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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Illinois Senate Bill No. 730 was adopted in July, 1985. This important legislation designated the Illinois State Board of Education as the responsible administrative agency for establishing a schedule of training for Illinois administrators through the Illinois Administrators' Academy. This training was to be in place by January 1, 1986. As cited in the Illinois School Code:

§2-3.53. Administrators' Academy. The State Board of Education shall cause to be established an Illinois Administrators' Academy. This Academy shall develop programs which provide for development of skills in the areas of instructional staff development, effective communication skills, public school relations, evaluation of personnel, including documentation of employee performance and remediation of unsatisfactory employee performance.

Hallinger stated that one of the areas for greatest rate of growth in the 1980s was that of professional development programs for school leaders. Hallinger further observed that although there were few leadership centers and academies at the beginning of the 1980s, the number had increased significantly by 1990.

Throughout the 1980s dissatisfaction with schools prompted studies attempting to identify problems and offering suggestions for the improvement of productivity and effectiveness of school programs.

---


3Ibid., 303.
Increasingly the focus for change was on the principal. Orlich stated: "Over the past few years, the spotlight has been on the principal as the key administrator in either making changes or implementing effective schooling practices." Orlich asserted: "It is imperative, therefore, that principals become aware of valid theories and processes associated with change efforts."

Preceding the reform movement of the 1980s a report sponsored by the Ford Foundation in 1972 pointed out that less attention had been focused on the training of leadership for schools, especially the principalship, than had been paid to other positions. In the report Mitchell stated: "It seems evident that a training focus on the key persons in charge of the individual school--the principal--can result in a direct improvement of the school."

Traditional forms of professional development were proving inadequate. A report on principal renewal stated:

Numerous researchers are now considering the possibility that principals are not being appropriately trained in many higher-education institutions, and they are being given less than adequate opportunity on the job to practice the requisite skills needed in the principalship.

Cooper and Boyd noted that formal training of school administrators had been a recent development. As the emphasis on

---


5Ibid., 141.


7Ibid., 57.

8M. D. Richardson and others, eds., *Principal Renewal: A Practical Approach to Principal Staff Development* (Fargo, N. Dak.: National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, 1991), 2.

administrator training increased, there was not a clear definition of responsibility for provision of professional development activities. Hallinger argued for involvement of government at the federal level, especially to fund the development and evaluation of program alternatives.  

Richardson observed that a recent National Association of Secondary School Principals' report argued for state involvement: "State education agencies should seize the lead in coordinating the efforts of institutions and groups involved in the training, certification, and career development of educational administrators."  

Richardson noted: "State departments of education are logical catalysts in building a consensus among these players on standards and programs for administrators."  

Daresh and LaPlant argued that because the role of the principal was so important in the improvement of schools, any form of support was needed. The need for positive and effective change was called for by a broad spectrum of individuals and groups. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration asserted that: "A revolution in education requires competent, skilled, and visionary leadership."  

School restructuring and the resultant changes brought to the role of principal were addressed at all levels. The wide-ranging call for change and restructuring had implications both for those leading the change process and for those training the leaders of change. As noted in the Ford Foundation report:  


Ibid.  


Daniel E. Griffiths, Robert T. Stout, and Patrick B. forsyth, eds., Leaders of America's Schools, xiii.
Changing the product of an organization requires changing what people do. What the administrator does always affects what people do and what they produce: thus changing the principalship seems imperative for improving education. Consequently, the recruiting or the training of principals who function differently should be a major priority of educational reform.\(^{15}\)

A critical part of the change process assured that the focus of change was on the human factor as opposed to program or organizational factors. Tye observed of the change process: "Seldom is adequate attention given to institutionalizing the new behaviors that employees would have to exhibit—consistently and permanently—if the desired organizational changes are to occur."\(^{16}\) Therefore adequate attention to articulation of behaviors to be changed was critical to success. In the report on principal renewal, Richardson observed:

Numerous reputable educational researchers have concluded that the principal is the key to an effective school. Principals alone do not have magic powers to create these effective schools; rather, they have the ability to mobilize other resources.\(^{17}\)

Johnson and Snyder stated that professional development for the new roles to be undertaken by principals were critical to the success of those principals:

The message for role development is clear: if principals are expected to perform new tasks and accomplish different kinds of performance results from that for which they were trained, their development in a new set of knowledge and skills must become a district priority.\(^{18}\)

They observed that transforming schools required adequate support for those given that responsibility: "We owe it to them to provide the necessary knowledge, skills, and support for their success."\(^{19}\)

\(^{15}\)Donald P. Mitchell, *Leadership*, 58.


\(^{17}\)M. D. Richardson and others, *Principal Renewal*, 3.


\(^{19}\)Ibid.
The focus on the training of administrators, and principals in particular, had at last come to the forefront of educational attention. Hallinger had noted that:

During the 1980s the field of staff development for administrators underwent an unprecedented expansion. Individual principals, regional groups, and professional organizations began demanding greater support for efforts to grow professionally.¹

Background of the Study

Marilyn A. Howell completed a doctoral dissertation in 1990 at Loyola University Chicago entitled: A Study of the Perceived Effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy on the Professional Development of Secondary School Principals in Northern Illinois. One hundred and one secondary school principals from five Educational Service Centers in the Chicago area (excluding the City of Chicago) were surveyed. At the time of data collection in 1988 secondary principals determined that the Academy was ineffective in the area of professional development relative to their needs.

One of Howell's recommendations for further study suggested replication of the study using elementary school principals.² This present study was undertaken with the purpose of determining the degree to which elementary school principals assessed the effectiveness of professional development provided by the Illinois Administrators' Academy relative to their needs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy on the professional

¹Philip Hallinger and Joseph Murphy, "Developing Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 72: (March 1991): 516.

development of elementary school principals. Three main research questions were addressed:

1. Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy sessions satisfy the elementary principal's personal needs for professional development?

2. Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy satisfy the elementary principals' need for increasing the level of competency in areas designated important for successful completion of duties?

3. Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy sessions by the elementary principal improve the school's organizational effectiveness?

Methodology

Elementary school principals from Lake County, Illinois, Educational Service Center 2, were the focus of this study. Collection of data involved the use of a written survey instrument containing requests for demographic data and thirty questions designed to address the three key research questions of the study. A structured interview followed using a sampling of principals who had responded to the written phase of data collection. Results for the study population of the research project were tabulated and further analyzed relative to the findings of Howell's research.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were defined:

The Illinois Administrators' Academy was the program mandated by the Illinois State Legislature to be administered by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). ISBE authorized the 18 regional Education Service Centers in Illinois to provide training for skill development in
instructional staff development, effective communication, public-school relations, and evaluation of personnel.\textsuperscript{22}

Elementary School Principals were identified as the chief administrators of an elementary school building serving any or all grades from kindergarten through eight.

Professional Development was identified in broad terms often used interchangeably as inservice education and staff development. In order to maintain continuity of understanding of this study with the term professional development as defined by Howell for her study, Howell's definition was used:

Professional development was defined as a systematic approach to the design of activities for administrators that would: 1) satisfy personal needs; 2) increase the level of one's competency; and/or 3) improve the school's organizational effectiveness.\textsuperscript{23}

Instructional Leader as defined by the Illinois Administrators' Academy stated:

The instructional leadership research base identifies practices and characteristics of principals associated with measurable improvements in student achievement. These instructional leadership characteristics include elements of leadership associated with defining and communicating the mission of the school, managing curriculum and instruction, and promoting all aspects of the school climate including the expectations of students and staff.\textsuperscript{24}

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

This study analyzed the effect of participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy on the professional development of elementary school principals as measured by their perceptions of effectiveness.


\textsuperscript{23}Marilyn A. Howell, A Study, 13.

\textsuperscript{24}Illinois State Board of Education, "Illinois Administrators' Academy: Monograph Series, Paper #1" (Springfield, Ill., 1986), 1.
The assumption was made that the state role in the provision and monitoring of professional development for school administrators was a proper one.\textsuperscript{25}

It was assumed that survey research was a valid method of data collection for the purposes of data analysis.

It was assumed that elementary school principals responded to the survey research in a truthful manner.

The focus of data collection was limited to the Illinois Administrators' Academy.

Data analysis was limited to perceptions of the principals surveyed.

**Organization of the Study**

This study was divided into five chapters, each organized for a specific purpose.

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to the study. Included were discussions of the background to the study, the purpose of the study, the methodology used, definitions of terms, assumptions and limitations, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 offered a review of the literature pertinent to the research study. Key areas identified for the literature background included professional development for school administrators and specific models for implementing administrator professional development.

Chapter 3 focused on the research design of the study, methods of data collection using written questionnaires and telephone interviews, a definition of the population used for the study, and the instrumentation selected to analyze the data.

Chapter 4 presented the analysis of data as it related to the research questions. A comparison was made to data summarized from Howell's study.

\textsuperscript{25}Daniel E. Griffiths, Robert T. Stout, and Patrick B. Forsyth, eds., *Leaders of America's Schools*, 23.
Chapter 5 summarized results of the study based on the findings. Implications of findings were presented and suggestions for further study were offered.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The focus on the restructuring of public schools implied fundamental changes for the leaders of those schools. The National Governors Association suggested a framework for the restructuring process:

Principals will need to provide the vision to help shape new school structures, lead talented teachers, and take risks in an environment that rewards performance rather than compliance.¹

Principals were faced with the need to know what to change and to acquire the style of leadership which would enable them to realize those changes. Jane L. David noted:

An invitation to change is perhaps the most critical aspect of leadership at the state, district, and school levels. People need both a reason and the opportunity to change what they are doing. An invitation signals that the goals and the rules have changed; it is no longer to be business as usual. Risk taking, experimentation—even failure—are invited.²

Throughout the 1980s invitations to change were issued by the federal government and various state governments. The business and public communities served by the schools, even the educational community itself, called for restructuring efforts. The responsibility for restructuring was one which was to be shared at many levels. For the principal there were implications of transforming leadership styles. Kenneth A. Leithwood noted that instructional leadership had served well in the 1980s and early 1990s but that the remaining years of this decade should require leaving behind instructional leadership: "Transformational leadership evokes a more appropriate range of practice; it ought to subsume instructional


leadership as the dominant image of school administration, at least during the '90s.'³

**Professional Development of Administrators**

Daresh and Playko asserted that professional development for administrators and other educational leaders was a reasonable facet of the restructuring process.⁴ The authors stated that academic preparation, field-based learning, and personal and professional formation comprised professional development. They defined three phases in the development: preservice preparation, induction, and ongoing inservice education.⁵

Orlich wrote that principals had special professional development needs in the areas of organization development, development of interpersonal relations, team building, and problem solving.⁶

Murphy and Hallinger outlined ten problems they believed to exist in the area of professional development for school administrators. These included: 1) a need for a stronger knowledge base, 2) a need for theory that reflects the realities of the workplace, 3) a need for content derived from research on factors that contribute to important organizational outcomes, especially indicators of student progress, 4) a need for a greater emphasis on managing technical core operations, 5) a need for a greater emphasis on skill-based instruction, 6) a need to bring the training process more in line with the conditions and milieu of the workplace, 7) a need for better instruction, 8) a need to view administrators as adult learners, 9) a need to emphasize more thoroughly


⁵Ibid., 21.

the principles of effective change and staff development, and 10) the need to connect theory and practice.  

Within the professional development process for administrators thinking skills formed the basis for the acquisition of cognitive areas. Two models presented here were developed to strengthen problem-solving and thinking abilities of principals.

Problem Solving

Leithwood and Steinbach proposed a model for administrative problem solving based on research from the field of school administration. Figure 1 listed the categories of problem solving suggested for this model. Administrators addressed these issues in 4-day workshops. Participants had positive reactions to the effectiveness of the model relative to problem solving skills. Leithwood and Steinbach concluded: 1) problem based instruction for administrators appeared promising and 2) gaining experience in problem solving on-the-job proved unreliable.

