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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Since the "Nation at Risk" report in 1983, a significant amount of literature and research has been compiled to evaluate and improve the American education system. One of the areas of focus was school reform. "Within the current period of educational reform and restructuring, emphasis was placed on the principal as one whose leadership is derived through effective participation with the school community as well as with the broader resources within the school's environment. Broader input and increased empowerment are crucial aspects of the impact of reform on the role(s) of the principal and on the manner in which principals execute their responsibilities." (Fredricks 1992)

As part of Illinois' response to the "Nation at Risk Report", the Illinois Senate passed Bill no. 730 in July 1985. The bill gave the Illinois Board of Education the responsibility of establishing a training program for Illinois administrators. The Illinois Board of Education established the Administrators' Academy for this purpose. As of January 1986, all administrators had to participate in the Academy as cited in the Illinois School Code:

S2-3.53. 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.

The Illinois State Board of Education established an Illinois Administrators' Academy for development of skill in: instructional staff development, effective communication, public-school relations, and evaluation of personnel. Illinois is divided into various regions. At the regional level, Academy programs and services were coordinated and delivered through the network of the Regional Offices of Education (ROE), formerly known as Educational Service Centers. The ROE, under the guidelines established by the state, had the primary responsibility of developing the programs and services. Most recently, the Academy has established guideline through which professional groups or school districts can design programs specific to their needs, while meeting the requirements for Academy credit.

Monograph Series Paper #2 published by the Illinois State Board of Education gave an overview of the purpose of the Academy and its scope of training. The growth of administrators' training centers reflected an intense need for relevant resources to support participating administrators as leaders and learners and a sincere resolve by school administrators to improve their leadership skills. The Academy was based on six common assumptions about learning experiences for administrators as presented by Barth and Van Der Bogert. (1985)

1. Most school principals can be effective educational leaders as well as building managers.

2. The role of the principal, the nature of the job and the context of the school are rapidly becoming more complex and problematic.

3. Principals have the capacity and the need for personal and professional growth, after assuming administrative positions as much as before.
4. Principals are as capable of lifelong learning as other professionals.

5. The role of the principal includes all conditions necessary for learning and growth: problems, a context, and a person who wants to address the problems.

6. The main missing element in principals’ professional growth has been a sympathetic, nonpunitive, nonjudgmental, helpful resource and support system.

Additionally, research supports that principals need four conditions met to enhance their learning experiences: a neutral setting for learning, maximum diversity of learning experiences, voluntary attendance, and professional recognition.

The Academy offers four strands of training: required, selective, designation, and clinical. The required strand is based on legislation regarding evaluation of certified staff. The selective strand is an introduction to and review of effective administrative practices. Participation at academies at this strand is based solely on the administrators’ area of interest or need. At the designation strand administrators earn recognition for their commitment to improving instructional leadership skills. Finally, the clinical strand offers administrators confidential, objective, constructive feedback about their instructional leadership skills.

Research has shown that the quality of leadership was related to the quality of a school. Barth stated three responses to this realization:

1. a move to strengthen the preservice training and certification of aspiring principals so that those who move into the principal’s office are prepared to use it wisely and effectively;

2. renewed attention to the process for selecting principals so that
those most likely to be successful leaders are given the opportunity; and

3. and the proliferation of activities to promote the professional
development of practicing principals. (Barth 1987)

The more the principal learned, the better the principal performed. The
better the principal performed, the better teachers and student performed. The
higher ground is to support the learning of school principals because learning is
in and of itself a precious value that too many principals have been deprived of
by the burden of ascribed omniscience.

The work of Ron Edmonds and Larry Lezotte (1976) in the effective
schools movement helped reassert the important of the school principal.
Qualities like strong leadership, continuous monitoring of performance and
providing a safe and orderly environment constitutes the job description of the
school principal. Principals have a large influence on the climate and morale of
the school. This is an excellent way for principals to unlock the potential,
energy, idealism and learning of each member of the school community.

Edmonds and Lezotte emphasized three characteristics of an effective leader:

1. principals must model important behaviors;
2. principals release energy by becoming sustained, visible learners;
3. principals unlock energy and idealism when they collaborate. Rather
   than going it alone principals should work with teachers, other principals and
   parents.

If superintendents model risk-taking, collaborative work and learning,
then principals are more likely to do the same, producing a trickle-down effect.

Researchers agreed that the principal determines the effectiveness of the
school. It is imperative that principals assume the instructional leadership role
because it is the main ingredient in an effective school and the principal is the
person who must exercise the leadership. Instructional leadership did not require in-born talents, but skills that could be taught.

One of the most marked distinctions between an ordinary principal and an outstanding one was the latter's capacity and commitment for continuous professional growth. The outstanding learner is responsible for his/her own professional development and realized lifelong learning requires motivation, conviction and action.

Ramsey (1992) offered six compelling reasons why outstanding leaders continually engage in professional growth activities:

1. continual learning helps find out what is possible;
2. leaders cannot expect teachers and other staff members to improve their skills and knowledge if the leader doesn't model lifelong learning;
3. working at continuous renewal is the only way to build vitality for the long haul;
4. without ongoing growth, you cannot develop the organization - you can only maintain it;
5. you cannot hope to be innovative and renew the school unless you persistently renew yourself and
6. continuous growth and development helps give you energy and keep you young.

