professionalism.

7. TEC's need to use a wide variety of incentives to encourage participation.

8. Large district TEC's should be subdivided to become more responsive to school level needs.

9. Despite logistical difficulties, some in-depth evaluation of the impact of staff development programs needs to be done. This evaluation would be an excellent opportunity for university-TEC collaboration.

10. Universities need to reevaluate incentives for TEC consultants to encourage long term, involved collaboration with the TEC's. Universities also need to provide training to their staff members in collaboration and implementation of TEC programs.

11. The State of Florida should continue Teacher Education Centers for the advantages outweigh the difficulties.

Suggestions for Future Studies

1. Comparisons should be made between large and small districts' program design in other states. Political and bureaucratic constraints of large districts, as well as populations served with special needs, seem to adversely affect staff development design and implementation. Large districts who have diminished these constraints deserve study.

2. A comparison should be made between those

Florida districts who use only State TEC funds and those who receive additional funding from the local district or State grants.

3. There is little in the literature concerning the training of teacher-leaders. Few formalized programs seem to exist. This area needs to be researched and the results disseminated.

4. The training of university personnel as staff development collaborators rather than just as presenters or consultants also has a small base in the literature. As in the prior suggestion, this area needs to be researched and the results disseminated.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baltes, Paul, and Schale, Warner. "On the Plasticity of Intelligence in Adulthood and Old Age." American Psychologist 31 (October 1976): 720-25.
- Bergquist, Constance C., Elizzey, Mary, and King, Deborah S. An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers. Tallahassee, FL: Evaluation Systems Designs, Inc., [1983].
- Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 159 289, 1978.
- Bishop, Leslee J. Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.
- Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. In-service Education and Training Teachers. Paris Cedex, France: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1982.
- Carrasquillo, Angela, and Segan, Frances. Staff Development: From the Bilingual Schoolroom to Beyond the Walls of the University. Alexandria, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 265 736, 1986.
- Collier, Arthur J. Florida's Teacher Education Centers: Determining If They Make a Difference. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 230 530, 1983.
- Cooper, Bruce S. "Retooling Teachers: The New York Experience." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 606-609.

- Courter, R. Linden, and Ward, Beatrice A. "Staff Development for School Improvement." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 185-209.
- Creamer, Robert, and Gillaspy, Mary. Creating a Climate for Success: Developing a District Inservice Plan and Making it Work. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education. Nashville, Tennessee: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 277 122, 1987.
- Defino, Maria E., and Carter, Heather. Changing Teacher Practices: Proceedings of a National Conference. Paper presented at Austin, Texas, 1981. Arlington, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 223 582, 1981.
- Dorsey, Mary, Director of Broward County, Florida Teacher Education Center, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, Interview, February 1988.
- Edelfelt, Roy. Inservice Education Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs. Bellingham, Washington: Western Washington State College, 1977.
- ERIC Research Action Brief: Staff Development. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 189 679, 1980.
- Fenstermacher, Gary D. "What Needs to be Known about What Teachers Need to Know." In Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research. Edited by Gene E. Hall. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1980.
- Glidewell, J.C.; Tucker, S.; Todt, M.; and Cox, S. "Professional Support Systems: The Teaching Profession." In New Directions in Helping, Volume 3: Applied Perspective on Help-Seeking and Receiving. Edited by A. Nadler, J.D. Fisher, and B.M. Depaulo. San Francisco: Academic Press, 1983.

- Gold, Gerard G. "A Reform Strategy for Education: Employer-sponsored Teacher Internships." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 384-387.
- Good, Thomas, and Grouws, Douglas. "The Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project: An Experimental Study in Fourth-Grade Classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology 71 (June 1979): 355-62.
- Goodlad, John I. "Schooling and Education." In The Great Ideas Today, Edited by Robert M. Hutchins. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1976.
- "The School as Workplace." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 36-61.
- Goodlad, John I.; Sirotnick, Kenneth A.; and Overman, Bette C. "An Overview of 'A Study in Schooling.'" Phi Delta Kappan 61 (November 1979): 174-178.
- Gray, William A. "Peer Coaching and Mentor Teaching: Conceptual Understandings." Presentation at the twentieth annual conference of The National Staff Development Council, Chicago. 10 December, 1988.
- Gray, William A., and Gray, Marilynne M. "Synthesis of Research on Mentoring Beginning Teachers." Educational Leadership (November 1985): 37-43.
- Griffin, Gary A. "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Staff Development Programs." In Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives." pp.126-139. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.
- "Introduction: The Work of Staff Development." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 1-12.

- _____. "Toward a Conceptual Framework for Staff Development." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 228-249.
- Hanes, Madlyn, and Rowls, Michael. "Teacher Recertification: A Survey of the States." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 123-128.
- Howey, Kenneth R., and Vaughan, Joseph C. "Current Patterns of Staff Development." Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 92-117.
- Howey, Kenneth R., and Zimpher, Nancy. "A Program for Those Preparing Teachers for Leadership Roles and the Mentoring of New Teachers." Presentation at the twentieth annual conference of The National Staff Development Council, Chicago. 11 December, 1988.
- Hunt, David, and Joyce, Bruce. "Teacher Trainee Personality and Initial Teaching Style." American Educational Research Journal 4 (May 1967): 253-59.
- Hutson, Harry, Jr. "Inservice Best Practices: The Learnings of General Education." In Collaborative Planning Guide for Personnel Development: Organizing for Change Through Planning, pp. 112-122. Prepared for the National Inservice Network in Bloomington, Indiana. Edited by Leonard C. Burrello. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981.
- Johnston, Gladys Styles, and Yeakey, Carol Camp. "Administrators' and Teachers' Preferences for Staff Development." Planning and Changing 84 (Winter, 1977): 230-238.