Strategic Learning

Another approach to the development of thinking skills was offered by Hallinger and McCary: "We argue that research on instructional

---


9Ibid., 341.

10Ibid., 338.

11Ibid., 341.
**Figure 1**
Leithwood/Steinbach Problem Solving Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leithwood/Steinbach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model of Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:** a principal's understanding of the specific nature of the problem, often in situations where multiple problems may be identified.

**Goals:** the relatively immediate purposes that the principal is attempting to achieve in response to his or her interpretation of the problem.

**Principles/Values:** the relatively long-term purposes, operating principles, fundamental laws, doctrines, values, and assumptions guiding the principal's thinking.

**Constraints:** barriers or obstacles that must be overcome if an acceptable solution to the problem is to be found.

**Solution processes:** what the principal does to solve a problem in light of his or her interpretation of the problem, principles, goals to be achieved, and constraints to be accommodated.

leadership must address the thinking that underlies the exercise of leadership, not simply describe discrete behaviors of effective leaders." The authors suggested that deficit areas in principal preparation programs existed; these deficiencies were made more critical given the role of the principal in the school reform movement.

Hallinger and McCary postulated: "A recurrent problem in management education is how to design opportunities for students to apply

---

their learning under conditions that promote transfer." In an attempt to improve strategic thinking skills the authors developed a computer simulation program addressing this specific skill. In the Center of Things (ITCOT) was offered as a model which introduced problems in a manner which addressed the complexity of the school-improvement process. Figure 2 presented the basic elements present in the ITCOT model.

Hallinger and McCary presented a method of addressing the complexities of the principalship and preparing individuals for the challenges presented in the thinking skills underlying those complexities: "The ability to skillfully implement changes originating outside as well as inside the school organization will be a key requirement of principals."

Professional Organizations

The National Association of Secondary School Principals identified five groups as responsible for preparation programs for principals. The primary group was the university. Also identified were: state agencies, school districts, professional associations and a grouping of other agencies "such as assessment centers, principal academies, LEAD Centers, and unions."

Achilles and Ramey cautioned that preparation programs for school leaders needed to examine carefully the use of evaluation data concerning

---

13 Ibid., 96.
14 Ibid., 98.
16 Ibid., 104.
Problem scenario: Participants assume the role of a newly appointed principal. Extensive descriptive information is provided. The principal is faced with making decisions based on cost-effective measures.

Design of the Simulation: The knowledge base for action by the principal consists of 33 programmatic approaches. The simulation provides a synopsis of relevant research for each approach and a cost/benefit analysis.

Engaging Learners: This model forces principals to engage in strategic thinking by: 1) confronting the context specificity of the problem, and 2) assessing the interdependence of actions taken.

Instructional Component: Training is divided into two 1-hour sessions. Principals work in teams of 2-3. Results among teams are compared followed by exchanges of various strategies used. Following the second session participants discuss the implications and limitations of research presented in the simulation.

In their discussion of evaluation programs, they pointed to the formation of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) which came about in 1985. "The NCEEA focused primarily on the preparation of educational administrators."\(^{19}\)


\(^{19}\)Ibid., 14.
From this organization (NCEEA) emerged the National Policy Board for Educational Administrators (NPBEA) composed of such disparate groups as the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). In 1989 the NPBEA listed criteria to be included in a knowledge base for administrator preparation programs.

Figure 3 outlined 21 performance areas of the principalship which the NPBEA presented as a framework for preparing principals.

A model assessment center utilized by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) was developed to screen and induct principals:

These centers typically employ a set of standardized procedures, involving multiple activities undertaken by potential or practicing administrators to evaluate their performance in validated skills areas. The assessment activities conventionally include at least one simulation inter alia incorporating decision-making skills.

State Agencies

Whereas the discussion above focused on professional development provided by professional organizations, Conzemius believed that it was at the state level that some degree of responsibility rested, since it was the state's role to oversee education for children. Conzemius reasoned that: "The state is the level at which both initial and continuing licenses are issued, so it stands to reason that the state agency would

---

20Ibid.
21Ibid., 17.
22Developing School Leaders, 38-41.
I. Functional Domains

These domains address the organizational processes and techniques by which the mission of the school is achieved. They provide for the educational program to be realized and allow the institution to function.

1. Leadership
2. Information Collection
3. Problem Analysis
4. Judgment
5. Organizational Oversight
6. Implementation
7. Delegation

II. Programmatic Domains

These domains focus on the scope and framework of the educational program. They reflect the core technology of schools, instruction, and the related supporting services, developmental activities, and resource base.

8. Instructional Program
9. Curriculum Design
10. Student Guidance and Development
11. Staff Development
12. Measurement and Evaluation
13. Resource Allocation

III. Interpersonal Domains

These domains recognize the significance of interpersonal connections in schools. They acknowledge the critical value of human relationships to the satisfaction of personal and professional goals, and to the achievement of organizational purpose.

14. Motivating Others
15. Sensitivity
16. Oral Expression
17. Written Expression

IV. Contextual Domains

These domains reflect the world of ideas and forces within which the school operates. They explore the intellectual, ethical, cultural, economic, political, and governmental influences upon schools, including traditional and emerging perspectives.

18. Philosophical and Cultural Values
19. Legal and Regulatory Applications
20. Policy and Political Influences
21. Public and Media Relationships
have added cause to extend its jurisdiction from preservice to inservice education." 24

James W. Keefe, Director or Research for NASSP, discussed the role of the state in principal preparation programs:

State agencies are the most likely catalysts in a process to bring some measure of unity to the often fractious partners in the preparation and career training of educational administrators. The NPBEA is defining standards that may gain a measure of acceptance. 25

The NASSP reasoned that state departments of education were the official regulatory agencies and held the legal obligation and responsibility to establish standards for school. 26

Hallinger and Murphy noted an increase in mandatory involvement in professional development by administrators over the last decade:

A number of states...now requiring practicing administrators to complete a certain number of inservice training courses over a period of years....Administrator participation is required in specific staff development programs designed by the state education agency to promote competence in selected domains of practice. 27

The authors continued their study of state involvement by noting: "A number of state education departments...derive staff development goals and the related curricula for administrators directly from reform legislation." 28 These mandated topics were disseminated throughout the states by means of central or regional academies. 29

A report sponsored by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration suggested that not only should states provide a certain level of funding for professional development for


25 Developing School Leaders, vi.

26 Ibid., 23.
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administrators, state educational agencies should also monitor professional development programs:

High-quality programs of professional development for school administrators will be costly, but they are a needed investment. Just as most states have line-item appropriations for teachers' professional development, all states should set aside funding for the continuing education of school administrators. The state board of professional school administrator licensure should be responsible for the monitoring and quality control of professional development.30

**Principals' Centers**

Roland Barth said of principals' centers: "Each seeks to make the principalship a context for professional growth."31 The growth of centers following the first at Harvard University in 1981 was rapid. Barth noted: "Each of the 100 or so centers across the land is an experiment, a laboratory that seeks to foster learning, to make visible and available professional craft knowledge, to encourage risk taking, and to develop a culture of collegiality."32

Rebecca van-der-Bogert observed regarding the development of principals' centers: "As people were rediscovering the principal, they were also rediscovering staff development."33 One principal noted:

It seems to me what principals want and need are real professional growth and renewal opportunities, not time spent in contrived, overly theoretical activity. Renewal and growth are critical to our effectiveness as principals and to our own intellectual and emotional well-being.34

---


32Ibid.


Erlandson examined the role that principals' centers filled: "They are facilitators of growth and relationships among the principals they serve. They can serve principals in conjunction with universities, professional associations, and state departments of education." 

Hallinger and Greenblatt described operating principles of principals' centers:

- Participation in center activities is usually voluntary.
- Center activities emphasize professional socialization, empowerment of the learner, skill development, and reflection as means for improving practice.
- The content of principal-centered programs is often determined by practicing administrators who serve in either a governing or advisory capacity for the organization.

Wimpelberg offered a simple evaluation structure for principals' centers. He recognized: "There is no single kind of information that will capture the complexity of even the smallest in-service programs." Wimpelberg offered four criteria when gathering data about evaluation: 1) rates of participation, 2) comparisons of program content, 3) gathering participant reactions, 4) measuring the long term effects. He offered two general suggestions: gather words as well as numbers, and develop evaluation expertise within the Center.

Hallinger and Greenblatt studied reasons for participation in principals' centers by participants. Among implications for program development were: continued stress on voluntary rather than mandatory

---
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involvement, increased opportunities for veteran principals, provision of a mix of formal and informal activities, and recognition at the district level of accomplishments of principals attending sessions. 40

Harvard Principals' Center

Barth noted that the Principals' Center recognized the need to know more about the principalship relative to student accomplishment:

The individual school is the critical unit for educational improvement. Within the school, the principal has a powerful influence upon the nature of the school, the conditions under which youngsters and adults learn, and upon what and how much they learn. Yet, for all the agreement about the central role of the principal, surprisingly little is known about characteristics of principals associated with effective leadership and with pupil accomplishment, let alone how these characteristics might be developed. The Principals' Center is attempting to provide a forum to contribute to that knowledge base. 41

Figure 4 listed the underlying assumptions guiding the creation of the center and its continuing efforts. 42

Barth recognized the need to support principals from an external framework: "To effectively use the principalship as a vehicle for school improvement, principals need external support systems--support from other principals, from the central office, from universities and professional organizations." 43

The Harvard Principals' Center had two School of Education codirectors and a full-time associate director. 44 The target group of principals for programs focused on regional members. Levine, Barth, and


4Roland S. Barth, "The Principals' Center," 24-25.

Underlying Assumptions for Creation and Operation

- The principal or headmaster is central to the quality and effectiveness of a school.
- Most principals can be effective educational leaders as well as building managers.
- The role of the principal, the nature of the job, and the context of the school are all changing rapidly, becoming more complex and problematic.
- Principals (and schools) need opportunities to learn and grow. Principals have the capacity and need for personal professional growth—as much after they have assumed the position as before.
- Principals are as capable of lifelong learning as other professionals.
- The conditions necessary for principals' learning and growth exist: problems, a context, and a person who wants the problems addressed.
- The major element missing is the existence of a sympathetic, nonpunitive, nonjudgmental, helpful resource and support system.
- A principals' center can mediate among principals, help without judging or condemning, and assist principals in acquiring, strengthening, and sharing their skills of school leadership.