Research shows the effective principal is an active learner. Holst (1990) suggests that, "self-awareness and self-knowledge were necessary components for the insight required to lead others. Principals that do not model appropriate behaviors, self evaluate, share, collaborate, network, observe and learn become stale and do a disservice to their staff, faculty, students and community."
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators' Academy on the professional development of secondary school principals. This study was a replication of a doctoral study conducted by Marilyn A. Howell at the Loyola University of Chicago entitled: *A Study of the Perceived Effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy on the Professional Development of Secondary School Principals in Northern Illinois* (1990). One of the recommendations for further study from Howell's study suggested replication at a later date after the Academy has grown in tenure status. This study compared her 1988 data results with those collected in 1995 to assess if the secondary principals’ perceptions of the Academy had changed in any way.

Three specific research questions were addressed:

1. Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy satisfy one’s personal need for professional development?

2. Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy increase one’s level of competency as part of one's professional development?

3. Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy aid one’s ability to improve the school’s organizational effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

The investigator compared the results of this study with those of the same study conducted in 1988 to ascertain what changes, if any, had occurred in the principals’ perceptions of the Academy.
Definition of Terms

For purposes of this research, the following were defined:

1. Administrators' Academy

The Illinois State Board of Education defined the Administrators' Academy as "A process, not a place. Through the Academy process, administrators are provided opportunities for professional development." (ISBE) As mandated by the law, program offerings had to provide for the development of skills in the areas of instructional staff development, effective communication skills, public school relations, evaluation of personnel, including documentation of employee performance and remediation of unsatisfactory employee performance. (ISBE)

2. Regional Office of Education (formerly Educational Service Center)

Nine regional Regional Offices of Education, under the control of the Illinois State Board of Education, were established to meet the needs of schools located in a specific geographic area. Each center coordinated and delivered programs.

3. Instructional Leader

The Illinois Administrators' Academy defined instructional leader as:

The instructional leadership research base identified 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. (ISBE 1985)
4. Professional Development

The term professional development had been used interchangeably with staff development and inservice. To avoid any confusion and to maintain continuity the same definition for professional development used by Howell was used here.

Professional development was defined as a systematic approach to design of activities for administrators that would:

1) satisfy personal needs - individual needs or personal interest areas within a professional arena that may have or may not have differed from the priorities of the school or district as a collective grouping;

2) increase the level of ones competency - the acquisition of knowledge in the cognitive domain of a specific subject area in order to foster the implementation or improvement of an instructional program and/or to provide a better understanding of the educational process; and/or

3) improve the school’s organizational effectiveness - characteristics of an institution that foster school improvement with the capacity of teachers and administrators to work together constructively in identifying and solving problems, and setting and accomplishing goals cooperatively.

5. Secondary School Principal

The chief administrator at a high school (grades 9-12) building.

Limitations of the study

Several limitations influenced the study:

1. The data collected reflected the perceptions of only secondary school principals as identified by the Administrators' Academy of Regional Offices of
Education numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 in northern Illinois. It excluded the city of Chicago.

2. It was assumed that the respondents answered the questionnaire truthfully and with candor.

3. It was assumed that the method of data collection was valid.

4. The population sample was not replicated in total from the first study.

5. The percentage of questionnaires returned differed from the first study.

6. The majority of the research in adult learning and development reflects a male dominated data base.

7. Different needs for current principals due to age and stage/experience in career as opposed to those prior to the 5&5 incentive.

8. The majority of the research on professional development is related to staff development not administrator development.

Organization of the Study

The study was divided into five chapters. Chapter one provided an introduction to the study, the purpose, definition of terms, limitations and the organization of the research.

Chapter II provided a review of the literature. The review included the background information on adult learning, characteristics of professional development for administrators and examples of varies models of administration professional development.

Chapter III provided the methodology of the research including: a review of the subjects, procedures, instrumentations, treatments, research questions, and methods of data analysis.

Chapter IV provided the analysis of the data collected. Also provided
was a comparison to the data collected from Howell’s study.

Chapter V provided the results of the data collected, discussion of the findings, implications of the finding and suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The emergence of meaningful professional development programs has captured a great deal of attention over the past decade. This chapter reviews literature related to adult learning, characteristics of an effective professional development programs and models of various professional development programs designed specifically for administrators. The research on the adult learner has offered many theories, as well as, characteristics which have been used as a guide for the development of professional development programs for administrators.

Although not a great deal of research has been done specifically on professional development for the administrator, Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall (1983) found in their research that, "...teachers at higher stages of development function more complexly, possess a wider repertoire of behavioral skills, perceive problems more broadly and can respond more accurately and emphatically to the needs of others." This research is pertinent due to the average age and level of experience of administrators. Learning, as an act of modeling by the administrator, should be at the top of the list of characteristics of an effective principals. Many of the characteristics, the skills we recognized and that research suggested were important for effective principals, were learned skills. A principal learned how to continuously monitor performance of pupils, convey high expectations to teachers and pupils, to orchestrate a safe,
orderly environment, and to establish effective lines of communication with faculty and the community (ISBE 1987). As principals remained at the same building, the tendency was to become comfortable in routine and not change. Programs in adult learning must address the adult learners’ needs in various stages of their lives and careers.