- Joyce, Bruce; Howey, Kenneth R.; and Yarger, Sam J. ISTE Report I: Issues to Face. Syracuse, NY: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, 1977.
- Joyce, Bruce; McNair, Kathleen; Diaz, Richard; and McKibbin, Michael D. Interviews: Perceptions of Professionals and Policy Makers. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 142 546, 1976.
- Joyce, Bruce, and Showers, Beverly. "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." Educational Leadership 37 (February 1980): 379-85.
- Joyce, Bruce, and Showers, Beverly. Student Achievement Through Staff Development. New York: Longman Inc., 1988.
- Kuh, George; Orbaugh, Tim; and Byers, Kathy. "Designing and Conduction Needs Assessments in Education." In Collabcrative Planning Guide for Personnel Development, Organizing for Change Through Planning, pp. 90-111. Prepared for the National Inservice Network of Bloomington, Indiana. Edited by Leonard C. Burrello. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981.
- Lanier, Judith E. "Tensions in Teaching Teachers the Skills of Pedagogy." Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 118-149.
- Lawrence, Gordon. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 176 424, 1974.
- Lieberman, Ann, and Miller Lynne. "The Social Realities of Teaching." In Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. pp. 54-68. Edited by Ann Liebermand and Lynne Miller. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.

- Liebes, Sherry. An Aging Teacher Corps: How Should School Systems Respond. Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children's 61st Annual Convention. Detroit, Michigan: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 235 553, 1983.
- Lloyd, Dorothy M. The Effects of a Staff Development Inservice Program on Teacher Performance and Student Achievement. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.
- Lytle, James H. "Investment Options for Inservice Teacher Training." Journal of Teacher Education 34 (January-February 1983): 28-31.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. Innovations in Classroom Organization. Paper presented at the sixtieth Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 106 895, 1975.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey, and Berman, Paul. "Retooling Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment." Educational Leadership 34 (December 1977): 191-194.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey, and Marsh, David. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record 30 (September, 1978).
- McLaughlin, Milbrey, and Marsh, David. "Staff Development and School Change." In Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. pp. 69-94. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.
- National Education Association Staff. "The NEA's View of Inservice Education." Creative Authority and Collaboration, Report IV of the Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project. Edited by D. Darland and R. Luke. Syracuse, NY: National Dissemination Center, 1977.

- Rankin, Stuart C. "A View from the Schools." Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 251-259.
- Romberg, Thomas A., and Price, Gary. "Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development as Cultural Change." Staff Development in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 154-184.
- Rules of the Florida Department of Education, State Board of Education, Section 6A-5.055.
- Schiffer, Judith. "A Framework for Staff Development." In Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, pp. 4-22. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynn Miller. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.
- Schlechty, Phillip C., and Whitford, Betty Lou. "The Organizational Context of School Systems and the Functions of Staff Development." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. p. 62-91.
- Scriven, M., and Roth, J. "Needs Assessment: Concept and Practice." In Exploring Purposes and Dimensions. Edited by S. Anderson and C. Coles. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Silver, Paula. "Principals' Conceptual Ability in Relation to Situation and Behavior." Educational Administration Quarterly 11 (Autumn 1975): 58.
- Sprinthall, Norman A., and Thies-Sprinthall, Lois. "The Teacher as an Adult Learner: A Cognitive-Developmental View." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

- State of Florida, Department of Education. Strides into the Future of Florida's Teacher Education Center Programs: Exemplary Inservice Teacher Education Programs. Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, [1985].
- Terrill, Marguerite; Strauber, Sandra; and Cone, Henry. "Effective Inservice Training: Mission Impossible?" Phi Delta Kappan 68 (October 1986): 166.
- Tikunoff, William J., and Mergendoller, John R. "Inquiry as a Means to Professional Growth: The Teacher as Researcher." Staff Development, in Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 210-227.
- Tyler, Ralph. "In-Service Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future." In Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, pp. 5-16. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Williams, Martha. Needs Assessment Instrument Categories. Prepared for the National Dissemination Forum. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 215 997, 1981.
- Winkler, John D., and Stasz, Cathleen. A Survey of Incentives for Staff Development of Computer-Based Instruction. Paper presented at the 69th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 268 996, 1985.
- Wu, P.C. Facilitating University-School District In-Service Collaboration: Principals of Communication. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 212 594, 1982.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO TEC DIRECTORS

(Spaces for answers have been reduced.)

Questionnaire for the Director of Teacher Inservice

PURPOSE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

1. Teacher staff development activities can be used to fulfill many purposes. Please check all the aims of teacher inservice programs sponsored by your TEC for 1988-89. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important, and "L" next to the least important.

- _____ To meet teacher deficiencies
 _____ To foster personal growth of teachers
 _____ To aid the enlivenment of an aging staff
 _____ To accomplish a particular school-wide goal
 _____ To implement a new program
 _____ For the general improvement of teaching and learning
 _____ For teacher recertification
 _____ As a cure for burn -out
 _____ Other: _____

FOCUS

1. Check all the areas on which your teacher inservice programs focus. Write "M" next to the area on which activities most often focus, and "L" next to the area of the least focus.

- _____ Individual teachers
 _____ School-wide programs
 _____ District-wide programs
 _____ Curricular programs and materials
 _____ Other : _____

2. What percentage of your teacher inservice programs focus on one entire school? Please estimate. _____ %

3. What problems do you most encounter with school-based inservices?

LOGISTICAL INFORMATION

1. When do teachers attend inservice programs that are TEC sponsored? Check all those that apply. Write "M" next to the most frequent time, and "L" next to the least frequent.

During school time Weekends
 After school hours In the summer

2. How long do your teacher inservice activities last? Check all those that apply. Write "M" next to the most frequent time schedule, and "L" next to the least frequent.

1-4 hours A semester
 4-8 hours A year
 Over several weeks Over several years

PROGRAM CONTENT

1. If program content were to be divided by the definitions below, what portion of your teacher staff development programs would come under each category?

MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS: trying to get rid of undesirable teacher or student behavior or to maintain current practices i.e., discipline techniques, teacher orientation.

None or few Less than half Half
 Most Almost all

ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS: activities that enhance teachers' existing skills to fine tune their classroom performance i.e., how to increase student involvement.

None or few Less than half Half
 Most Almost all

ESTABLISHMENT PROGRAMS: a significant change in the structure of existing patterns, behaviors, or attitudes toward an organizational goal. i.e., implementing school-wide change.