Haskins believed that: "Honoring school leaders as adult learners may be our greatest contribution."45 The authors observed: "The Center is beginning to demonstrate that there are conditions under which school leaders are not only educable, but will take responsibility for and voluntarily engage in activities which will promote their learning."46

46 Ibid., 162.
Barth observed of principals' involvement in their own professional learning:

Above all, the Principals' Center is important for offering an example that legitimizes an idea—that there are conditions under which principals will voluntarily engage in activities that promote their growth as leaders in school improvement. Principals can indeed become learners and thereby leaders in their schools.47

Westchester Principals' Center

Hallinger and Greenblatt reported of this Center:

It is an intermediate education agency and is the primary source of staff development services for approximately 1,300 administrators and supervisors from 60 school districts in a four-county region, including approximately 675 public and private school principals.48

A policy board made up primarily of principals governed the Center and promoted its mission of developing instructional leadership to bring about more effective teaching and learning in schools.49 Hallinger and Greenblatt conducted a study of the Center addressing the motivation for principals' participation and found that skill development and relationship building represented important outcomes which in turn influenced program design.50

Alaska Principals' Center

Hagstrom observed the need for Alaska to go beyond traditional means for provision of professional development for principals: "Alaska has pioneered the use of technological bridging, which has helped connect people for more than two decades."51

---
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He further noted the planning needed to accommodate the vast geographical areas and sparse populations: "Plans were made to link school leaders from the most sparsely populated areas of the state using a scheme that incorporates three quite different forms of 'people connecting.'\(^{52}\)

Three main approaches used in the Alaska Principals' Center utilized face-to-face meeting, audioconferencing, and an annual workshop. Hagstrom wrote:

These three activities have created Alaska's version of a principals' center. First, knowing that it is essential for participants to have opportunities to engage one another in face-to-face discussions about common problems and concerns, ways were developed to encourage village principals' attendance at one, and in some cases two, state education meetings in Anchorage. Second, an audioconference network was established so that principals could be connected within regions, and, on occasion, across the state. Third, a "Workshop on Successful Small School Practices" is scheduled each year in June on the campus of the University of Alaska at Fairbanks.\(^{53}\)

**Texas A&M University's Principals' Center**

Erlandson, Hinojos and McDonald defined the purpose of a principals' center:

The ultimate purpose of a Principals' Center, as it is conceived at Texas A&M University, is to serve principals by providing them with the orientation, skills, and understanding that will enhance their position as instructional leaders in their schools. This common need of principals has been demonstrated and intensified by recent legislation and social events that threaten the principal's capacity for leading the school.\(^{54}\)

The center was governed by a 20-member congress of principals representing Texas' geographical complexity. Consideration was given to the diversity represented in urban and rural locations and in elementary and secondary levels.\(^{55}\)

---
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The congress of principals met regularly on weekends during the year. The authors described the purpose of the meetings: "to devise specific strategies, review operations, and evaluate progress of the Principals' Center. The congress is the central source of ideas and activities for the Center." 56

Nine regional clusters of principals were formed from those attending the Summer Academy. The congress encouraged this arrangement which provided support for principals within each region. Each cluster developed its own courses based on needs of principals within each region. 57

The Principals' Center staff at Texas A&M provided services in addition to the planning and conducting of training sessions. These included: a toll-free hotline for help to any principal requesting it, a newsletter to every principal in the state with information of the Principals' Center activities, and a variety of research and development activities to support principals. 58

Baylor University Principals' Center

The Principals' Center at Baylor was governed by a program advisory board representing three groups: area principals, university representatives, and local Education Service Center representatives. 59

Estes and Crowder observed five ways in which the center assisted school administrators:

First, we foster a sense of collegiality and involvement on the part of the members through what we call "collegial circles." Second, we provide opportunities for interaction between principals and representatives from the Texas Education Agency. Third, we offer quality programs for state-mandated training in instructional leadership. Fourth, we coordinate a series of principals' seminars.

56 Ibid.
57 Ibid., 37.
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Finally, we encourage our members to interact with each other at meetings.60

Institutes

Daresh offered this description: "The institute is any type of relatively short-term learning activity that is directed toward a single specific topic or a narrow range of related topics."61 Advantages of the institute structure were defined as the ability to provide information addressing current topics, flexibility in scheduling for busy administrators, and the convenience in learning activities.62 Lack of in-depth topic coverage for complex subjects, lack of preparation time for reading of materials, and lack of time for involvement of participants in setting training objectives were among disadvantages listed for institutes.63

Vanderbilt Principals' Institute

The Vanderbilt Principals' Institute promoted experiential learning for principal participants in training sessions. The Kolb model provided an effective manner in which to present experiences. Four stages of learning were completed: 1) concrete experience, 2) reflective analysis, 3) abstract conceptualization, and 4) active experimentation.64 Writing activities were an important part of the institute and included the recording of ideas in daily journals both for use at a later date and as feedback for the Institute's faculty.65
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A special emphasis was placed on the development of a school improvement project by each participant: "Each participant prepares a written school improvement plan and presents that plan to the group, thus gaining feedback and professional support and establishing an informal contract with compatriots." Peterson noted that peer support and input increased the value of the experience for participants both through development of a project individually and through analysis of various other projects collectively.

The summer program of professional development for principals had been conducted annually for the past several years. Each institute was organized around a theme related to leadership and school improvement and was organized by a member of the Educational Leadership faculty and a school district staff developer.

Hallinger and Greenblatt investigated ways of improving potential transfer of knowledge through such centers of study. They concluded:

Two challenges face the field of staff development. The first is to make effective use of our knowledge of how adults transform new knowledge into usable tools.... The second is documenting the effects of staff development programs on participants and their organizations.

Peterson concluded of the Institute experience:

If the institute has reached them then they have developed a clearer sense of their own educational values and philosophy, learned some of the basic research on schools, classrooms, and principals, gained new ways of deciphering the ambiguity and complexity of their schools, and gained a renewed sense of their own effectiveness and the importance of their daily work—that joyful, demanding, frustrating, exciting job of being a school principal.

---
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North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals

A permanent staff consisting of a director, assistant director, two consultants and an advisory council were designated with the responsibility for planning training sessions for the institute. Varied programming was developed to meet participants' needs. Five areas of program development included:

1. Executive Assistants. Three principals were selected each year to serve a one-year term as executive assistant in the institute.
2. Seminars. The institute offered both statewide and regional seminars each year varying from ten to thirty contact hours.
3. Business and Industry Liaison. Principals participated in generic corporate staff development activities.
4. Short-term Intern Program. Participants arranged site visits and were reimbursed expenses by the institute.
5. Television Programs. Programs were sponsored three times yearly on public broadcasting networks and accompanied by guides for use by principals with faculties.\(^7\)

Grier offered ten observations on lessons learned from the institute during the many years the institute had operated: 1) Length should be no longer than two days in any week. 2) Programs should be carefully coordinated. 3) Clear designations of seminar content should be made. 4) A regional staff member should be designated for each region. 5) Program offerings for the entire year should be made available to allow principals the opportunity to plan attendance. 6) An emphasis should be placed on communication. 7) Institute staff should be used for the planning and conducting of programs. 8) The business liaison should be approached by topical choices on the part of principals. 9) Exemplary

programs, schools, and principals in the state should be identified. 10) Topics on television programs should be changed periodically.73

**Academies**

Academies began in the late 1970s when Pennsylvania offered a program for school leaders.74 Patterson described the academy concept as one in which training was provided to school administrators under the auspices of a state education agency.75 Several assumptions were made regarding the state role in providing training for school leaders:

1. There is a body of management knowledge and skills that school leaders should acquire.
2. Such knowledge and skills make a positive difference in the performance of school leaders.
3. Such knowledge and skills can be presented through an academy program offered by the state education agency.
4. School leaders will be motivated to attend academy programs and will benefit from this training.76

In an effort to develop effective training programs through academies, researchers and educators studied various programs in operation. Figure 5 outlined points of advice from four such organizations.77

Daresh and Playko offered a broader interpretation of the term academy: "The inservice education academy is an arrangement wherein a school district, a state department of education, or some other

---
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### Advice from State-Level Organizations

#### South Carolina Administrators' Leadership Academy

1. Make sure that goals and objectives are clearly stated, and evaluate everything you do based on whether or not it helps you accomplish your goals and objectives.
2. Build credibility and support for your programs.
3. Put a great deal of effort into program development.
4. Be visible.
5. Network with other inservice training organizations.

#### North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals

1. Make sure that the staff represents the client group.
2. Develop long-range plans for growth.
3. Start small to ensure success. Then build upon your success.
4. Offer a variety of programs and cover the levels from awareness to acquisition of competency.
5. Do not underestimate the value of advertising.

#### Maryland Professional Development Academy

1. Start slowly. Develop specific goals and attack them in a systematic way.
2. Focus on two or three things that you can do exceptionally well and then build upon your success.
3. Base your program on the identified inservice needs of administrators.

#### Florida Academy for School Leaders

1. Keep your system dynamic. The organization should have the ability and flexibility to change as the needs of the client group change.
2. Model principles of effective training and adult learning in the development and implementation of inservice programs.

---

Educational agency provides structured learning experiences to educators on an ongoing basis.  

Two distinctions from university courses were observed: the academy was an in-house operation specifically addressing needs of local practitioners, and participation in activities was client driven. Advantages of the academy structure were its permanent structure with a

---
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regular staff and the direct control exercised by practitioners who were participants. Disadvantages were noted as presenters, respected scholars and experts in their fields, who were not familiar with the local context, and a danger of too much focus on present issues without examining long-term solutions.

California School Leadership Academy (CSLA)

CSLA was cited as a prominent and innovative training program for school leaders. Administrators participated in a 3-year program designed to emphasize instructional leadership within a context of school reform mandated by the state. Three components made up the training: 1) core module workshops, 2) follow-through support and networking activities, and 3) comprehensive school improvement projects.

Researchers conducted a study of CSLA participants to determine the implementation of practices introduced in the training sessions. Three conclusions were drawn:

1. Graduates were practicing many pieces of instructional leadership at their sites.
2. The training made a real difference to the graduates.
3. Instructional leadership is developed in stages.

Indiana Principal Leadership Academy

Following publication of the report by the Carnegie Foundation in 1983 which called for the establishment of academies for principals,

---
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the Indiana General Assembly established the Indiana Principal Leadership Academy. Hallinger and Anast noted that:

The IPLA was established in 1984 by the state legislature to strengthen the ability of practicing principals to achieve excellence in teacher and student performance. The legislated mission of the academy is to provide building principals with the knowledge and skills required to implement state education reform successfully.  

Figure 6 listed official goals and programs of the IPLA. 

Training consisted of 18 days of activities taking place over a two-year period; participation in the academy was voluntary. Four major areas of development were addressed: leadership, school programs, school culture, and communication. In addition to the two-year development program other opportunities for growth were provided: a newsletter, a neophyte academy for principals with less than three years' experience, an advanced level academy for graduates of the two year program, and a graduate two-day seminar open to all IPLA graduates. 

Ellsberry noted several reasons for success of the IPLA model of administrative training: the cutting edge curriculum, a shared focus of content and process, a long term commitment to professional development, and principal participant networking.

---
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Indiana Principal Leadership Academy

**IPLA Goals and Programs**

1. To identify and select principals who have demonstrated a potential for professional self-growth and develop that potential through an intensive and exciting improvement program.

2. To create a self-perpetuating cadre of school administrators to serve as facilitators and/or trainers of other administrators and teachers.

3. To create an excitement for continuous growth among participants in academy programs.

4. To ensure school effectiveness by developing leaders of instructors as well as efficient managers.

5. To strengthen leadership skills through exposure to an in-depth application of "classic" administration themes, including leadership, school culture, school programs, and communication.

Utah Principals' Academy

Brian Schiller, 1987-88 Academy Director, asserted:

The task of helping to change the role of the principal from school manager, often the physical plant manager, to instructional leader approaches transformation for many practicing principals. For some, entirely new sets of skills and attitudes need to be acquired.  

The Mission Statement of the Utah Principals' Academy included the following guiding objectives:

- To strengthen the role of the principal as an instructional leader.
- To provide inservice training for continued skill development of principals.
- To build a collegial network of support among principals.

---

To serve as a resource center for all principals in the state in the dissemination of ideas and practices.\textsuperscript{94}

The Academy began operations in the mid 1980s and has offered programs to principals including:

1. Academy Fellows--an intense program of eight to ten monthly inservice seminars for forty select principals.
2. Academy Seminars--a series of ten to fifteen inservice offerings open to any Utah principal.
3. Cluster Grants--small incentive grants to districts of consortia of districts to plan and implement local principal inservice efforts.\textsuperscript{95}

**Maryland Professional Development Academy**

The Maryland Professional Development Academy (MPDA) was under the jurisdiction and funded by the Maryland Department of Education. Nine training programs were offered each year for the state's principals.\textsuperscript{96} "These institutes focus on imparting skills to increase administrators' abilities to improve teaching, to provide clinical supervision, or to build more effective and more democratic patterns of teamwork among staff members."\textsuperscript{97}

Major assumptions under which the MPDA operated included: a state educational agency could provide some programs more appropriate to the state role, effective schools research could be translated into staff
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\textsuperscript{95}Ibid., 3.