The Adult Learner

Edward Lindeman’s (1926) research on adult learning found that “change occurs at meaningful life transitions or critical events - which call for readjustment and a strategic reappraisal of one’s circumstance.” Erick Erikson (1959) suggests in his research that change occurs in developmental phases with corresponding crises. He suggests eight stages of development: infancy, early childhood, play age, school age, adolescence, young adult, adulthood and mature age. Changes occur during these stages when a crisis occurs. John Garner (1965) states in his book, Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society, that adults tend to develop rigid routines and unchanged patterns in life by the age thirty. By that time adults have stopped acquiring new skills and attitudes. Adults tend to narrow their scope and variety in life, however, most have the potential to develop new skills. If the environment demanded the skill then, and only then, would the adult develop it.

Adult learning theorist, Malcolm Knowles (1973) suggests that the process of teaching the adult should differ from that of teaching children. Knowles concludes, “as an adult matures his/her need and capacity to be self-directing, to utilize his/her experience in learning, to identify his/her own readiness to learn, and to organize his/her learning around life problems, increases steadily from infancy to preadolescence and then with increasing
rapidity through adolescence." Andragogical theory (teaching of adults) is based on four assumptions: adults are self-directed, have a reservoir of experiences from which to draw, learn what is necessary to perform their evolving social roles, and are problem centered in their orientation to learning (Knowles 1973). Research further suggests that the teachers of adults must draw upon the adults' experiences and that teacher should act as facilitator.

Unlike Knowles, Houle (1972) suggests that pedagogy cannot be replaced by andragogy. He continues, "the teaching of students and adults is essentially the same." According to Houle, the fundamental process includes: identifying possible educational activities, deciding to proceed, specifying objectives, developing learning format, relating that format to the experiences of the learner, implementing learning activities, and assessing outcomes.

The work of John Dewey (1938) suggests incorporating experience, democracy, continuity and interaction in programs designed for adult learning. Additionally, Coates and Thorensen (1978) suggest in their research including discussion, inquiry, modeling and self-regulation as effective teaching techniques for the adult learner.

Patricia Cross, in her book *Adults as Learners* (1981), emphasizes the importance of looking at each phase of the individual and how it effects the individual's personal and work life. Cross feels the two dimensions are inseparable and must both be considered when studying adult learning. Adult development theorist Levine (1989) emphasizes the importance of the ego development when considering the development of school personnel.

As the focus turns to the principals as learner, the misconception by outsiders that learning would only occur through outside stimulant, programs are forced to offer varying opportunities. Research shows that when principals
are willing to take ownership in their own learning, others would not. When principals exercise ownership in their own learning, they will learn more and enjoy it more (Barth 1984).

Sparks (1992) describes four obstacles that hinders the image of the principal as learner. First, “it is immoral to take money out of the mouths of babes,” using precious school resources for the principal’s own personal and professional development is seen as immoral. Secondly, the myth that the principal who does not know how to do something, who is learning, is somehow flawed. Third, the activities attended by principals have generally been so dreadful that few wanted to attend any others. Finally, the realization that when a principal learns something, s/he has to do something immediately with what is learned.

In support of the adult learner, Barth (1985) states, “Time invested in principals will pay off over time. Rather than being completed or finished, adult development is that grown-ups continue to grow.” The most powerful reason for principals to be learners, as well as leaders, comes from the extraordinary influence of modeling behavior. When the leader is learner, when the principal’s learning is continuous, sustained, visible and exciting, a crucial and very important message is sent to the school: this school is a community of learners; learning is its most important characteristic; and the principal is the head learner.

The leader as learner is critical because there is a striking connection between learning and collegiality. The most powerful form of learning, the most sophisticated form of staff development, comes from sharing what we know with others. Learning comes more from giving than from receiving. By reflecting on what principals did, by giving it coherence, and by sharing and articulating their
knowledge they made meaning and they learned.

Researcher discusses the benefits of a professional development program designed specifically for principals. W. Edwards Deming states, “... working alone is neither good for the quality of the product nor for the quality of life of those who produce the product. Working together, we can continually improve what we set out to do and at the same time get a great kick out of doing it.” Collegiality has taken the place of the paranoia that has long discouraged leaders from sharing any ideas or concerns with each other.

Additionally, research shows that when principals are responsible for their own learning, they design programs they enjoy (Barth 1985). Programs designed by principals frequently offer a new angle to a topic and are often risky. Principals design programs that challenge themselves as learners. The goal is to provide leadership through their learning. Many also volunteer as resources for others so they can share their enormous and often concealed knowledge and experiences.

Research demonstrates that leadership is correlated in a significant way to student learning outcomes. Leadership can be learned, shaped and developed. Research confirms that an instructional leadership development program, grounded in theory, sound assessment practiced and situated learning, provides a solid model for the effective training of school leaders.

Finally, Barth (1985) states, “... professional development can be both energy and time depleting and energy and time replenishing”. In contrast to years past, the pendulum has swung in support of the principal as learner.
Characteristics of a Professional Development Program

Several researchers offer insight into characteristics to be considered when developing a professional development program for the administrator. Critical periods in an adult’s life, various degrees of commitment, adults’ perceptions of time all have implications on adult learning and how training might be organized and delivered.