_____ None or few _____ Less than half _____ Half
 _____ Most _____ Almost all

2. How often do you include these components in teacher inservice training?

Presentation of theory
 _____ Never _____ Sometimes _____ Usually
 _____ Mostly _____ Almost always

Modeling or demonstration of the concept
 _____ Never _____ Sometimes _____ Usually
 _____ Mostly _____ Almost always

Practice under simulated conditions (with other teachers or students)
 _____ Never _____ Sometimes _____ Usually
 _____ Mostly _____ Almost always

Structured or open-ended feedback following classroom tryout of the new concept
 _____ Never _____ Sometimes _____ Usually
 _____ Mostly _____ Almost always

Coaching for application by the presenter, a supervisor, or a peer
 _____ Never _____ Sometimes _____ Usually
 _____ Mostly _____ Almost always

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. Who participated in the writing of the last needs assessment instrument? Please check all those who participated.

_____ TEC staff _____ TEC council
 _____ Administrators other than those on the TEC council
 _____ Teachers other than those on the TEC council
 _____ University consultants other than those on the TEC council
 _____ Others: _____

2. How did you gather data for your last needs assessment? Check all that apply. Write "M" next to the source you consider most important and "L" next to the least important.

teacher questionnaires observations
 interviews test data
 review of documents community input
 student questionnaires
 administrator questionnaires

Other: _____

3. What triggers awareness for staff development needs? Check all that apply. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important, and "L" next to the least important.

Test scores Public pressure
 Outside reports University input
 Inside district reports Teacher desires
 Other: _____

PRESENTERS

1. Who presents the inservice activities for teachers? Check all those who are presenters. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important, and "L" next to the least important.

University personnel
 Personnel from the TEC
 Curriculum personnel from the district
 Presenters from outside the district
 Representatives from textbook firms
 Teachers from the district
 District administrators
 Others Please specify: _____

2. To what degree are presenters available for follow-up help?
- Never Sometimes Usually
 Mostly Almost always
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of university participation?

4. In general, university presenters are perceived as providing practical programs by those who attend the presentation.

Never Sometimes Usually
 Mostly Almost always

FOLLOW-UP TO TEACHER INSERVICE

1. Do your teacher staff development programs include some type of follow-up?

Never Sometimes Usually
 Mostly Almost always

2. Check the types of follow-up activities that your TEC uses. Write "M" next to the most frequently used follow-up and "L" next to the least frequently used follow-up.

A skill check or testing of what the teachers learned in the program
 Technical assistance in the classroom or school site
 Peer coaching
 Evaluation of the teacher by a supervisor
 Formally scheduled maintenance activities

3. In those staff development activities that include follow-up, who is responsible for the follow-up? Check all those who have responsibility. Write "M" next to persons who are most frequently responsible, and "L" next to the least frequently responsible.

Principal
 Teaching peers
 University personnel
 Subject area supervisor
 Other Please specify: _____

INCENTIVE

1. Other than inservice points towards recertification, what incentives are offered to teachers to participate in inservice activities?

EVALUATION

1. In what portion of your teacher staff development activities is the effect on STUDENT achievement or STUDENT behavior FORMALLY measured.
 None or few Less than half Half
 Most Almost all

2. In what portion of your teacher staff development activities is the effect on TEACHER behavior FORMALLY measured?
 None or few Less than half Half
 Most Almost all

3. In what portion of your teacher staff development activities are attitudinal effects of the STUDENTS FORMALLY measured?
 None or few Less than half Half
 Most Almost all

4. In what portion of your teacher staff development activities are attitudinal effects of the TEACHERS FORMALLY measured?
 None or few Less than half Half
 Most Almost all

5. When formal, measurable evaluations are not done, how are perceived effects measured? Check all the methods that will be used in 1988-89. Write "M" next to the most frequently used and "L" next to the least frequently used.
 School climate
 Perceived teacher improvement by supervisor
 Perceived student improvement by teachers
 Teacher satisfaction with the inservice activity
 Presenter satisfaction with the inservice activity

APPENDIX B

Appendix B

LISTING OF ALL FLORIDA TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

TEC	SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DISTRICTS	FULL OR PART TIME	TCHRS ONLY OR OTHERS	SM MED LG	LOC
Alachua	S	P	O	M	NE
Bay	S	F	O	M	NW
Brevard	S	F	TO	M	C
Broward	S	F	TO	L	S
Citrus	S	P	TO	S	NE
Clay	S	P	O	M	NE
Collier	S	F	O	S	S
Columbia	S	P	O	S	NE
Dade/Monroe	M	F	TO	L	S
Duval	S	F	TO	L	NE
Escambia	S	F	O	M	NW
Gadsden	S	P	TO	S	NW
Gilcrest	S	P	O	S	NE
Hamilton	S	P	TO	S	NW
Hardee	S	P	O	S	C
Hernando	S	F	TO	S	C
Highlands	S	P	O	S	C
Hillsborough	S	F	O	L	C
Indian River	S	P	O	S	C
Jefferson	S	P	TO	S	NW
Lake	S	P	TO	M	C
Leon	S	P	O	M	NW
Madison	S	P	O	S	NW
Manatee	S	P	TO	M	C
Marion	S	P	TO	M	NE
Martin	S	F	TO	S	S
Northeast	M	F	TO	S	NE
Okaloosa	S	F	TO	M	NW
Okeechobee	S	P	O	S	C
Orange	S	P	TO	L	C

Osceola	S	P	O	S	C
Palm Beach	S	F	O	L	S
PAEC	M	P	TO	S	NW
Pasco	S	P	O	M	C
Pinellas	S	P	O	L	C
Polk	S	F	O	L	C
St. Johns	S	P	O	S	NE
St. Lucie	S	P	TO	S	C
Santa Rosa	S	P	O	S	NW
Sarasota	S	P	O	M	C
Seminole	S	F	O	M	C
Southwest	M	F	TO	S	C
Sumter	S	P	O	S	C
Suwannee	S	P	O	S	NW
Taylor	S	P	O	S	NW
Volusia	S	F	O	M	NE
Wakulla	S	P	TO	S	NW
Walton	S	P	O	S	NW
N=48	S=44	F=16	TO=20	S=26	NE=10
	M= 4	P=32	O =28	M=14	NW=14
				L= 8	C =19
					S = 5

Full or part time refers to employment status of the TEC director. "LOC" stands for location of the TEC within the state.