\textsuperscript{97}Ibid.
development behavior, and school-based administrators were the proper leaders of staff development for their schools.  

Sanders reported on lessons learned from several years of operation: 1) the crucial importance of conducting a needs assessment, 2) the benefit of statewide over regional institutes, 3) the fact that training could not be viewed as remedial, 4) the need to change the focus of training in the course of the year so that skill building becomes the primary objective, 5) the recognition of a need to help school systems prepare to receive principals back into the system with new ideas, 6) the need to accommodate team training (principal, supervisor, and master teacher), and 7) inclusion of an internship program. 

Sanders observed of the renewal process for participants:

What had become routine and laborious for a while is infused once more with the vision of what could be. We believe once more. We even believe that the vision can be retained, at least long enough to capture a bit of it in our school, among our staff, and for our learners.

Illinois Administrators' Academy

The Illinois Administrators' Academy developed training based on a synthesis of research of characteristics and behaviors of principals connected to student performance. As outlined by the Academy, the principals' role:

Defines the mission

- Frames goals

- Communicates goals

Manages Curriculum and Instruction

- Knows curriculum and instruction

---
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Coordinates instructional program
Supervises and evaluates
Monitors student progress

Promotes school climate
Sets standards focusing on achievement
Sets expectations
Protects time and provides orderly atmosphere
Creates productive working environment and promotes instructional improvement and staff development
Cultivates supportive external environment

The Academy developed four strands of participation for participants. Flexibility for administrators was an important consideration relative to varying need and time constraints of participants. Conditions under which professional training were offered included: a neutral setting for learning, maximum diversity of learning experiences, voluntary attendance, and professional recognition. The four strands of participation offered to administrators included: 1) Required—to meet legislative requirements, 2) Selective—to develop or improve a specific skill in a short length of time, 3) Designation—to earn professional recognition, and 4) Clinical—to assess instructional leadership skills as individuals or the climate for instructional leadership in their school buildings or districts.

Summary

A review of the literature indicated that a significantly intensified focus on professional development for individual school
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102 Ibid., 2-7
104 Ibid., 2.
105 Ibid., 3.
principals occurred beginning in the 1980s. The focus initially was on defining the principal as the instructional leader within the school. Professional development efforts concentrated on delineating essential skills and behaviors to bring about effective change positively affecting student performance. An evolution occurred from the initial focus on instructional leadership skills to recent emphases on transformational leadership behaviors.

The array of professional development resources available to principals included mandated state programs, professional organizational institutes and resources, renewed district-level training, principals' centers sponsored by various agencies, and broadened opportunities offered by universities. In many instances various levels of government and professional agencies worked cooperatively to provide optimal opportunities for principal development.

In addition to the increased importance placed on content of programs available to principals, efforts focused on providing more effective strategies and techniques in presenting program information. Increasingly principals were viewed with unique needs of adult learners and responses were defined to address those needs. Repeated studies articulated the critical importance of focusing on human resources as the agents in bringing about change rather than focusing on the programs which were being transformed. The role of the principal changed from one of relative professional isolation to one of increased professional interaction with peers. This support network increased the positive feelings by principals that their efforts were needed, recognized and supported. Ultimately this would affect the schools in which they were the leaders.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the research design and methods used for this study. Sections in this chapter included: Research Questions, Design of the Study, Howell's Study, Population, Instrumentation, Statistical Analysis and Summary.

The research for this study relied on survey research for data collection; both a written survey instrument and structured interview schedule were utilized.

Surveys possessed three characteristics according to Fraenkel and Wallen:

1. Information is collected from a group of people in order to describe some aspects of characteristics ... of the population of which that group is a part.

2. The main way in which the information is collected is through asking questions; the answers to these questions by the members of the group constitute the data of the study.

3. Information is collected from a sample rather than from every member of the population.¹

As stated by Fraenkel and Wallen, "What researchers want to find out is how the members of a population distribute themselves on one or more variables...."²

The field of survey research was highly complex. In discussing the field of sample surveys W. Edwards Deming stated:

Translation of a substantive question into a stimulus (question or test) enables man to inquire of nature and to quantify the result in


²Ibid., 332.
terms of estimates of what the same inquiry would produce were it to cover every unit of the population.³

Research Questions

Three main research questions were addressed with the purpose of investigating the effect of participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy on the professional development of elementary school principals:

1. Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy sessions satisfy the elementary principals' personal needs for professional development?

2. Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy satisfy the elementary principals' need for increasing the level of competency in areas designated important for successful completion of duties?

3. Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy sessions by the elementary principal improve the school's organizational effectiveness?

Design of the Study

This study analyzed the effect of participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy on the professional development of elementary school principals through use of a cross-sectional survey. The study was designed to replicate to a large extent a study conducted by Marilyn A. Howell of secondary school principals.

Data were collected using a two stage process: a mail survey along with a telephone survey. A cover letter (see Appendix A) and a three page questionnaire containing 6 questions on demographic information and 30 questions relating to principals' perceptions of professional development outcomes comprised the mail survey (see Appendix B). A follow-up structured interview schedule of 5 questions was used for a sampling of principals who responded to the written survey instrument (see

Appendix C). Following the collection of data an analysis was made to determine the degree of satisfaction relating to the personal needs, levels of competency, and organizational effectiveness of the professional development process offered by the Illinois Administrators' Academy. Comparisons were made with data from this study for elementary school principals and data for secondary school principals from Howell's study.

**Howell's Study**


**Population**

Elementary school principals from all elementary school districts in Lake County, Illinois, were the subject of this study. Elementary schools in unit districts were excluded for the purposes of this study. One hundred principals were identified for this target population. Any principal who supervised a building or buildings that contained students in pre-kindergarten through grade 8 was considered to be an elementary principal. Written questionnaires were sent to 100 principals; 69 questionnaires (69%) were returned. Responses from 28 of the 30 principals were included in the study.

---
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elementary school districts were received. Sizes of the school districts as measured by student population ranged from a low of 93 to a high of 3,054.

**Instrumentation**

Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection were incorporated into this study. Subjects of the study were asked to complete a written questionnaire. A sampling was selected from the respondents and a telephone interview survey administered to them.

Quantitative data were collected from the mailed questionnaire. Fraenkel and Wallen discussed advantages and disadvantages of mail surveys. One advantage of this type of data collection was that it allowed respondents sufficient time for answers. A disadvantage was that there was less opportunity for encouraging completion or providing assistance.\(^5\)

The collection of qualitative data was expressed by direct quotations from the interview schedule. Merriam pointed out that, "In highly structured interviews, questions and the order in which they are asked are determined ahead of time. The most structured interview is actually an oral form of the written survey."\(^6\)

Kahn and Cannell stated that:

The research interview ... may be defined as a two-person conversation that is initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining information that is relevant to research. Such an interview is focused on content specified by the usual research objective of systematic description, prediction, or explanation.\(^7\)

---


Written Survey Instrument.

The written survey instrument comprised two sections: six questions related to demographic data followed by 30 questions which related to each of the three main research questions posed for this study.

Demographic data. Demographic questions related to 1) student enrollment, 2) grade levels in the school, 3) years as a principal in present position, 4) years as principal in prior positions, 5) highest level of education, and 6) professional development resources. Responses for the thirty questions were rated on a modified Likert scale ranging in value from 4.0 (representing a high level of agreement) to 1.0 (representing a low level of agreement).

Thirty questions. This part of the questionnaire duplicated the questions prepared by Howell for data collection from secondary school principals. Each survey item was designed to correspond to one of the three research question categories. Table 1 listed the questions in the survey designed to focus on the principal’s personal needs in professional development. Workshop topics such as leadership styles and integration of values and attitudes related to this topic.

A second grouping of the questions on the survey instrument related to levels of competency which were increased or enhanced as a result of attendance at Illinois Administrators’ Academy sessions. Workshops directed at supervision and evaluation of staff, Effective Schools Research, budget preparation, and student assessment were examples of this category. See Table 2 for the questions included in the survey addressing this area of professional development.

The third area of professional development addressed in this survey concerned organizational effectiveness. Academy workshop titles such as school climate, school culture, and methods of effective decision-making related to this category. Table 3 presented those questions from the written survey which correlated with this area of concern.
A total of 69 written questionnaires (69%) were returned; 2 of the questionnaires were not usable for this study. The number of questionnaires used for this study was 67, representing 67% of the target population.

Table 1.--Survey items corresponding to personal needs

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

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

7. Communication from the Academy is frequent and informal.

10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.

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

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

19. The Academy is receptive to my suggestions.

22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.

25. The Academy cares about me as a person as well as my professional needs.

28. The Academy provides opportunities to work on challenging tasks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Academy provides the support I need to be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Academy helps me learn how to model creative thinking for staff and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Academy workshops focus on my techniques and my needs for improvement in the supervision of certified personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Academy makes available to me current research findings regarding the learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Academy provides me with inservice on varied instructional methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Academy provides me with workshops on legislation regarding student rights and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Academy provides me with the opportunity to review methods for appropriate budget development and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Academy helps me to identify major functions and characteristics of school public relations programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The Academy helps me in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.--Survey items corresponding to organizational effectiveness

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

6. The Academy provides me with adequate inservice regarding the development and assessment of school climate.

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

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

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

18. The Academy workshops help me to focus on school goals in curriculum development.

21. The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement.

24. The Academy helps me to review fit between curriculum objectives and achievement testing.

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

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

The interview schedule used for the second stage of data collection for this study is represented in Appendix C. The five questions derived from six of the questions used by Howell in her study of secondary school principals. From the 67 principals (67%) who responded to the written survey instrument, 10 principals representing 14.9% of respondents were selected to participate in the interview stage. The 5 principals with the highest degree of satisfaction with the Illinois Administrators' Academy and 5 of the 6 principals with the lowest degree of satisfaction were selected for this second stage of data collection. The interviews were conducted by telephone. Following a brief introductory explanation of the study, the structured interview guide of 5 questions was used with each of the 10 principals.

Statistical Analysis

Written Survey Instrument.

The written questionnaire consisted of data collected in two sections: the 6 questions relating to the demographic data, and the 30 questions relating to the three main research questions.

Demographic data. Of the six questions relating to demographics, four were used for data interpretation. Those used included school enrollments, principals' levels of experience, principals' levels of education and sources of professional development. The question relating to grade levels was not used; it provided responses too complex for meaningful data interpretation. For example, Grade 5 could be represented in responses for grade levels within the school as K-8, 4-5, 4-8, 3-5. The 2 questions relating to the principal's experience (years in present position as a principal and number of years as principal in other schools were combined as one unit to determine experience.

Interpretation of the demographic questions relating to enrollment, education level, and experience was made using the Spearman correlation coefficient rank measured with the mean scores of respondents.
Charles stated that:

The purpose of correlational research is to find corelationships between two or more variables. Such correlations enable us (1) to understand better the conditions and events that we encounter (e.g., what goes with what), and (2) to predict future conditions and events.  

A graphic presentation of data for the professional development question of the demographic section was used to interpret the data.

30 questions. Interpretation of the 30 questions involved determining a mean score for each principal. Responses for each question ranged from 4 (high degree of satisfaction) to 1 (low degree of satisfaction) as expressed in Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Scores of each principal's questionnaire were summed to provide a possible raw score ranging from a high of 120 points (30 questions x 4) to a low of 30 points (30 questions x 1). The total raw score was divided by the total number of questions answered to yield a mean score for each principal.