Lipow (1992) suggests several characteristics to be consider when developing an effective professional development program. First, give adults some control. Adults are accustomed to being in control and taking responsibility for their own lives. Most people like to think of themselves as independent and self-directed. They often feel uncomfortable when placed in situations where they have little control or feel challenged by their lack of knowledge. Secondly, build on the adult’s experiences. Adults bring unique personal experience to the learning activity. Experience is the core of the adult’s sense of self. It can be converted into new knowledge and understanding with appropriate learning structures, and it can serve as a rich resource for the learner to share with others. Thirdly, adults are ready to learn when they needed to know something. The principal’s need to be more effective influences his/her need to learn. The need is sparked by a problem that needs to be solved or by a change in the individual’s personal life or career. Fourth, make the activity or program applicable to every day life. Adults want to use their knowledge to accomplish something. Adults expect what they learned to be relevant to their needs. They expect to see the connection between the material presented and the problem(s) they are trying to solve or the task they have undertaken. Finally, adults seek learning experiences that help them meet internal needs.
Howey and Vaughan (1983) contribute additional factors to considered when establishing professional development programs: interactiveness, comprehensiveness, continuity, patency (relevancy), support, structures and personnel (to minimize isolation) and documentation (planning, implementation and outcomes).

Pinter (1985) offers ten additional factors to consider in the development of professional development programs: provide time away from the work setting; allow for personalized training, encourage reflective thinking about one's actions; build on one's experiential base; incorporate modeling, feedback and practice opportunities for the development of skills; include a training component for trainers; serve the professional interest of individuals as well as the organization's need to solve problems and to maintain itself; design training that is cumulative and based on the continuous assessment of skills; emphasize outcomes over sentiment in the evaluation of training effectiveness; keep the purpose of training in mind.

The following professional development programs are all grounded, in part, in adult learning theory. Each program is designed, at least partially, on the characteristics described earlier. What follows is a brief description of several administrative professional development programs. The terms academy and center are used interchangeable. Essentially their aim is to provide local administrators with continuing support and programs which enhance their leadership skills.
Professional Development Models

A variety of professional development models are used by different states. Some programs are school supported, others are district supported and still others are supported by the state. There are as many different programs offered as there were ways of funding.

**Principals' Centers/Academy**

Principals' centers provide a collegian setting through which principals engage in professional development activities, share the skills of their craft with each other, and develop a network of people with common concerns (Blumberg 1986). Principals gather at the centers to develop innovative and exciting programs in staff and professional development. The participants engage in thoughtful, honest conversations with one another about issues that are more engaging and sustaining rather than listening to someone else talk. New relationships and networks among principals are established.

Centers evolved through different means. Some have evolved through affiliation with state departments of educations, others cooperated with business groups. Still others were affiliated with universities or with a state principals' associations.

Principals' Centers are based on several assumptions: (1) the principals or headmaster is a central variable in determining the quality of a school; (2) it is possible for most school principals to be effective educational leaders as well as building managers; (3) 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; (4) principals need opportunities to learn and grow; (5) principals
have the capacity and need for personal and professional growth as much after they have assumed their position as before; (6) principals are as capable of life-long learning as other professionals; (7) all of the conditions necessary for principals' learning and growth exist: problems, a context, and someone who wants the problems addressed; (8) the major element missing is the existence of a sympathetic, nonpunitive, non judgmental, helpful resource and support system; and (9) principals' centers can mediate among principals, help without judging or condemning, and assist principals in acquiring, strengthening and sharing their school leadership skills.

The centers are based on four principles associate with successful professional invigoration: professional recognition, voluntary attendance, protected setting and maximum diversity.

Principal participation is essential to the Centers' success. Principals can participate through: workshops for colleagues, service on program/planning boards, programs are offered through an array of formats - summer institutes, hot lines, full-day topical workshops and colleague circles. Centers recognize that principals preferred different learning styles, have different attention spans, interests and needs. Diversity in programs make it possible to meet many of the professional development needs of principals (Barth and van Der Bogert 1984).

Academy model

There are several advantages to the Principals' Center/Academy. First, it's a permanent structure established to address the continuing need of practitioners. Secondly, it's controlled directly by the practitioners who serve as participants. Finally, it is a grassroots approach to inservice education, where participants are given considerable opportunity to influence the content and
approaches used as part of the learning activity (Daresh and Playko 1992).

Academies offered by the Center are effective because they emphasize methods that ensure that individual participants' needs, interests and concerns are addressed as completely as possible. The academy model parallels effective inservice education practice because agencies that sponsor this model demand ongoing evaluation.

The negative aspects of the academy model include: instruction provided may be through one-way communication; confusion regarding who was leading the inservice activities, the provider of the inservice program has little or no knowledge of the current conditions or events present in the school district that may have led to the need for the inservice; the ever-present danger of addressing issues in the here and now, whereas little emphasis may be given to finding long-term solutions to what may be extremely complex educational and organizational problems. (Daresh and Playko 1992)

The academy is designed primarily as a way for school systems to develop strategies to meet localized learning needs. Academies feature a fairly high degree of involvement by participants in the planning, implementation and evaluation of programs. Inservice academies are based on participants' needs. Learning activities deliberately avoid reliance on lectures and other forms of one-way communication and emphasized high-level participant involvement activities to promote participant learning. Inservice academies are frequently the product of a school system's interest in professional development.