APPENDIX C

Appendix C

TEC'S RETURNING SURVEYS

TEC	SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DISTRICTS	FULL OR PART TIME	TCHRS ONLY OR OTHERS	SM MED LG	LOC
Alachua	S	P	O	M	NE
Bay	S	F	O	M	NW
Brevard	S	F	TO	M	C
Broward	S	F	TO	L	S
Citrus	S	P	TO	S	NE
Clay	S	P	O	M	NE
Collier	S	F	O	S	S
Columbia	S	P	O	S	NE
Dade/Monroe	M	F	TO	L	S
Escambia	S	F	O	M	NW
Hamilton	S	P	TO	S	NW
Hardee	S	P	O	S	C
Hernando	S	F	TO	S	C
Highlands	S	P	O	S	C
Hillsborough	S	F	O	L	C
Indian River	S	P	O	S	C
Lake	S	P	TO	M	C
Manatee	S	P	TO	M	C
Marion	S	P	TO	M	NE
Martin	S	F	TO	S	S
Northeast	M	F	TO	S	NE
Okeechobee	S	P	O	S	C
Orange	S	P	TO	L	C
Osceola	S	P	O	S	C
Palm Beach	S	F	O	L	S
Pasco	S	P	O	M	C
Pinellas	S	P	O	L	C
Polk	S	F	O	L	C
St. Johns	S	P	O	S	NE
St. Lucie	S	P	TO	S	C

Santa Rosa	S	P	O	S	NW
Sarasota	S	P	O	M	C
Seminole	S	F	O	M	C
Southwest	M	F	TO	S	C
Suwannee	S	P	O	S	NW
Taylor	S	P	O	S	NW
Volusia	S	F	O	M	NE
Wakulla	S	P	TO	S	NW

N=38	S=35	F=15	TO=15	S=19	NE= 8
	M= 3	P=23	O =23	M=12	NW= 7
				L= 7	C =18
					S = 5

Full or part time refers to employment status of the TEC director. "LOC" stands for location of the TEC within the state.

APPENDIX D

Appendix D

TEC'S NOT RETURNING SURVEYS

TEC	SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DISTRICTS	FULL OR PART TIME	TCHRS ONLY OR OTHERS	SM MED LG	LOC
Duval	S	F	TO	L	NE
Gadsden	S	P	TO	S	NW
Gilcrest	S	P	O	S	NE
Jefferson	S	P	TO	S	NW
Leon	S	P	O	M	NW
Madison	S	P	O	S	NW
Okaloosa	S	F	TO	M	NW
PAEC	M	P	TO	S	NW
Sumter	S	P	O	S	C
Walton	S	P	O	S	NW
N=10	S=9 M=1	F=2 P=8	TO=5 O=5	S=2 M=2 L=1	NE=2 NW=7 C =1 S =0

Full or part time refers to employment status of the TEC director. "LOC" stands for location of the TEC within the state.

APPENDIX E

Appendix E

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

General Questions

1. PURPOSE OF INSERVICE : What do you mainly try to accomplish through inservice activities?
2. How are district goals tied to inservice activities?
3. How is curriculum tied to inservice activities?
4. At the gut feeling level, is staff development supported in this district for the purpose of improvement or to meet the rules and regulations of the State?

II. FOCUS OF INSERVICE AND SCHOOL-BASED

Do you think you get the best results when components are focused on the individual, the school, or the district? Why?

When do you think school-based staff development is most productive?

The greatest problems cited with school-based staff development were lack of leadership on the school site, lack of planning, time and cost. What problems do you encounter with school-based staff development?

1. Tell me about the kinds of inservice programs you have, what content has been presented in the last year, what is the process you've used?
2. What kinds of programs do you spend most of your time on?
3. How do you keep track of the multiplicity of programs?
4. How many of your programs are mandatory rather than voluntary?

III. PROGRAM DESIGN

What is your most productive program in terms of changed teacher behaviors? How can you tell?

1. What are the major impediments to conducting successful activities?
2. What have been the most successful three to four topics?
3. How do you find time for teachers to thoroughly learn a procedure so they will incorporate it into their classroom procedures?

III A. PRESENTERS

On what basis does the district identify presenters?

1. How does distance from the university affect follow-up?
2. Since university presenters are often perceived as not practical, not available, or out of touch with district expectations, what other alternatives have you tried?
3. If you received money rather than IEC university hours, would you use university consultants as much as you do now?

IV. LOGISTICS AND TIME

The biggest cited problem was lack of time for inservice. How do you find time for inservice? What alternatives have you tried?

1. What is your turnover rate of teachers, and how do you incorporate them into ongoing programs?
2. How does this district feel about released time for staff development?
3. Do all districts have inservice days built into their calendars?
4. If you cited 1-4 hour programs in your survey, is that the total program, or are those just hours at one sitting of a longer program?

U. EVALUATION

1. How do you judge which programs have been most successful in terms of impact on students? How can you tell?
2. Is there a comparison made between teachers who use programs and procedures learned in staff development activities and teachers who don't use them or have not attended?
3. What does the district do if teachers are not integrating the new skill into classroom procedures?

VI. COLLABORATION AND UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION

What benefits have accrued due to mandated collaboration by the state?

The benefits most often cited were knowledge, low cost, and long term cooperation. The problems were distance, lack of availability, discrepancy in expectations, and lack of practicality. How is the university partnership working in this district?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What parts of your job do you find the most satisfying and the most frustrating?
2. If you're not a full time director, what other duties do you have?
3. How did you get into this job?

QUESTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TECS

TEC 1

1. How were you able to make the switch from traditional staff development to 75% school based?
2. How are school goals decided?
3. What benefits besides improvement in instruction do you see for school-based staff development?
4. Do you find sufficient leadership within the schools?
5. How do you arrange for release time?

Is that sufficient incentive for participation in staff development?

6. The southern districts that responded to my survey, especially the big ones, Dade, Broward & Palm Beach seemed low on follow-up, taking test results in account on needs assessment, and paying little attention to public pressure. Can you shed any light on possible reasons?

TEC 2

1. You answered "most" for the greatest purpose being teacher certification. Do you feel this district sponsors staff development mainly to meet the recertification requirements of the state or for individual growth.