Each of the 30 questions related to one of three groups of questions about professional development provided by the Illinois Administrators' Academy: personal, competency levels, and organizational effectiveness. Mean scores for each category were determined by summing and averaging raw scores. A comparison of data was made using findings from surveys of elementary school principals in this study and findings as reported by Howell for secondary school principals.

Structured Interview Instrument.

The structured interview instrument yielded answers requiring qualitative analysis. Each principal's responses to the 5 questions were briefly summarized. Similar responses from the total group of principals interviewed were identified and combined. A comparison was made with the data collected from the written survey instrument with data interpreted

---

from the interview schedule. Again, Howell's data for secondary school principals and the data for this study were looked at for comparisons.

**Summary**

Data collection for this study occurred in a two-stage process. The first stage involved a written survey instrument designed to correlate the three main areas of concern addressed by the research questions: personal needs, competency levels, and organizational effectiveness as related to the professional development provided by the Illinois Administrators' Academy.

Elementary school principals from Lake County, Illinois, comprised the target population. Of the 100 principals surveyed, 69 principals (69%) responded to the written questionnaire.

The second stage of data collection comprised telephone surveys of 10 elementary school principals selected from respondents to the written questionnaire. Responses were used to validate and expand the interpretation of the written data.

Data interpretation involved both quantitative and qualitative data. Procedures utilized for organizing and interpreting quantitative data involved calculation of mean scores of individual respondents for the 30 questions as answered using a Likert scale. Scores were ranked and grouped for interpretation. A Spearman correlation coefficient rank was used to interpret data from the 30 questions with the demographic data.

Quantitative data was represented by verbal responses given by respondents to a structured interview schedule administered by telephone. Results from this survey were compared with responses from the written survey.

An overall comparison was made for elementary school principals from this study with data collected by Howell from secondary school principals.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The major purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which elementary school principals assessed the effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators' Academy. Responses from 67 principals to the written survey instrument and responses from 10 principals to the structured interview schedule provided the basis for presentation and analysis of data.

The three main research questions to be answered using the data were: 1) Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy sessions satisfy the elementary principals' personal needs for professional development? 2) Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy satisfy the elementary principals' need for increasing the level of competency in areas designated important for completion of duties? 3) Did participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy sessions by the elementary principals improve the schools' organizational effectiveness?

Tables were constructed to present data from the questionnaire representing both demographic information and survey items. Raw scores, mean scores and frequencies of grouped scores were used in analyzing data.

Interview data were presented as summarized group responses to each of the five questions followed by supporting quotes from individual principals. Comparisons were made of both groups of questionnaire and interview data.

One hundred elementary school principals in elementary districts in Lake County were asked to complete the thirty item questionnaire along with the six demographic questions included in the survey. These
statements were designed to relate the effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators' Academy workshops to the professional development need of the principals. The thirty statements were divided into three groups to directly relate to the three research questions designed for this study. Demographic data related to school enrollment, years of experience as a principal, level of education of the principal, and additional sources of professional development for the principal.

Sixty-nine principals (69%) responded to the questionnaire of the one hundred surveyed; sixty-seven questionnaires (67%) were completed and these provided the basis of data presentation used for the study.

**Questionnaire Demographic Data**

Principals from 38 of the 40 elementary school districts in Lake County were represented in responses to the written survey. Student enrollments in principals' schools ranged from a low of 90 to a high of 859. Principals' levels of experience as a principal ranged from first year to more than 31 years. The level of higher education attained by principals was represented in all three of the categories surveyed: Master's, CAS, and Doctorate. Responses to the professional development sources utilized by the principals indicated that all four categories (professional literature, in-district inservices, professional organizations, and professional conferences) were important in varying degrees. A few responses were specified for the Other category in this question.

**Enrollment**

The size of student populations in the elementary schools represented ranged from 90 students to 859 students. The largest group of respondents, 34 schools ranging from 250 - 499 enrollment, was represented by slightly more than one-half (50.7%) of the total 67 schools. The second largest number of schools came from the 500 - 749 grouping: 20
schools (29.9%). Only 3 schools were represented in the 750 or more grouping providing 4.5% of the sampling. See Table 4.

Table 4.--School enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student enrollment</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 249</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 499</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 749</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience

Responses to the two questions relating to experience as a principal were combined to provide one number as the basis for analysis. The largest segment representing 18 of the 67 principals (26.9%) had 0 - 3 years of experience; this indicated that approximately 1 out of 4 principals was relatively new to this position. Approximately two-thirds of the group, 44 principals (65.7%), had 10 years or less in the position of principal. The smallest number of principals, 5 (7.5%), fell in the mid-range of 11 - 15 years of experience. See Table 5.

Table 5.--Principals' experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as principal</th>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education

Of the three categories designated for higher education, two-thirds of the principals, 44 (65.7%), were in the Master's level as the highest level of education earned. Only 4 principals (6.0%) had earned a doctorate. Slightly more than one-fourth of all principals, 19 (28.3%), indicated earning a CAS degree. The State of Illinois required that principals acquire an Administrative Certificate for placement as a principal. These certificates were issued with a minimum requirement of a Master's degree, thus assuring that all principals had attained at least this level of higher education. See Table 6 below.

Table 6.-- Principals' education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree in Higher Education</th>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Development

Principals were asked to rate each of four areas of professional development as to usefulness for each individual. The ratings for responses were Very Much, Much, Little, Not at all. It should be noted that it was possible for each principal to select all four of the categories as Very Much or any combination designated as reflective of the individual principals perceptions.

In-district inservices. As indicated in Table 7, 30 of the 65 principals (46.2%) rated in-district inservices as of little use as a source of professional development. Only 10 of those 65 principals (15.4%) felt that in-district inservices were very important to their professional development.
Professional literature. Sixty-two of the 67 principals rated this as either very important or of much importance. No principal rated this category of professional development as Not at all. This was the highest rated category for professional development.

Professional conferences. This category ranked second to professional literature in importance. Fifty-six of the 67 principals (83.6%) rated this as either very important or of much importance.

University-level courses. In the category of university level-courses, the largest group of respondents, 24 principals (36%), indicated that these were of little importance. The largest number of respondents in the Not at all rating also appeared in this group, 6 principals (9.2%). University coursework was important to 35 principals out of 65 (53.8%) compared to not important for 30 principals out of 65 (46.2%).

Other. The responses for the category Other indicated that 4 out of the 8 responses pointed to peers as a very important source of professional development; the 2 responses in Very Much also specified peers as important. Six of the 10 principals responding to this category indicated that peer interaction was important or very important as a resource for professional development. The remaining 4 principals for the Very Much rating were divided into 3 principals who cited ESC seminars and 1 principal who cited audio-visual tapes. See Table 7.

Table 7.--Total scores professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>In-dist. Inservices</th>
<th>Prof. Lit.</th>
<th>Prof. Conf.</th>
<th>University Level-courses</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much (80)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much (107)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little (69)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional development mean score groupings. Table 8 presented the demographic data in a format which correlates the responses for each of the four categories of professional development (in-district inservices, professional literature, professional conferences, and university level-courses) with the total response ratings as measured by mean scores of the principals.

Table 8.--Responses to professional development (except the category other)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>In-dist. Inservices</th>
<th>Prof. Liter.</th>
<th>Prof. Conf.</th>
<th>University-Level-courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(V=Very much   M=Much   L=Little   N=Not at all)

The single principal in the Strongly Agree rating relied very much on professional literature and conferences, but not at all on in-district inservices.

The largest grouping of principals appeared in the Agree rating. Of the 42 principals, 39 principals selected professional literature as
either Very Much or Much in importance to their professional development. The second largest number selected professional conferences, 34 principals of the 42 principals. Twenty-two principals of the 42 principals chose university-level coursework as either Little or Not at all important for their professional development. Eighteen principals cited in-district inservices as of little importance.

Of the 23 principals whose mean scores placed them in the Disagree rating, 21 principals selected professional literature and 20 principals selected professional conferences as of Very Much and Much importance. Twelve principals of the 23 indicated that in-district inservices were of little importance to their professional development. Eight principals selected Little or Not at all as responses for university-level coursework.

One principal's mean score indicated placement in the Strongly Disagree rating. That principal selected professional literature and professional conferences as very important; in-district inservices was next in importance as indicated by Much.

Table 9 presented data for the Other category in the professional development section of demographic information. Six of the 10 responses were from principals whose mean scores placed them in the Agree rating. Peers were the most important source of professional development cited with 3 of the 6 responses. Of those principals whose mean scores placed them in the Disagree rating, 3 principals pointed to peers as very important.

**Questionnaire Survey Data**

**Mean Scores**

The questionnaire was designed to elicit responses from elementary school principals regarding individual perceptions concerning professional development satisfaction and the Illinois Administrators' Academy. Each item on the written survey required one response selected from Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.
Table 9.--Responses to professional development, category other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Other, including comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1--peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1--audio-visual tapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2--ESC seminars,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including Principal's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2--peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>3--peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1--ESC seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>3--peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50-2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1--ESC seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(V=Very much  M=Much  L=Little  N=Not at all)

Responses to the thirty questions provided data for raw scores with 120 points at the highest possible level of agreement with the statements (30 questions x 4) to 30 points at the lowest possible level of agreement with the statements (30 questions x 1). Mean scores were assigned with Strongly Agree ranging from 3.50 - 4.0, Agree ranging from 2.50 - 3.49, Disagree ranging from 1.50 - 2.49, and Strongly Disagree ranging from 1.00 - 1.49. The mean scores were used to indicate placement in one of the four categories. See Table 10.
Table 10.--Mean scores of individual respondents (N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of response</th>
<th>Mean score of questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Total by category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.50-4.00)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.50-3.49)</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.50-2.49)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.00-1.49)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 1 principal (1.5%) provided a mean score for placement in the Strongly Agree category. The largest category was represented by those whose mean scores placed them in the Agree category, 42 principals (62.7%). The second largest category of responses was that of Disagree, 23 principals (34.3%). One principal (1.5%) had a mean score which indicated placement in the Strongly Disagree rating.

Strongly Agree and Agree ratings were combined to indicate a general agreement that professional development through the Illinois Administrators’ Academy was positive. Disagree and Strongly Disagree ratings were combined to indicate a general disagreement that professional development through the Academy was negative.

With these criteria 43 principals (64.2%) indicated positive perceptions of the training provided by the Illinois Administrators’ Academy. This represented almost two-thirds of the total number of principals responding to the survey. By contrast 24 principals (35.8%), or slightly more than one-third of the total number of principals responding to the survey, indicated negative perceptions of the training provided by the Illinois Administrators’ Academy. See Table 11.

Table 11.--Grouped mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of response</th>
<th>Mean score of questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Total by category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3.50 - 4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.50 - 3.49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.50 - 2.49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficient.

The following three tables, Tables 12, 13, and 14, utilized individual respondents' mean scores and principals' rankings for
enrollment, experience, and education. The Spearman correlation coefficient rank was selected to interpret correlations between these rankings. Variables in this study could be ranked but could not be assigned numerical values on an absolute scale. This system provided an ordering but not an interval scale and was referred to as ordinal measurement. When testing for a correlation between two measurable characteristics, it was important not to assign causality to the correlation; this might or might not be the reason for a correlation. The Spearman used rankings only. Each of the following three tables had a standard error of $r$ of 0.12315. For the .05 level of confidence the $r$ must have been greater than .2413.

Table 12 presented data based on principals' school enrollments ranked with the level of agreement as expressed in principals' mean scores. The Spearman for enrollment was computed at 0.0730. This was too low to suggest a correlation between the school enrollment of the principal and the level of agreement with the Illinois Administrators' Academy.