Inservice Education Academy

The inservice education academy is an arrangement wherein a school district, a state department of education or some other educational agency
provide structured learning experiences to educators on an ongoing basis. First, the inservice is an in-house effort sponsored by an educational agency specifically to address the needs of local practitioners. Secondly, its activities are client-driven. Structurally the inservice is a blend of the traditional university course and the locally sponsored institute that focus directly on practitioners' concerns and interests. (Daresh and Playko 1992)

**Maryland Professional Development Academy**

The Maryland Professional Development Academy is an intensive inservice education program designed to enhance the instructional leadership skills of administrators across the state (Huddle and Hammond 1987). It is financed entirely by the Maryland Department of Education. The Academy has three major assumptions: (1) the state department of education provides some type of training and staff development that is more appropriate to its role than to that of other agencies, such as local school systems. This statewide focus addresses the need for equity among the state’s school systems; (2) the academy is based on the belief that effective schools research can be used as its basis and that the findings of this research translated into ongoing staff development; (3) school-based administrators are the proper leadership over staff development needs in their school in the same way that they make responsible judgments on curriculum, instruction and organizational climate.

The state provides resources to support the academy in a number of ways. First, a small full-time academy staff is maintained to coordinate the work for the academy each year. Secondly, the stated assumes the costs associated with providing training for up to 230 of the state’s 2,258 school administrators. Finally, money is available for the academy to offer as many as nine different
short-term learning experiences each year to practicing administrators.

Des Moines Academy

Des Moines Public Schools offers an internal staff development program for administrative personnel (Van Der Bogert 1987). Its creation is based on two fundamental assumptions. First, expanding training programs for administrators is vital if the district is going to meet community needs and expectations. Secondly, the training program must help administrative staff member perform effectively on a day-to-day basis, as well as develop skills in coping with the unexpected.

Additionally, the district's goals relate to professional growth are taken into consideration. Included are: the school district has a basic responsibility for the professional growth of its employees; all administrative training and development be designed to help administrators cope with problems and improve their managerial skills in relation to the goals and objectives of the district and their school; school administrators want to be as efficient and effective as possible; active and full participation of administrators will result if appropriate topics are offered and competent leadership was provided; and ongoing training was necessary if effective leadership is to be maintained in the district.

Participating administrators are asked to identify topics to be covered in the sessions offered as part of the academy. All learning activities provide evidence that they have been designed to address the concepts of collaboration, peer leadership, a sound cognitive base, experiential activities and the maintenance and reinforcement of newly acquired concepts and skills.

There are five basic procedures for the operation of the Academy:
collaboration, peer-leadership, sound cognitive base, experimental activities and maintenance and reinforcement.

Collaboration and ownership by participant is crucial to the Academy's success. It is based upon the belief that the recipients of a service has the right, as well as the responsibility, to be part of that service.

Administrators are invited by the Steering Committee to become a "Leader of Leaders" for the Administrative Academy. Leaders of Leaders must:
1. use innovative concepts and skills in daily work,
2. have the respect of peers,
3. be willing and able to find the time to get the job done right and
4. demonstrate effective instructional skills.

Several administrators study and prepare together to present one topic; they plan and develop their presentations together and after several months of preparation they divide into three teams to conduct one-on-one and half day seminars and to consult with other administrators on a one-to-one basis.

The Steering Committee selects the organization or agency to train and develop the Leaders of Leaders. Training take place outside of Des Moines. The training is grounded in a sound cognitive base. This has two advantages: (1) it provides an opportunity for the leaders to form a cohesive group through travel as well as learning together and (2) training in the "home office" of the trainer adds to the resources available as well as the perceived benefits.

Training and development activities have meaningful and are applicable to the job functions of the manager if s/he is learning and apply new skills on the job. Experiential activities demand interaction among all participants and include problem-solving and decision-making skills. Participants take hold and deal with problems and situations that are real and meaningful to them.
Maintenance and reinforcement of participants’ new skills is important and unique to the concept of the Academy - important to the extent that what is learned can and will be applied on the job, unique to this program is that it offers follow-up experiences.

The concept of the Administrative Academy requires the commitment of both the employer and the employee. It further demands collaborative leadership among all involved with the program - the Board of Education, school administrators and the local professional organization for administrators (Wise 1981).

Peer-Assisted Leadership

The purpose of a learning center is to offer a variety of resources and teaching technologies, such as video, audio, computer instruction, and interactive video all of which can be tailored to a person’s preferred learning style.

Success planning and implementation of an internal learning center that will meet the needs of the clients requires clear objectives. The key components of the learning center concept are quality programming based on need, cost-effectiveness, flexibility, portability and time effectiveness.

In 1983, the instructional management program at the Far West Laboratory established Peer-Assisted Leadership (PAL), a unique professional development program for principals. It is based on principals helping one another to become better instructional leaders. Principals work in teams of two, the PAL program teaches them how to “shadow” and how to conduct “reflective interviews” with each other. The program introduces principals to a framework of instruction based on research that describes the principal’s role in terms of
instructional manager.