2. Your percentage of school based inservice (30-40%) is higher than the state average. What problems did you have getting administrators or teachers to leave the traditional inservice model?

3. You answered "most" for inservice during school time. How does the district support released time?

4. What do you do to make sure there is follow-up in the classroom?

(Subject area supervisor responsible for follow up most)

TEC 3

1. How long have you served in this position?

2. You cited .02% as school based inservices. What difficulties have you encountered with school-based?

3. You answered "least" for inservice during school. How does this district feel about released time?

(Also cited as greatest problem for school-based inservice)

4. What is ACIT-TIME?

5. How do you manage to coordinate 5,200 teachers?

TEC 4

1. What kinds of problems do you have in finding leadership for school-based inservice?

2. How does this district feel about released time for

inservice?

3. How do you manage to arrange for feedback and coaching for new skills?
4. Does each school have a different school improvement project or are there district goals?
5. (Peers mostly responsible for follow-up) Have you sponsored a particular program for training peers to coach?

TEC 5

1. What problems have you had in finding leadership for school-based inservice?
2. You answered "most" for inservice during school time. Have you had any problems funding released time?
3. How effective are principals in providing assistance to teachers following inservice in terms of feedback and coaching?

TEC 6

1. You cited as the main purpose "to empower teacher in the decision-making process at the school level in school effectiveness/school improvement models" That is innovative thinking for the State of Florida. Can you mesh this kind of thinking with State mandates?
2. How did you get the district to go towards 40% school-based staff development and away from the present and leave model? Did you have problems with administrative and teaching traditions?
3. What benefits do you see in school-based inservice other than improvement in teaching skills and attitudes?
4. What is the main impediment to release time?
5. You are one of the few districts that checked staff development over several years. Do you have problems keeping the project going?
6. What type of process are you using in training peers?
7. Since university personnel have little follow-up, is there another source for leaders or presenters or consultants?
8. You seem to provide more follow-up than most districts.

How do you manage the time and logistics of classroom follow-up?

TEC 7

1. Have the districts supported the consortium to meet State requirements or to enhance learning and teaching?
2. What special problems are there in developing inservice activities for multiple districts?
3. Are you able to coordinate long term projects in single or multiple districts?
4. If you do a multi-district activity, who is responsible for follow-up and coaching in individual districts?
5. How can you judge impact in the classroom over several districts?

TEC 8

1. This is the smallest district in the state that has a single TEC. Is it difficult to meet all the State mandates in a small district?
2. You cited 1-8 hour activities. Are these complete components or just part of a larger component?
3. In program content, you cited most maintenance programs. Are they just to keep the organization healthy or is there deep resistance to change?
4. What alternatives to university presenters have you tried, someone who might be perceived as more practical or available for follow-up?
5. As TEC Director in a small district, how personally involved do you get with inservice activities and follow-up?
6. Does the State consider districts like yours or does Dade County's 14,200 teachers' needs overshadow small northern districts?
7. In the northwest, there seemed to be greater interest in recertification and programming for teacher deficiency. Are there different needs in the northwest than in other parts of the state?

TEC 9

1. Meeting teacher deficiencies were cited in the northwest more than any other section of the state. Are there particular difficulties here and in the panhandle?
2. You cited 1-4 hr and 4-8 hour sessions. Are these total components or just segments of larger units?
3. Do you have any multi-year programs?
4. What do you consider your most important source when doing needs assessment?
5. Does the State consider districts like yours or does Dade County's 14,200 teachers' needs overshadow small northern districts?
6. In the northwest there was greater emphasis on maintenance, teacher deficiency and teacher recertification. Are there different needs in the northwest than in other parts of the state?

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

BREAKDOWN OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMPOSITE BY DISTRICT
CHARACTERISTICS

Numbering of appendix tables corresponds with numbering of tables in Chapter III for easy reference.

TABLE F-1

PURPOSE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Teacher staff development activities can be used to fulfill many purposes. Please check all the aims of teacher inservice programs sponsored by your TEC for 1988-1989. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important, and "L" next to the least important.

For the general improvement of teaching and learning

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	87	100	100	91	100	100	71	100	100	94	80
L	6	0	6	4	13	0	5	8	0	0	0	11	0
M	63	100	60	70	66	65	74	58	57	50	86	67	60

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

All numbers are in percent.

C = checked

L = least

M = most

Sin = single district

Mul = multiple districts

FT = full-time director

PT = part time director

TO = teachers only

Ot = teachers and others

Sm = small sized districts

Md = medium sized districts

Lg = large sized districts

NE = northeast

NW = northwest

C = central

S = south

TABLE F-1 -- CONTINUED

To accomplish a particular school-wide goal

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	100	87	96	100	87	95	100	71	88	100	94	80
L	3	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	14	0	0
M	46	66	47	48	60	39	53	32	57	38	43	61	20

To implement a new program

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	100	87	96	93	91	95	92	86	88	100	89	100
L	3	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	6	0
M	34	66	47	30	47	30	42	25	43	13	57	39	40

For teacher recertification

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	87	100	100	91	100	100	71	100	100	94	80
L	11	0	6	13	13	9	16	8	0	38	0	6	0
M	34	66	33	39	47	30	42	32	29	13	57	44	20

To foster personal growth of teachers

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	87	100	100	91	95	100	86	100	86	100	80
L	20	0	13	22	27	13	16	25	14	25	14	17	20
M	29	66	33	30	33	30	42	25	14	25	38	39	0

To meet teacher deficiencies

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	89	100	87	91	93	87	95	92	71	88	100	89	80
L	14	66	27	4	20	9	16	8	14	13	0	17	20
M	26	0	13	30	33	17	32	16	14	0	57	28	0

As a cure for burn -out

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	74	100	80	74	73	78	79	64	86	63	100	83	40
L	49	66	40	57	60	43	68	16	57	25	57	67	20
M	6	0	13	0	0	9	0	16	0	0	14	6	0

To aid the enlivenment of an aging staff

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	66	100	80	61	60	74	74	64	57	50	86	72	60
L	46	66	53	43	40	52	58	42	43	25	57	55	60
M	3	0	6	0	6	0	5	0	0	13	0	0	0

TABLE F-2

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DEVELOPERS

Who participated in the writing of the last needs assessment instrument? Please check all those who participated.