Table 13 presented data based on principals' experience ranked with the level of agreement as expressed in principals' mean scores. The Spearman for experience was computed at a negative 0.2041912. It should be noted that a positive or negative number had the same significance with the exception that the rankings were correlated in reverse order. As in the data for enrollments, this number also was too low to suggest a significant correlation between a principal's experience and the level of agreement with the Illinois Administrators' Academy.
Table 12.--School enrollment frequency scores  
(N = 67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories/mean score</th>
<th>0-249(%)</th>
<th>250-499(%)</th>
<th>500-749(%)</th>
<th>750+(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>1(1.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-3.49</td>
<td>5(7.5%)</td>
<td>24(35.8%)</td>
<td>12(17.9%)</td>
<td>1(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50-2.49</td>
<td>5(7.5%)</td>
<td>10(14.9%)</td>
<td>7(10.4%)</td>
<td>1(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10(15%)</td>
<td>34(50.7%)</td>
<td>20(29.8%)</td>
<td>3(4.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient

\[ r = 1 - \frac{6Ed^2}{n(n^2-1)} \]

\[ r = 0.073007 \]
Table 13.—Principals’ experience frequency scores  
(N = 67 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories/mean score</th>
<th>0-3(%)</th>
<th>4-6(%)</th>
<th>7-10(%)</th>
<th>11-15(%)</th>
<th>16-20(%)</th>
<th>21+(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-3.49</td>
<td>12(17.9)</td>
<td>7(10.4)</td>
<td>7(10.5)</td>
<td>3(4.5)</td>
<td>5(7.5)</td>
<td>8(11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50-2.49</td>
<td>7(10.4)</td>
<td>6(8.9)</td>
<td>4(6.0)</td>
<td>2(3.0)</td>
<td>3(4.5)</td>
<td>1(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td>1(1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20(29.8)</td>
<td>13(19.3)</td>
<td>12(18.0)</td>
<td>5(7.5)</td>
<td>8(12.0)</td>
<td>9(13.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient

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

\[ r = -0.2041912 \]
Table 14 presented data based on principals' education ranked with the level of agreement as expressed in principals' mean scores. The Spearman for education was computed at 0.7118535. This suggested that there might exist a meaningful correlation of data; further investigation would be necessary to look at cause and effect.

Table 14.--Principals' education frequency scores (N = 67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories/mean score</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>CAS</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-3.49</td>
<td>28 (41.7%)</td>
<td>13 (19.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50-2.49</td>
<td>15 (22.4%)</td>
<td>6 (9.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (65.6%)</td>
<td>19 (28.4%)</td>
<td>4 (6.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient

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

\[ r = 0.7118535 \]

**Item Responses by Category**

The written survey instrument was designed to allocate ten questions to each of the three categories addressed by the three research questions. Questions in the first category related principals' perceptions of professional development in the area of satisfying personal needs. Questions in the second category pertained to increasing the
competency levels of the principals through the professional development workshops of the Illinois Administrators' Academy. The third grouping of questions addressed the category of organizational effectiveness.

**Personal needs.** Of the total 658 responses in this category to the 10 questions addressing personal needs, more than one-half of the responses (54.5%) were in the Agree rating. The smallest response (6.8%) was in the Strongly Disagree rating.

When the Strongly Agree and Agree responses were summed, 411 of the 658 responses (62.5%) indicated at least general agreement with the professional development of the Illinois Administrators' Academy workshops as they related to principals' personal needs. This represented nearly two-thirds of total responses as favorable. Those principals indicating negative responses represented 247 of the 658 total responses for this category or approximately one-third (37.5%) of the total responses.

Each statement in this category was represented by a minimum of one response for each rating of Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The statement most strongly agreed with was #22 with 12 responses in the Strongly Agree rating. In the Agree rating statements #22, #1, and #16 were supported most strongly.

Statement #10 emerged as the statement most respondents reported in the Disagree rating; in the Strongly Disagree rating statement #10 elicited 13 responses. Statement #10 was the most selected statement to be disagreed with totalling 50 responses in the two ratings.

Listed below were the most agreed with and most disagreed with statements for the personal needs category of responses.

**Agreed with:**

#22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.

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

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

#10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.

See Table 15.

Table 15.--Response distribution for personal needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Response</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#10</th>
<th>#13</th>
<th>#16</th>
<th>#19</th>
<th>#22</th>
<th>#25</th>
<th>#28</th>
<th>Total(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>358 (54.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>202 (30.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 658 (100%)

Levels of competency. The second grouping of statements related to increasing the levels of competency for principals. There was a total of 663 responses for this category. The largest number of responses (53.3%) appeared in the Agree rating. Of the total responses for the category, 407 of the 663 responses (61.4%) were in the Strongly Agree and Agree ratings.

Of the 663 responses 222 appeared in the Disagree rating. A combined total of 256 responses of the 663 responses (38.6%) were in Disagree or Strongly Disagree ratings.

In this category for competency levels there were two statements, #23 and #26, in the Strongly Agree with 0 responses. Two statements, #5 and #17, provided 0 responses in the Strongly Disagree rating. Statement #17 elicited the strongest positive response with 53 Agree ratings and 8 Strongly Agree ratings for a total of 61 responses. Statements #5 with 59
responses and #11 with 58 responses for the combined agree rating were also highly ranked.

Item #23 was disagreed with by 44 respondents. This was also the statement most disagreed with in combining the Disagree and Strongly Disagree ratings, 51 negative responses.

Listed below were the statements most agreed and disagreed with in this category.

Agreed with:

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

#5. The Academy successfully synthesized mandates and requirements for proper implementation.

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

Disagreed with:

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

See Table 16.

Organizational effectiveness. Responses in the third category of statements indicated a slightly lesser degree of agreement with the professional preparation in the area of organizational effectiveness. The largest segment of responses appeared in the Agree rating with 320 of the 664 responses (48.2%) for the category. The combined total number for Strongly Agree and Agree responses indicated that 370 of the 664 responses (55.2%) demonstrated a general agreement with the statements. The smallest number of responses, 32 of the 664 responses (4.8%), appeared in the Strongly Disagree rating.

Item #27 received the strongest response from 44 principals in the Agree rating. Statement #27 also indicated the highest combined total
Table 16.--Response distribution for competency levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Response</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#14</th>
<th>#17</th>
<th>#20</th>
<th>#23</th>
<th>#26</th>
<th>#29</th>
<th>Total(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>353 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>222 (33.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>663 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or responses for Agree and Strongly Agree ratings with 51 total responses. Items #12 and #6 were close in combined total responses with 49 and 47 respectively.

Forty of the responses appeared in the Disagree rating for statement #21. More principals disagreed with #3 when the Disagree and Strongly Disagree ratings were combined: #3 totals 45 responses and #21 totals 42 responses.

The following statements were the most agreed and disagreed with in the category of organizational effectiveness.

Agreed with:

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

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

#6. The Academy provides me with adequate inservice regarding the development and assessment of school climate.
Disagreed with:

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

#21. The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement.

See Table 17.

Table 17.--Response distribution for organizational effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Response</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#12</th>
<th>#15</th>
<th>#18</th>
<th>#21</th>
<th>#24</th>
<th>#27</th>
<th>#30</th>
<th>Total(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>320 (48.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>262 (39.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>664 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary/High School Comparisons

The section of the written survey instrument containing the thirty questions used for this study was originally used for a study of secondary school principals by Marilyn A. Howell. Thus a basis for a comparison of data existed for elementary school principals from the present study with data from Howell's study of secondary principals.

There was a significant difference in perceptions of the Illinois Administrators' Academy between the two groups of principals. The combined number of Strongly Agree and Agree responses of elementary principals was 43 principals (64.2%) from a total of 67 principals. The
combined number of secondary principals in agreement was 27 principals (35.5%) from a total group of 76 principals.¹

An examination of data concerning disagreement with the Illinois Administrators' Academy showed that 49 secondary school principals (64.5%) were in this category. Of the elementary school principals 24 (35.8%) were in disagreement.²

Howell's data collection occurred in December, 1988, three years following implementation of the legislatively mandated Illinois Administrators' Academy workshops. The difference in time of data collection between secondary school principals and elementary school principals was three years. This time difference might have been a factor in the differing perceptions of the two groups of respondents. Three years ideally would have permitted time for adjustment of workshops to administrators' needs and development of programs with effective presentations. See Table 18.

See Table 19 for data comparison of personal needs. Nearly two-thirds of responses (62.5%) for elementary school principals were in agreement that personal needs were met by the Illinois Administrators' Academy; slightly more than one-third of responses (37.5%) were in disagreement. Secondary school principals' responses were nearly evenly matched in this category: 48.4% in agreement and 51.6% in disagreement.³

Data for competency levels was reversed for the two groups of principals. Elementary school principals provided data indicating 61.4% agreement; secondary school principals provided data indicating 60.2% disagreement. See Table 20.⁴

¹Howell, Perceived Effectiveness, 99.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., 107.
⁴Ibid., 109.
Table 18.—Elementary/high school comparison of personal needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of response</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Strongly agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 658 100.0% 760 100.0%

Table 19.—Elementary/high school comparison of competency levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of response</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Strongly agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 663 100.0% 760 100.0%
Table 20.--Elementary/high school comparison of organizational effectiveness

| Rating of response | Elementary | | | | High School | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                    | Number of responses | % of total | Number of responses | % of total |
| Strongly agree 4   | 50         | 7.5%       | 31               | 4.1%       |
| Agree 3            | 320        | 48.2%      | 239              | 31.4%      |
| Disagree 2         | 262        | 39.5%      | 376              | 49.5%      |
| Strongly disagree 1| 32         | 4.8%       | 114              | 15.0%      |
| Total              | 664        | 100.0%     | 760              | 100.0%     |

Table 21.--Overall elementary/high school comparison

| Rating of response | Elementary | | | | High School | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                    | Number of principals | % of total | Number of principals | % of total |
| Strongly agree 4   | 1          | 1.5%       | 0                | 0.0%       |
| Agree 3            | 42         | 62.7%      | 27               | 35.5%      |
| Disagree 2         | 23         | 34.3%      | 42               | 55.3%      |
| Strongly disagree 1| 1          | 1.5%       | 7                | 9.2%       |
| Total              | 67         | 100.0%     | 76               | 100.0%     |
Data comparing organizational effectiveness in Table 21 showed that 55.7% of the elementary school principals' responses agreed that the Illinois Administrators' Academy had a positive effect. Only 35.5% of secondary school principals' responses indicated agreement. Responses indicating disagreement were 44.3% of elementary and 64.5% of secondary.\textsuperscript{5}

**Interview Data**

Written surveys from sixty-seven (67%) of the principals who were surveyed were used for this study. From those respondents a total of ten (10%) were administered a structured interview schedule by telephone.

The follow-up interview was designed to elicit responses which would expand the understanding of responses to the written survey. Oral responses allowed for more defined answers than the Likert scale response rating used with the written survey. The interviews were used to validate data collected in the written portion of the study and to allow respondents to add comments relating to the Academy which were not formally asked.

Table 22 presented a profile of the principals interviewed as determined by the total mean scores collected from the written survey. An attempt was made to interview the highest five and the lowest five principals as determined by total mean scores. This was not possible due to non-availability of principals within the timeframe needed to complete the interviews. As a result the next available principal was selected.

Each principal interviewed was asked five specific questions related to the purposes of this study. Respondents interpreted the questions as to meaning on an individual basis. Responses to the structured interview schedule were reported in two ways. The first reporting of the data summarized individual responses into a group response reflecting a comparison and synthesis of data for each question.

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., 111.
Table 22.--Principals interviewed with mean scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Interviewed</th>
<th>Total mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second presentation of data listed individual quotes from respondents which were used in the comparison and analysis for the summary response.

Following were the five interview questions with summary and individual quotes.