The PAL program has four major goals: to help principals develop skills that they can use to analyze their own and other principals' management behaviors; to give participant opportunities to learn how other principals lead their schools; to enable principals to gain support from colleagues; to help principals integrate into their own school settings the general framework of instructional leadership.

Three important findings emerged from the research at the Far West Laboratory. First, effective principals engage in "higher-order thinking" as they assess their school environments, their own limitations and strengths, and the kinds of programs and outcomes they desire for their students. Secondly, many principals feel isolated, and they welcomed opportunities to talk with and learn from colleagues. Finally, the principals in the study reported that the reflective interviews encouraged them to engage in self-evaluation.

Because PAL participants are able to observe and talk with other principals, they often learn new techniques and strategies for dealing with issues in their own schools. Activities included in the PAL program encourage principals to become more reflective and more willing to try new ideas and methods. By shadowing and interviewing one another, principals become more aware of their goals for their students and better understand the consequences of their actions. They have an opportunity to compare and contrast their own leadership styles with those of other principals. Principals also, develop new skills in data collection and analysis regarding themselves and their own schools - skills that they can use productively throughout their administrative careers (Barnett and Long 1986).
South Carolina's Administrators' Leadership Academy

The Academy is run by an advisory board. The board is made up of school board members and practicing administrators. The board designs all the programs offered by the academy. The programs are based on administrator's need which were determined through a needs assessment.

The programs feature local presenters and practicing administrators. Involving local administrators develops a sense of ownership and belonging. Programs are offered at regional sites convenient to participants.

The academy provides three long-term, competency based training programs: the Principal Apprenticeship, the Springfield Simulation and the Superintendency Internship Program. In addition to the programs, the academy offers an assessment center. A network has been established between the academy and other professional organizations, higher education institutions and regional educational consortia.

South Carolina's advisory recommends the following for a successful administrative academy. Begin with clearly stated goals and objective. Secondly, offer quality programs. Third, use practicing administrators as presenters and involve representation from local group in the decision making process. Fourth, monitor and evaluate each program, get feedback. Fifth, promote the programs. Finally, network with other inservice and training organizations (Thompson 1987).

North Carolina's Leadership Institute for Principals

The main goal of the academy is to take participants from the basic awareness level of an issue to a level of competency for the issue. The academy offers ten, week long institutes per year. Practicing administrators participate in the planning and structuring of the programs. Participants
develop an action plan through which they develop goals based on established school goals and mission statements. Programs are based on need identified through a needs assessment (Grier and Draughon 1987).

**The Florida Academy for School Leaders**

The Executive Assistant Program and Design Team Concept are two programs the Florida Academy offers. The goal for all academy programs is to maximize the effectiveness of public school administrators by improving or refining their management and leadership skills. The academy’s success is based on two ideas. First, the academy’s ability to change as the needs of the participants change. Secondly, its adoption of model principles of effective training and adult learning theories (Thompson 1987).

**Principals’ Center at Harvard University**

The Center believes that by replenishing the lives of school people the school experiences of students will be enriched. The Center is based on four guidelines. First, practitioners play a key role in their own development. This means that the programs are designed for practitioners by practitioners. Secondly, principals need an external support system. The support system is accomplished through the development of national and world wide networking. Third, the center supports principals so they can meet their goals. Finally, presenters are drawn from the membership, from advisory boards in the university community and outside consultants (Barth 1987).

The Center was established on two basic beliefs. First, principals should determine what sources of assistance they want and need. Secondly, the Center focuses on essential knowledge and skills a principal needs to be effective. The Center provides principals with recognition. In doing so,
principals are able to realize the support they have from their peers. Those who participate want to participate. Through involvement in the planning of programs, recognition of accomplishment, and presentation at the academies, participants feel ownership in the Center. The Center provides a neutral and protected setting for each participant to reflect and share experiences.

Texas A&M University's Principals' Center

The purpose is to serve principals by providing them with the orientation skills and understanding that will enhance their position as instructional leaders in their schools. Because the Center covers such a large geographic area, nine regional clusters are centrally located throughout the state. Clusters function to provide support to principals in the region through individualized programming. The programming is determined through a needs assessment in each cluster. Programs are provided throughout the school year.

The programs and activities for the entire state are organized by a twenty member congress. The membership consists of principals throughout the state. The congress plans two major academies a year: the summer academy and the fall follow-up academy. The summer academy provides participants with the knowledge necessary to utilize current legal mandates and social pressures for their own instructional leadership purposes. For those participants who are able, the fall academy provides a follow-up to the summer academy. Participants are able to discuss how the information gained from the summer academy is being implemented (Erlandson, Hinojosa and MacDonald 1987).

Baylor University Principals' Center

The Center's goal is to pride unity, a common direction and to meet the
personal and professional needs of school administrators. The Center is
governed by a program advisory board. The board consists of area principals,
representatives from the university and representatives from the local
educational service center. The board determines program content, time and
locations. To make programs more accessible the Center divided the board
into three geographic regions.