TEC Council													
	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	94	100	93	96	100	91	95	100	86	100	86	100	80
TEC staff													
	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	77	66	73	78	80	74	68	75	100	75	71	78	80
Teachers other than those on the TEC Council													
	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	60	33	66	52	66	52	47	58	71	50	57	61	60
Administrators other than those on the TEC Council													
	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	57	33	60	52	66	48	47	64	57	38	43	72	40
University consultants other than those on the TEC Council													
	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	34	0	27	35	27	35	21	32	57	25	29	33	40

TABLE F-3

SOURCES OF DATA FOR NEEDS ASSESSMENT

How did you gather data for your last needs assessment? Check all that apply. Write "M" next to the source you consider most important and "L" next to the least important.

Teacher questionnaires

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
L	3	33	13	0	13	0	11	0	0	0	0	11	0
M	71	66	66	74	66	74	74	58	86	75	86	61	80

TABLE F-4

TRIGGERS FOR AWARENESS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

What triggers awareness for staff development needs?
Check all that apply. Write "M" next to the one that
you consider most important, and "L" next to the least
important.

Teacher desires

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	100	87	96	93	91	95	92	86	100	100	94	60
L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	71	100	60	83	80	70	84	58	86	75	86	78	20

Inside district reports

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	89	100	93	87	100	83	89	92	86	88	100	89	80
L	6	0	0	9	0	9	11	0	0	0	14	6	0
M	29	66	47	22	47	22	32	25	43	25	43	28	40

Test scores

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	86	66	80	87	93	78	89	92	71	88	100	89	40
L	9	0	6	9	0	13	11	0	14	0	14	11	0
M	29	66	40	26	40	26	26	42	29	25	43	33	0

Outside reports

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	69	66	53	78	73	65	79	75	29	88	100	67	0
L	29	66	20	39	60	13	37	25	29	38	29	39	0
M	17	0	20	13	6	22	16	25	0	13	43	11	0

Public pressure

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	60	66	60	61	53	65	79	50	29	75	100	50	20
L	40	66	40	43	33	48	58	32	14	38	86	39	0
M	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

University input

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	57	66	66	52	60	57	63	50	57	63	71	55	40
L	34	66	47	30	40	35	37	32	43	38	57	33	20
M	6	0	6	4	6	4	5	8	0	0	14	6	0

TABLE F-5

FOCUS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Check all the areas on which your teacher inservice programs focus. Write "M" next to the area on which activities most often focus, and "L" next to area of least focus.

School-wide programs

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	97	100	100	96	100	96	100	100	85	88	100	100	100
L	6	0	6	4	6	4	5	8	0	0	0	11	0
M	60	66	66	57	73	52	68	58	43	38	71	61	80

District-wide programs

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
L	17	0	13	17	6	22	16	16	14	13	0	17	40
M	57	33	66	57	66	57	58	64	57	38	86	61	60

Curricular programs and materials

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	100	91	93	96	95	92	100	100	100	89	100
L	23	33	33	17	33	17	26	16	29	13	0	33	40
M	37	33	27	43	40	35	47	25	28	50	71	28	0

Individual teachers

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	97	100	100	96	100	96	95	100	100	88	100	100	100
L	40	33	40	39	47	35	47	25	43	38	71	28	40
M	26	33	20	30	27	26	26	32	14	13	29	39	0

TABLE F-6
SCHOOL-BASED INSERVICE

What percentage of your teacher inservice programs focus on one entire school? Please estimate. ____%

	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Sin	43	23	17	0
Mul	33	33	33	0
FT	40	20	27	6
PT	43	26	13	9
TO	40	33	27	13
Ot	43	17	13	9
Sm	42	26	11	11
Md	42	16	32	8
Lg	43	29	14	0
NE	13	50	25	13
NW	43	0	29	14
C	55	28	11	0
S	40	0	20	20

TABLE F-7
ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DESIGN

How often do you include the following components of inservice design in your staff development activities?

Presentation of Theory

Never	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	3	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	14	0	0
Sometimes	43	100	40	52	40	52	53	42	43	38	29	61	40
Usually	40	0	53	26	47	30	32	42	43	38	57	28	40
Mostly	9	0	0	13	6	9	11	8	0	13	0	11	0
Almost always	6	0	6	4	6	4	0	8	14	13	0	0	20

TABLE F-7 -- CONTINUED

Modeling or Demonstration of the Concept

Never	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	14	33	13	17	27	9	11	16	29	25	0	11	40
Usually	57	33	66	48	53	57	58	50	57	38	86	55	40
Mostly	17	0	6	22	6	22	21	8	14	25	0	17	20
Almost always	11	33	13	13	13	13	16	25	0	13	14	17	0

Practice Under Simulated Conditions (With Other Teachers or Students)

Never	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	3	0	0	0	4	6	0	8	0	13	0	0	0
Sometimes	43	66	40	48	47	43	47	32	57	25	43	50	60
Usually	37	0	40	30	33	35	32	32	43	50	29	33	20
Mostly	11	0	6	13	6	13	16	8	0	0	14	11	20
Almost always	6	33	13	4	6	9	5	16	0	13	14	6	0

Structured or Open-Ended Feedback Following Classroom Tryout of the New Concept

Never	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	57	33	47	61	66	48	63	32	71	50	57	61	40
Usually	29	33	33	26	20	35	21	42	29	25	29	28	40
Mostly	9	0	6	9	6	9	11	8	0	13	0	6	20
Almost always	6	33	13	4	6	9	5	16	0	13	14	6	0

TABLE F-7 -- CONTINUED

Coaching for Application by the Presenter, a Supervisor,
or a Peer

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	51	100	66	48	80	39	53	50	71	63	43	55	60
Usually	34	0	27	35	20	39	37	25	29	25	29	33	40
Mostly	9	0	6	9	0	13	5	16	0	0	14	11	0
Almost always	6	0	0	9	0	9	5	8	0	13	14	0	0

TABLE F-8

FREQUENCY OF FOLLOW-UP TO INSERVICE

Do your teacher staff development programs include
some type of follow-up?