**Interview Question #1**

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

**Summary response.**

The area of personal needs of professional development addressed topics related to leadership style, rapport between the Academy and the principal, adequate time within workshops to complete tasks, and the opportunity for active participation within the Academy structure itself and workshops. This was the only question presenting ambiguity to a few respondents regarding the interpretation of personal needs.

Increased confidence in job performance was cited by three principals as a perceived benefit of workshops. Exposure to new programs
and skills were important to two respondents. Only one principal's reaction to this question was completely negative; the response indicated that the only motivation to attend sessions was the requirement by the State of Illinois.

Supporting quotes.

This is one of the few sets of workshops aimed specifically at administrators.

I feel that the whole point of professional development and taking courses is to do it from a love of learning. We are in a learning environment, and it is important for all levels of staff to be learning.

My confidence in acquiring new skills for clinical supervision and evaluation increased in working with faculty members.

I attended two staff evaluation workshops which were very good. Another workshop on long range planning was very helpful.

Providing information, skills and training have helped me tremendously with self-confidence in working with my staff. Being exposed to national presenters has been valuable.

It increased my feeling of confidence in the approaches I was taking to administration. "How common a practice is this?" Interaction with peers gave me confidence that the approaches were what was being done in other schools.

I have attended 4 or 5 workshops. Only half were valuable. Management By Walking Around was good. It was something I already believed in and used but it still advanced my knowledge.

It didn't. I am in a doctoral program now and that is where I get personal needs met. The Academy is a hoop I jump through. It is not a growth opportunity.

It exposed me to new programs and allowed me to explore more topics.
Interview Question #2

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

Summary response.

Within the competency level area of professional development were topics such as supervision techniques, inservices on instructional methods, selection and evaluation of instructional materials, and discussions on implementation of mandates and requirements.

Networking, hands on experience, an increase in knowledge and acquisition of new skills were important benefits to many of the respondents. Workshops on observation, evaluation, and remediation of teachers were noted as being especially helpful, although one respondent indicated that this was redundant.

Supporting quotes.

That depends on the workshops I took. The extended workshops were the most valuable. They addressed leadership skills and school restructuring.

It helped in two ways. The first was through networking. I took two courses on remediation, for example. I was familiar with the procedure outlined in the School Code, the law, and the concept. Talking with others helped pull it all together. Hearing their problems and solutions was very helpful to me. The second way was with the materials I received. For example I attended sessions on REI and was given bibliographies, lists of contact persons, and other materials which I thought were very valuable.

The workshops have been especially helpful in the evaluation of teachers, including a broader understanding of the instructional process. It has made me a more effective participant in the classroom process and in conferencing with teachers. The remediation workshop was particularly
helpful when I found the need to activate those procedures within my school.

The workshops increased my knowledge base on setting goals and helping staff in their professional development.

Workshops gave me many new skills which were valuable for me in my position as principal. Especially helpful were hands-on applications of newly acquired skills. This training was important in helping me accomplish required tasks within my position.

It provided a background and basis for implementing programs and policies. Interaction with practicing administrators was helpful. New approaches in administration were helpful.

The Academy probably reacquainted me with things I already knew; it encouraged me to practice things I already knew, but it gave me new insight into those things. Collaboration with other administrators was also stimulating.

Not a whole lot. One workshop that was helpful was on learning styles. Workshops on supervision and evaluation have been very redundant and have presented material I was already exposed to.

Teacher Observation and Writing Across the Curriculum were very useful workshops which helped me.

Interview Question #3

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

Summary response.

Academy workshops within the area of organizational effectiveness addressed school climate, school culture, school/community communication, needs assessment and the team management process.

A diversity of positive gains emerged from this interview question. The strongest negative response occurred here. Four of the
respondents indicated that neither new nor helpful ideas were presented. Positive responses were noted for simulated situations, staff development and the state student-testing program.

Supporting quotes.

The SIP (School Improvement Process) workshop specifically addressed the needs to move a school forward. Another workshop involved a retreat and addressed planning and what to do to move forward. I liked the goal-setting session which involved staff in site-based management. It definitely had an impact on my school.

It depends on the course. Workshops on assertive discipline, staff development, and assessment of staff were important to me. The workshop on peer coaching helped me plan staff development for my staff. I am not sure that it did help in implementing new or different strategies.

Several workshops were helpful in understanding the state-mandated testing of students each year. It helped our district and myself develop strategies for staff development regarding the testing of students.

The training and practice in simulated situations aided me greatly. Support beyond the workshops was important. For example follow-up telephone assistance provided me with needed advice and support which was very helpful. The materials and resources were of great assistance with new programs.

They helped in two ways. First, the handouts were helpful as a basis for something that was a sample of what was done successfully and could be used as described or modified. Second, they increased my confidence level that what I was doing was good practice.

They did not directly help me. They exposed me to new ideas but left up to me how to implement them when I went back to my school. This is a weakness of the Academy.
It didn't. At best it reinforced what I already knew, but did not present anything new.

I don't recall anything really specific. By providing knowledge of programs and how to implement them.

**Interview Question #4**

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

**Summary response.**

The legislated mandate in 1985 specified that the Illinois Administrators' Academy develop programs in four skill areas: instructional staff development, effective communication skills, public school relations, and evaluation of personnel. Perceptions of this purpose differed in degree from that stated purpose.

Several respondents cited the requirement for attendance by the State of Illinois as the original purpose of the Academy. Many principals indicated that the purpose had expanded beyond that to introduce new programs and understanding of policies and practices within the field of education.

**Supporting quotes.**

To keep school administrators apprised of the direction in which education is moving. It helps expand understanding and solving of current school problems. Education is changing because society is changing. The purpose is to keep administrators in line with what is changing: REI, site-based management, and so on.

The original purpose was to assure that principals went to school; accountability of principals was an important factor. Now the purpose is continuing education. The Academy offers courses right on the edge of what is new. They do great surveys on needs and have very good speakers. One of the best workshops I attended was one in which I took my staff with me. The workshop was on the School Continuous Improvement Plan. The Academy scored a lengthy questionnaire we completed about our
school and we analyzed it and set goals and objectives. We had a great professional discussion with them, very in-depth and useful. Another area new to me was evaluation of non-certified staff; again the Academy was an invaluable resource.

The Code required attendance for those evaluating teachers. It was designed to help administrators be more competent in their jobs. It has gone beyond that by making many programs available and helping us grow professionally.

The purpose is to make local districts aware of changes affecting schools made at the state level. It helps train administrators to meet the demands of those changes. It brings an awareness of change and helps create understanding of those changes. It provides a chance to raise questions about our concerns.

The purpose is to help me keep current on supervision skills and evaluation of teachers. An optional purpose is to keep me well-informed on current educational issues and to provide me with needed materials and resources.

Unfortunately to set up state certification for administrators. Professional growth for administrators has developed from that.

To keep principals current and the level of proficiency high. Recurrent training is present in other professions and we do need it. After a number of years in the same position, things can get awfully stale.

I feel it is a requirement from the state to keep administrative skills current.

To increase knowledge and skills of the professional principal.

Interview Question #5

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

Sensitivity to the scheduling of programs to provide variation in available times was important to principals. Flexibility, variation of presenters, and adequate attention to the need for practical applications were expressed requests for change in Academy practices.

Supporting quotes.

It is moving in the direction I want. They have expanded options. Not every workshop counts for the biennial requirement. They regularly ask administrators what is wanted. They need to be responsive to administrators.

I honestly cannot think of anything to improve it. They give surveys on needs, brochures listing courses well in advance to allow for planning, reminders on courses, and they provide in-school workshops.

I tried to register for two workshops and they were both filled. I am not sure if the Academy tries to determine if there is a need to reschedule workshops which are filled. I have been generally very pleased with presenters and facilities. Our district chose not to be a comprehensive full member of the Academy. As a result we were charged double the amount for workshops that both I and my assistant principal were required to attend by the state. There should be some consideration within the legislative process for payment of state-mandated programs.

The Academy has summer sessions lasting one week in length; these are offered the same two weeks each year. I would suggest that the time be staggered throughout the summer from year to year to that I could attend a session.

The Academy is exemplary. I can only suggest that they continue with what they are doing. We have good consultants, frequent mailings, varying locations for workshops. It would be terrifying to think that resource would not be there.
Vary workshops presenters. There is a tendency to fall back on the same individuals; after several sessions there needs to be different presenters.

There is an area of weakness in practical applications. The sessions inspire one, but if it does not fit into my situation, it won’t happen. It is one-shot learning at the workshop and then magically it is supposed to happen in the school setting. There is something missing—it leaves it up to the principal to make it happen. The stages of development the principal has moved up to are not taken into account. There needs to be more follow-up in implementation of these programs.

One recommendation I would make is to have flexibility as part of the Academy. We should be able to demonstrate our competency in other ways: other staff development activities, coursework, readings. There should also be flexibility within the Academy so that there is something besides just workshops available.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the professional development provided by the Illinois Administrators’ Academy as perceived by elementary school principals. Professional development for the purposes of this study was subdivided into three broad categorical areas: personal needs, competency levels, and organizational effectiveness. Demographic data were gathered in order to enhance the understanding of responses provided by the group of elementary principals.

Analysis of the data indicated that a majority of principals perceived that the Illinois Administrators’ Academy was effective in providing professional development opportunities. From the total of 67 principals whose responses were used for this study, 43 principals representing 64.2% of the total, agreed with this assessment.
Demographic profile

The largest single groups in each of the three demographic categories were: 50.7% of principals represented in the 250 - 499 enrollment category, 26.9% of principals in the 0 - 3 years experience category, and 65.7% of principals in the Master's degree as highest level of education category. This presented a profile of the average elementary principal respondent as a relatively new principal in a relatively small school with a Master's degree.

Professional development

The Illinois Administrators' Academy was not included as a choice in this category. Possible selections included: in-district inservices, professional literature, professional conferences, university-level courses, and Other (to be specified by the respondent). The following percentages of agreement derived from a combination of answers to the Very Much and Much ratings for each category.

This group of elementary principals indicated that the use of professional literature was the most highly rated of the four groups as a source of professional development; 92.5% selected this category. The second most highly rated source was that of professional conferences; 83.6% rated this as important.

The next two categories, university-level coursework and in-district inservices were closely rated by the elementary principals: 53.9% for coursework and 52.3% for in-district inservices. The single most important source in the category Other was that of peers, represented by 6 of the 10 favorable responses.

Literature as a source of professional development would be readily available at a reasonably low cost. A great degree of flexibility would exist as to when and where it was used. The broad range of subject coverage would assure that it would touch upon the needs of most individuals.
Professional conferences would have provided a broad range of topics available to principals and a reasonable degree of flexibility for accessibility both in time and location. Although the cost generally would be significantly higher than that of professional literature, many school districts would have furnished a portion or all of the cost incurred. Professional conferences would have provided the aspect of peer interaction, thus adding to its positive characteristics.

University-level coursework would require a significant level of commitment in time and effort. The cost incurred for coursework could be a deterrent, although many school districts might have provided for a portion of all of the costs involved. There would have been an added incentive in almost all school districts of placement in a higher salary lane upon completion of a specified number of coursework hours.

In-district inservices would vary considerably in breadth and quality. Smaller districts would be at a disadvantage with lack of staff and smaller budgets for planning. Principals in larger districts might have a different perspective for those reasons. This was the only category not evenly available to all of the principals responding.

In the category Other peer interaction was selected as the most important source of professional development. This item might have been selected by more principals if it had been expressly stated as a choice.

Item response by category

There were three categories identified within professional development by the Illinois Administrators' Academy for investigation. The elementary school principals' responses indicated general agreement with the sum total or responses of these groups: 43 principals representing 64.2% of respondents expressed agreement. A positive degree of correlation existed between the level of principals' leadership education and the degree of satisfaction with the offerings of the Illinois Administrators' Academy.
An examination of each of the three areas within the total grouping of questions represented on the survey shows that the personal category exhibited the greatest degree of agreement. A total of 62.5% of the responses in this category were rated as Strongly Agree or Agree.