The Academy's objectives include: fostering a sense of collegiality
through collegial-circle (collegial-circles provide opportunities for principals to
share and learn from each other's experiences); providing opportunities for
networking between principals; offering quality programming; coordinating
seminars; encouraging interaction at seminars; and providing a forum for the
dissemination of current research, litigation etc (Estes and Crowder 1987).

The Maine Principals' Center

The Center was developed through cooperation between Maine's
principal association, the State Commissioner of Education and the University
of Maine. The program's success is based on three objects. First, programming
deals with the functions principals fulfill at school and in the community, not the
activities they carried out. Secondly, the Center recognizes that the variety of
positions and people called principal make it virtually impossible to design an
experience that will benefit each principal in the same way. Thus, activities
encourage principals to explore and test an idea or practice, share plans to get
feedback from colleagues and to stay in touch with one another as they
implement the plan (Donaldson 1987).

The work of The Rand Corporation and Bruce Joyce and his colleagues
has contributed to the development of the "ideal" inservice program. Below are
the characteristics prescribed of such a program.

1. Support from the superintendent as well as the board of education. Support was shown by having the decision makers allocate both time and money to inservice plans.

2. Those needs defined primarily by the learners are not “laid on” by district office personnel. Learners are likely to gain most from programs they have had an opportunity to select and design.

3. Offers participants opportunities to experience and to reality-check new behaviors (with feedback) in a safe environment. Observing another skilled person demonstrating a particular process does not necessarily mean a learner had internalized the process.

4. Continuous and holistic activities. Instantaneous solutions to complex problems may offer exciting fantasies, but they are seldom real. Generalizing and transferring are key concepts to keep in mind when promoting holistic learning.

5. Offer reasonable rewards to participants. Inservice programs that reward participants by illustrating a recognizable tie between newly learned behavior and student achievement were exceptionally satisfying. (Olivero 1982).
Summary

This chapter reviewed literature related to the adult learner, characteristics of professional development programs and models of various professional development programs designed specifically for administrators.

Theorist on adult learning support one of two theories: stage development or development due to crisis. The theorists who support stage development believe that people are ready to learn as they pass through various stages of development in their lives. For example, a child passing through adolescence has different learning needs than a person who is nearing the end of his/her career cycle. Others support theories that revolve around an individuals crises. This does not mean that something awful must occur in the individual's life before learning can occur, rather it refers to change. The change may be life altering or it may be a change in the work environment.

Characteristics of a professional development program are offered by many researchers. Common characteristics include: programs designed by the participants; programs based on the participants’ knowledge base and experiences; programs that were self-directed; programs that had immediate application to a job related problem; programs that incorporated discussion, inquiry modeling and self-regulation; programs that allowed the participant to work with others, share ideas and experiences; and programs in which the participant felt ownership.

The final section of this chapter shares various administrative academy models. Funding for the academies comes either from the school district, the state or professional organizations. The main objective of all the academies is to provide the Administrator with a growing and learning environment. The programs address timely issues that are designed to give the administrators
additional resources for solving the daily and long-term problems in their schools.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

This chapter includes the methods used for data collection, the procedures used to analyze the data, and the research questions. The target audience for this study were secondary school principals from five Regional Offices of Education within the northern Illinois area. The five regional offices covered districts in north, south and west Cook County, Lake County and DuPage/Kane County, excluding the city of Chicago. The sample represented diverse communities, as well as diverse instructional programs. The five Regional Offices of Education provided researcher with the secondary schools within their region. The principals were identified through a phone contact to each high school. The Regional Offices of Education provided no other information for the purpose of this study.

The data were collected in two stages. First, a thirty item questionnaire was sent to 90 secondary school principals (Appendix B). The questionnaire required the principal to respond to what effect the Academy had on his/her professional development needs. Every question addressed one of the three research questions. The three questions were:

1. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy satisfy one's personal needs for professional development?

2. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy increase one's level of competency as part of one's professional development?
3. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy aid one's ability to improve the school's organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

The principals responded to the degree to which each question met his/her needs. The Likert scale ranged from 1 - strongly disagree to 4 - strongly agree. Each question was assigned a numeric value. Each questionnaire was summed and averaged to determine the individual's mean score. For each questionnaire every third question was summed and averaged to determine the individual's mean score in each of the aforementioned categories.

Stage two consisted of a telephone interview with ten principals. After the mean score for each principal was establish, the principals with the five highest and five lowest mean scores were selected for an interview (Appendix C). An interview schedule was used (Appendix D). The interview focused on the perceived effectiveness of the Administrator's Academy as it related to professional development. Responses to the interview questions were summarized and similarities were noted.

The questionnaire included seven questions related to demographic and personal data. This information included: the respondent's name, the name of the high school, the school's enrollment, the number of years of experience as a high school principal, years in present position, years in other high school principalships, highest degree of education held and whether or not the respondent participated in Howell's study.

The remainder of the questionnaire was designed for the respondent to select to what degree s/her agreed with the question. The question responses were weighted from 4.0 being the highest possible rating and 1.0 being the lowest. The selection range included: strongly agree, agree, disagree and
strongly disagree. Howell purposefully excluded from the range “undecided” or “unsure” to force the respondent to make some commitment to agree or disagree with the statement. The questionnaire’s deliberately designed for brevity. The anticipated time used to complete the questionnaire was no more than 20 minutes.