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	46	100	53	48	60	43	53	32	71	38	43	50	80
Usually	26	0	33	17	20	26	21	32	14	25	29	28	0
Mostly	11	0	6	13	13	9	11	8	14	0	0	17	20
Almost always	17	0	6	22	6	22	16	25	0	38	29	6	0

TABLE F-9

TYPES OF FOLLOW-UP TO INSERVICE

Check the types of follow-up activities that your TEC uses. Write "M" next to the most frequently used follow-up and "L" next to the least frequently used follow-up.

A skill check or testing of what the teachers learned in the program

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	83	66	80	83	87	78	79	83	86	75	100	83	60
L	0	0	6	9	13	4	11	8	0	0	0	17	0
M	69	66	66	70	66	70	63	64	86	88	100	61	40

Technical assistance in the classroom or school site

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	86	100	93	83	87	87	84	83	100	88	100	83	80
L	23	33	33	17	33	17	26	8	43	25	14	28	20
M	31	66	27	39	33	35	37	25	43	13	43	39	40

Peer coaching

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	83	100	93	78	93	78	84	92	71	100	100	72	80
L	29	33	33	26	33	26	32	25	29	38	43	22	20
M	20	33	27	17	27	17	26	25	0	0	29	22	40

Evaluation of the teacher by a supervisor

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	80	66	80	87	93	70	89	83	43	88	100	72	60
L	29	66	33	30	27	35	37	42	0	25	57	33	0
M	14	0	13	13	27	4	11	8	29	13	14	6	40

Formally scheduled maintenance activities

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	69	100	73	70	87	61	74	75	57	100	86	55	60
L	43	66	53	39	53	39	53	32	43	38	71	39	40
M	11	0	0	17	6	13	11	16	0	25	0	11	0

TABLE F-10

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

In those staff development activities that include follow-up, who is responsible for the follow-up? Check all those who have responsibility. Write "M" next to persons who are most frequently responsible, and "L" next to the least frequently responsible.

Principal

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	89	66	87	87	93	83	95	75	86	63	86	100	80
L	14	0	13	13	13	13	16	8	14	0	14	22	0
M	46	66	40	52	53	43	58	25	57	38	57	50	40

Subject area supervisor

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	80	100	80	83	87	78	79	92	71	88	86	83	60
L	11	66	20	13	20	13	26	8	0	13	29	17	0
M	34	0	27	35	40	26	26	32	43	13	43	39	20

Teaching peers

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	69	66	73	65	66	70	63	75	71	75	71	78	20
L	29	66	27	35	33	30	47	8	29	38	29	39	9
M	20	0	13	22	20	17	16	16	29	13	43	11	20

University personnel

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	71	100	80	70	93	61	84	58	71	75	86	61	100
L	37	66	53	30	60	26	42	32	43	50	29	28	80
M	14	33	6	22	13	17	32	0	0	13	43	11	0

TABLE F-11

PRESENTERS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Who presents the inservice activities for teachers? Check all those who are presenters. Write "M" next to the one that you consider most important, and "L" next to the least important.

University personnel

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	97	100	93	100	100	100	95	100	100	100	100	100	80
L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	51	100	60	52	66	48	63	32	71	50	57	50	80

TABLE F-11 -- CONTINUED

Teachers from the district

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	100	91	100	91	89	100	100	88	100	94	100
L	9	0	6	9	0	13	11	0	14	0	14	6	20
M	46	66	53	43	53	43	42	50	57	38	57	44	60

Presenters from outside the district

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	100	93	91	93	91	95	92	86	75	100	100	80
L	3	33	6	4	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	11	0
M	40	33	33	43	47	35	53	25	29	13	71	44	20

Curriculum personnel from the district

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	100	87	96	100	87	89	100	86	88	100	100	60
L	14	33	6	22	6	22	32	0	0	0	29	22	0
M	31	33	47	22	47	22	11	50	57	13	43	39	20

District administrators

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	83	100	87	83	100	74	84	92	71	75	100	89	60
L	17	33	27	13	20	17	26	8	14	0	14	33	0
M	17	33	20	17	27	13	16	25	14	13	43	17	0

Personnel from the TEC

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	80	100	87	78	93	74	79	83	86	75	100	83	60
L	23	0	20	22	13	26	26	25	0	0	43	28	0
M	6	100	20	9	33	0	16	0	29	13	14	11	20

Representatives from textbook firms

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	66	87	91	100	83	95	100	57	100	100	89	60
L	63	66	60	65	60	65	74	64	29	75	71	61	40
M	6	0	0	9	6	4	11	0	0	0	29	0	0

TABLE F-12

No breakdown of district characteristics coincides with Table III-12.

TABLE F-13

AVAILABILITY OF PRESENTERS FOR FOLLOW-UP

To what degree are presenters available for follow-up help?

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	29	33	40	22	27	30	32	25	29	25	14	33	40
Usually	37	33	40	35	40	35	21	50	57	25	29	39	60
Mostly	20	0	6	26	20	17	32	0	14	25	29	17	0
Almost always	14	33	13	17	13	17	16	25	0	25	29	11	0

TABLES F-14 and F-15

No district characteristics correspond with Table III-14 or Table III-15.

TABLE F-16

INSERVICE TIME LOGISTICS

When do teachers attend inservice programs that are TEC sponsored? Check all those that apply. Write "M" next to the most frequent time, and "L" next to the least frequent.

During school time

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	97	100	93	100	100	96	100	100	86	100	100	100	80
L	20	0	13	22	13	22	5	32	29	25	0	22	20
M	51	66	47	57	66	43	74	42	14	50	71	55	20

TABLE F-16 -- CONTINUED

After school hours

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	97	100	100	96	100	96	95	100	100	88	100	100	100
L	23	33	13	30	40	13	32	16	14	13	29	28	20
M	54	66	73	43	47	61	32	75	86	50	71	50	60

In the summer

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	93	96	93	96	89	100	100	88	100	100	80
L	11	33	13	13	6	17	16	0	29	0	14	11	40
M	34	66	47	30	47	30	37	32	43	25	43	39	40

Weekends

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	86	100	87	87	80	91	89	83	86	100	86	89	60
L	71	66	73	70	53	83	74	64	71	63	86	78	40
M	3	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	6	0

TABLE F-17

LENGTH OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

How long do your teacher inservice activities last?
 Check all those that apply. Write "M" next to the
 most frequent time schedule, and "L" next to the least
 frequent.