Closely behind the highest rated category came that of competency levels. A total of 61.4% of the responses in this category were rated in agreement. The lowest of the three categories still was rated in agreement: organizational effectiveness with 55.2% of the responses in agreement.

Table 23 presented the questions most agreed with in all three of the categories investigated. The Academy workshops provided active participation and good rapport for administrators. Areas of strength included support in instructional methods, supervision, staff development activities and assistance with mandates and requirements.

Table 23. Statements agreed with by elementary principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>17. The Academy provides me with inservice on varied instructional methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5. The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>11. The Academy workshops focus on my techniques and my needs for improvement in the supervision of certified personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>16. The Academy maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1. The Academy provides the support I need to be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>27. The Academy trains me in staff development activities such as needs assessment, formulation and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 presented questions disagreed with by elementary school principals. Elementary principals felt excluded from the process of input into the Academy's planning. The areas of budget preparation and school/community communication were not addressed adequately.

Table 24. Questions disagreed with by elementary school principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>23. The Academy provides me with the opportunity to review methods for appropriate budget development and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3. The Academy asks me to fill out a professional needs assessment survey on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>21. The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary/secondary comparison

The overall perceptions of elementary principals and secondary principals were opposite. Elementary principals agreed that the Illinois Administrators' Academy was effective in providing professional development for their needs; high school principals did not agree that the Academy was effective in meeting their needs for professional development.

Data for each group of principals indicated that both elementary and high school perceived personal needs to be most effectively met: 62.5% elementary and 48.4% secondary expressed this. The second ranked category of professional development of competency levels was rated in agreement by 61.4% of elementary principals and 39.8% of high school principals. The lowest ranked category by both groups was that of organizational effectiveness: 55.7% elementary and 35.5% of high school principals were in agreement with this group of questions.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The data collected in this study supported a positive perception by elementary school principals in Lake County, Illinois, that the Illinois Administrators' Academy provided them with effective professional development. For the purposes of this research professional development was divided into three areas: personal needs, competency levels, and organizational effectiveness.

The state mandate to implement a program of training for school administrators in Illinois to be effective January 1, 1986, provided a focus for professional development on a statewide level. Whereas efforts had been made prior to the mandate within various districts and by individual principals, the state hoped to assure that a high level of professional development would be achieved by all administrators. It was assumed that these efforts would affect the school children in Illinois in a positive way.

A review of the literature indicated that Illinois was not the only state with a focus on professional training. Several states were the principal advocates in providing programs. National professional organizations and universities were also key players in this transformation of administrators. Numerous studies were conducted to assess these diverse efforts. The focus of the research ranged from program content, to effective teaching techniques for administrators as adult learners, to the array of professional developments available to administrators.
The specific research objectives of this study were:

1. To determine if participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy satisfied personal needs for professional development,
2. To determine if participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy increased the level of competency as part of the principals' professional development, and
3. To determine if participation in the Illinois Administrators' Academy improved the organizational effectiveness within the schools.

In order to determine the perceptions of elementary school principals relative to these three purposes, a two-stage data collection process was undertaken. The first stage collected data in responses from a written survey instrument consisting of demographic data and thirty questions related to the stated purposes. The second stage of data collection involved using a structured interview instrument of five questions related to the stated purposes. The second stage of data collection involved using a structured interview instrument of five questions administered by telephone to a sampling of respondents to the written survey. One hundred elementary school principals in Lake County, Illinois, were surveyed; sixty-nine principals (69%) responded, and sixty-seven surveys (67%) were usable for the purposes of this study.

Data interpretation from the written survey instrument was accomplished by calculating mean scores for individual principals both for each of the three categories of professional development and for the total of the categories. These mean scores were grouped into four rankings of Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

Data interpretation of the structured interview schedule was accomplished through compilation of individual responses to each of five questions. Comparison and analysis of responses provided the basis for a summary interpretation of responses to each question. Interview data validated and expanded interpretation of the written survey data.
Findings from these data were used to provide the basis for conclusions, recommendations for action and recommendations for further study.

Conclusions

The findings of this study did indicate positive perceptions of professional development offered by the Illinois Administrators' Academy as viewed by elementary school principals in Lake County, Illinois. Three areas of professional development were identified for study: personal, competency levels, and organizational effectiveness.

Specific conclusions were made relating to the three research questions which were the focus of the study. The data used to support these conclusions were collected from the written survey instrument and the structured interviews.

1. Elementary principal respondents believed that the Illinois Administrators' Academy did furnish them with needed information and services relative to professional needs.

A total of sixty-four percent (64.2%) of elementary school principals indicated support for the Illinois Administrators' Academy as measured by mean scores from responses to the written survey instrument. This represented the overall response to the questions from the three areas of focus in professional development for this study: personal, competency levels, and organizational effectiveness. Only one principal respondent (1.5%) ranked in each of the categories Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree rating.

2. The category focusing on personal needs of professional development received the highest positive rating from the elementary school principals.

Sixty-three percent (62.5%) of the responses to questions in the personal category of professional development were either Agree or Strongly Agree. Sixty-one from a total of sixty-seven principals agreed with the statement: The Academy workshops allow for active participation.
Fifty-six of the sixty-seven principals agreed that: The Academy maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with principals.

3. The area of competency levels closely followed the personal needs area of professional development in positive ratings from the elementary school principals.

Sixty-one percent (61.4%) of elementary principal respondents were in agreement that the Illinois Administrators' Academy was successful in meeting needs for increasing competency levels within the area of professional development. Sixty-one from the total of sixty-seven respondents agreed with the statement: The Academy provides me with inservice on varied instructional methods. The next highest ranked question responded to by principals in this category was agreed with by fifty-nine principals: The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.

4. The area of organizational effectiveness was the lowest of the three categories of professional development, although the overall rating placed the category within the positive perception range.

The combined total number of responses in the Strongly Agree and Agree categories for this third category of professional development indicated that fifty-five percent (55.2%) were in agreement that the area of organizational effectiveness was being successfully carried out by the Academy. The highest ranked statement within this category was supported by fifty-one out of sixty-seven principal respondents: The Academy trains me in staff development activities such as needs assessment, formulation and evaluation.

5. The Illinois Administrators' Academy is meeting the objective of assisting in mandated goals.

Fifty-nine of the sixty-seven elementary principals agreed with the statement: The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.
6. The correlation of the level of leadership education with the degree of satisfaction by principals was significant. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient of 0.7118535 indicated that a significant correlation existed. It is possible that those principals with higher levels of education were predisposed to acceptance of the need for leadership training. The correlation might indicate a higher level of course presentation more appropriate to those with advanced degrees.

Recommendations for Action

1. Review current research on the role of the principal and changes which occurred in the last decade.
2. Expand Academy offerings to include workshops focusing on appropriate budget development and evaluation.
3. Communicate with principals concerning professional development needs and schedules for Academy course offerings.
4. Conduct a needs assessment on a regular basis to identify areas of professional development for principals.
5. Increase the focus on school/community communication and involvement in Academy workshops.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations were presented following completion of this study as possible topics for further exploration.

1. Expand the group of administrators being studied beyond that of the principalship; the Illinois Administrators' Academy was established to further the professional development of all Illinois school administrators.
2. Focus specifically on one topic relating to the four purposes of the Academy and study that topic in-depth.
3. Survey faculties of principals who have completed workshops within the Academy to determine the degree to which effects of the training transferred to the individual school.

4. Survey superintendents of principals who completed workshops within the Academy to assess superintendents' perceptions of change in principals with whom they work.

5. Conduct a study of legislators working within legislative committees on education to determine the degree of success perceived regarding the Illinois Administrators' Academy.

6. Conduct a study of legislators working within legislative committees on education to examine pressures from various constituencies to make changes in current legislation regarding professional development of administrators.

7. Conduct an in-depth case study of a principal and a school to determine changes in performance relating to attendance at Academy workshops and other support services supplied by the Academy.

8. Examine the resource for professional development identified as peer support/networking and the degree to which principals rely on this as a source of information.

9. Conduct a study of administrators in charge of Illinois Administrative Academies throughout the state to identify challenges presented in coordinating professional development activities for administrators.

10. Conduct a study of administrators in charge of Illinois Administrative Academies focusing on the coordination of activities between the legislature and the Academy.

11. Study the advisory board structure of the Academy to determine sources of input into decision-making for policy.

12. Examine the financial structure of Academies to compare resources and expenses throughout the state.
13. Conduct a study focusing on the broad areas of professional development available to the principal to determine the degree to which each is valuable as a resource.

14. Conduct a comparative study of new principals within the Illinois Administrators' Academy with new principals in a state without a formal mandated program of professional development to assess the relative degree of assistance of the Academy to the Illinois principals.

15. Review the research base on which the Illinois Administrators' Academy is structured to determine the validity of this base ten years after inception.

16. Conduct a comparative study of various academies within the state. Respondents indicated in telephone interviews that the Lake County ESC and its Administrators' Academy is exceptional in its efforts to conduct the Academy.
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

February 1, 1992

Dear Principal:

I am conducting a research study for a doctoral dissertation on the topic of the professional development of elementary school principals. This study is under the chairmanship of Dr. Edward Rancic, Assistant Professor, at Loyola University. Would you please assist in this study by taking 15-20 minutes to complete the enclosed survey?

The purpose of this study is to determine the effect that participation in the Illinois Administrators’ Academy has had on the professional development of elementary school principals. The effectiveness of the Academy’s offerings will be analyzed from the participant’s point of view; your response is needed in order to accurately assess the questions being investigated.

All information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for academic purposes only. I have provided a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. Please return this completed questionnaire on or before Friday, February 12, 1993.

Your assistance is appreciated and I thank you in advance.

Respectfully,

Rebecca L. Cassell
APPENDIX B
WRITTEN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ID NUMBER: __________

GRADE LEVELS IN YOUR SCHOOL: __________

ENROLLMENT IN YOUR SCHOOL: __________

NUMBER OF YEARS (NOT INCLUDING THIS YEAR) AS A PRINCIPAL IN YOUR PRESENT POSITION: __________

NUMBER OF YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL IN OTHER SCHOOLS: __________

HIGHEST DEGREE IN EDUCATION:

(CHECK ONE) MASTER’S___ CAS___ DOCTORATE___

PLEASE INDICATE HOW EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PROVIDES A SOURCE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR YOU BY CIRCLING ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN-DISTRICT INSERVICES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY-LEVEL COURSEWORK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Academy provides the support I need to be effective.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Academy asks me to fill out a professional needs assessment survey on a regular basis.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Academy helps me to establish clear guidelines for policy and procedures within the school building.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Academy provides professional recognition of my efforts as principal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.

6. The Academy provides me with inservice regarding the development and assessment of school climate.

7. Communication from the Academy is frequent and informal.

8. The Academy helps me learn how to model creative thinking for staff and students.

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

10. The Academy seeks me out for advice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18. The Academy workshops help me to focus on school goals in curriculum development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. The Academy is receptive to my suggestions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The Academy provides me with workshops on legislation regarding student rights and responsibilities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The Academy workshops allow for active participation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The Academy provides me with the opportunity to review methods for appropriate budget development and evaluation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The Academy helps me to review fit between curriculum objective and achievement testing.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The Academy cares about me as a person as well as my professional needs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Academy helps me to identify major functions and characteristics of school public relations programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The Academy trains me in staff development activities such as needs assessment, formulation and evaluation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The Academy provides opportunities to work on challenging tasks.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The Academy helps me in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The Academy models group facilitation skills and processes in the team management process.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

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

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

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

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

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