Over several weeks

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	94	100	93	96	93	96	89	100	100	88	100	100	80
L	14	0	13	13	13	13	16	8	14	13	29	11	0
M	63	100	53	74	80	57	68	64	57	63	71	67	60

4-8 hours

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	86	66	87	83	87	83	84	83	86	75	86	89	80
L	26	0	13	30	27	22	16	25	43	13	29	28	20
M	31	66	47	26	40	30	47	16	29	38	57	28	20

TABLE F-18

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DIRECTED TOWARDS MAINTENANCE

If program content were to be divided by the definitions below, what portion of your teacher staff development programs would come under each category?

MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS: trying to get rid of undesirable teacher or student behavior or to maintain current practices i.e., discipline techniques, teacher orientation.

None or few	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	31	0	33	26	27	30	26	16	57	0	14	39	60
Less than half	49	100	47	57	60	48	53	58	43	88	43	50	20
Half	17	0	20	13	13	17	16	25	0	13	29	11	20
Most	3	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	14	0	0
Almost all	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE F-19

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DIRECTED TOWARD ENHANCEMENT

ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS: activities that enhance teachers' existing skills to fine tune their classroom performance i.e., how to increase student involvement.

None or few	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less than half	20	0	13	22	13	22	21	25	0	13	29	22	0
Half	31	66	33	35	33	35	37	25	43	50	43	33	0
Most	43	33	47	39	40	43	37	50	43	38	14	44	80
Almost all	3	0	6	4	13	0	5	0	14	0	14	0	20

TABLE F-20

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DIRECTED TOWARD ESTABLISHMENT

ESTABLISHMENT PROGRAMS: a significant change in the structure of existing patterns, behaviors, or attitudes toward an organizational goal. i.e., implementing school-wide change.

None or few	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	17	0	20	13	20	13	16	8	29	0	0	22	40
Less than half	60	66	53	65	60	61	63	75	29	88	86	50	20
Half	17	33	20	17	13	22	16	8	43	13	14	22	20
Most	6	0	6	4	6	4	5	8	0	0	0	6	20
Almost all	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE F-21

ARE UNIVERSITY PRESENTERS PERCEIVED AS PRACTICAL?

Never	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	34	0	33	30	13	43	26	32	43	25	14	39	40
Usually	29	66	40	26	33	30	21	42	43	38	29	28	40
Mostly	29	33	20	35	40	22	37	25	14	38	57	17	20
Almost always	9	0	6	9	13	4	16	0	0	0	0	17	0

TABLE F-22

EFFECT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities is the effect on STUDENT achievement or STUDENT behavior FORMALLY measured.

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
None or few	57	33	40	65	60	52	63	32	71	38	57	61	60
Less than half	40	66	60	30	40	43	32	64	29	50	43	39	40
Half	3	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	0	13	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Almost all	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE F-23

EFFECT ON TEACHER BEHAVIORS

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities is the effect on TEACHER behavior FORMALLY measured?

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
None or few	20	33	20	22	27	17	26	8	29	0	14	28	40
Less than half	34	33	27	39	33	35	32	32	43	50	43	28	20
Half	9	0	13	4	6	9	5	8	14	13	0	11	0
Most	17	33	20	17	27	13	32	8	0	13	29	17	20
Almost all	20	0	20	17	6	26	5	42	14	25	14	17	20

TABLE F-24

EFFECT ON STUDENT ATTITUDES

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities are attitudinal effects of the STUDENTS FORMALLY measured?

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TD	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
None or few	60	66	53	65	60	61	68	42	71	63	57	61	60
Less than half	40	33	47	35	40	39	32	58	29	38	43	39	40
Half	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Almost all	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE F-25

EFFECT ON TEACHER ATTITUDES

In what portion of your teacher staff development activities are attitudinal effects of the TEACHERS FORMALLY measured?

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TD	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
None or few	9	0	0	13	6	9	11	8	0	0	0	17	0
Less than half	34	33	40	30	40	30	26	42	43	38	43	33	20
Half	6	0	0	9	0	9	11	0	0	0	14	6	0
Most	14	33	6	22	20	13	21	8	14	13	14	17	20
Almost all	37	0	53	26	33	39	32	42	43	50	29	28	60

TABLE F-26

INFORMAL EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

When formal, measurable evaluations are not done, how are perceived effects measured? Check all the methods that will be used in 1988-89. Write "M" next to the most frequently used and "L" next to the least frequently used.

Teacher satisfaction with the inservice activity

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	91	100	100	87	100	87	89	92	100	88	100	89	100
L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	83	66	87	78	66	91	74	83	100	63	100	83	80

Perceived teacher improvement by supervisor

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	89	66	80	91	87	87	89	83	86	88	100	83	80
L	14	33	27	9	13	17	16	8	29	13	29	11	20
M	37	0	20	43	33	35	37	25	43	38	43	33	20

Presenter satisfaction with the inservice activity

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	86	100	93	83	100	78	89	92	71	100	100	78	80
L	31	0	20	35	27	30	37	16	29	25	43	22	40
M	14	33	27	9	20	13	21	16	0	25	29	6	20

Perceived student improvement by teachers

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	63	66	66	61	66	61	58	83	43	63	71	67	40
L	20	33	27	17	27	17	21	25	14	38	0	22	20
M	23	0	13	26	13	26	16	25	29	13	57	17	0

School climate

	Sin	Mul	FT	PT	TO	Ot	Sm	Md	Lg	NE	NW	C	S
C	66	100	87	57	73	65	58	83	71	63	86	61	80
L	37	33	47	30	40	35	32	50	29	38	43	39	20
M	11	0	6	13	13	9	11	8	14	0	29	11	0

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Bonnie Burns has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Mel Heller, Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy
Studies, Loyola

Dr. Max Bailey
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership
and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Phillip Carlin
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership
and Policy Studies, Loyola

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

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

November 25, 1989
Date

Mel Heller
Director's Signature