Each question was designed to fall into one of three categories related to the professional development of the respondent and one of three research questions. The three categories of professional development were:

Category I - Personal Needs

Personal growth as part of professional development included the personal fulfillment or the satisfaction of personal needs. (Howell 1990) Workshops offered by the Administrators’ Academy which address these needs include: building self-esteem, identifying one’s leadership style, integrating values and attitudes, promoting in interpersonal relationships etc.

Questions Relating 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.

**Category II - Increased Levels of Competency**

Professional development include the enhancement of levels of competency as demonstrated by the acquisition of a new skill or the understanding of new knowledge (Howell 1990). Workshops offered by the Academy which address this area of professional development include: clinical supervisory skills, a synthesis of effective school research, plans for increased student achievement, or the implementation of a new instructional program.

Questions Relating to Increased Levels of Competency were:

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

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

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

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

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

17. The Academy provides me with inservice on varied instructional methods.
20. The Academy provides me with workshops on the legislation regarding student rights and responsibilities.

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

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

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

Category III - Organizational Effectiveness

Professional development programs that address the goals of the institution for school improvement are included in this final category (Howell 1990). Workshops offered by the Academy that addressed organizational effectiveness include: organizational climate, identifying techniques for producing an effective school climate, promoting cooperative decision-making skills, and the need to restructure a school's managerial framework.

Questions Relating to Organizational Effectiveness:

3. The Academy helps me to establish clear guidelines for policy and procedure within adequate inservice regarding the development and assessment of school climate.

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

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

12. The Academy provides me with help in the design and implementation of school improvement plans.
15. The Academy meets my need to provide inservice on measurement and evaluation to include test construction, integration or selection.

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

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

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

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

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

The questionnaire was mailed to ninety secondary school principals. Fifty principals returned the questionnaire. Forty-seven (94%) of the fifty returned were used for data analysis. Two principals did not return the questionnaire within the time frame indicated in the cover letter and one did not complete the demographic information and therefore could not be used for analysis. Table 1 represents a break down of the questionnaires returned by Regional Office of Education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School's ROE</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage Returned</th>
<th>Percentage Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROE 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE 7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned, but incomplete 03

TOTAL 90 50

Fifty of the ninety questionnaires mailed were returned, resulting in a 56% return rate. Forty-seven (94%) of the fifty returned were used for data analysis. Howell's questionnaire return rate was 82.3%.

**Interview Schedule**

An interview schedule was used to interview ten (20%) of the forty-seven participants. The five (10%) principals with the highest questionnaire mean score and the five (10%) with the lowest were selected to be interviewed. The purpose of the interview was to gain additional insight into their questionnaire responses. The selection of the interviewees was based solely on the mean
scores of the questionnaire. All ten principals agreed to be interviewed. (Appendix A) The interview consisted of six questions (Appendix B) and took not more than fifteen minutes to complete.

The six questions on the schedule were:

1. What activities or workshops did you engage in an/or attend for professional development within the last three years at the Academy?
2. How did participation in the Administrators' Academy workshops meet your personal need for professional development.
3. How did participation in the Administrators' Academy workshops enhance your professional competency as part of your professional development?
4. How did participation in the Administrators' Academy workshops meet your needs for implementing new and/or different strategies and techniques in the improvement of the effectiveness of your school.
5. What do you feel is the purpose of the Administrators' Academy?
6. If you could make one recommendation to improve what the Administrators' Academy offers or how it meets your needs in respect to your professional development, what would that recommendation be?

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Scoring the questionnaire

Each questionnaire item was assigned a numerical value. The value range was: 4 (strongly agree), 3 (agree), 2 (disagree) and 1 (strongly disagree). Each principal answered the questions based on the degree to which the Administrators' Academy met his/her professional development needs. Each
questionnaire was totaled, resulting in a raw score. The raw score was divided by the number of questions on the questionnaire, 30, resulting in a mean score for each respondent. The distribution range of mean scores is presented in Chapter IV.

A second tabulation, by research question, was made on each questionnaire. The total score for each of the three categories was averaged yielding a mean score for each of the three categories. The mean scores indicated to what degree the Administrators' Academy met the principals' personal professional development needs, increased one's level of competency and the ability to improve the school organizational effectiveness.

Spearman Correlation was used to further analyze the data. The Spearman was used to test for significant correlation between the three research questions and specific demographic information. The three questions were:

1. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy satisfy one's personal needs for professional development?

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

3. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy aid one's ability to improve the school's organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

For purposes of the Spearman test the three research questions were identified as "need" for question number 1, "competent" for question number 2 and "school" for question number 3. The demographic, subscale information used as variables included: total student enrollment, number of years of experience as a principal and highest educational degree earned.
Interview Data

Ten total principals were interviewed. The principals' responses to the six questions of the interview schedule were briefly summarized and presented in Chapter VI. The principals' responses were analyzed for commonalities amongst the interviewees and then compared to the answers given in Howell's study.

Summary

Data for this study was collected in two ways. First, a thirty item questionnaire was sent to secondary school principals identified by five REOs. The five areas included north, south and west Cook County, Lake County and DuPage/Kane County. Ninety questionnaires were sent and fifty (50) were returned. Of the fifty (50) returned forty-seven (94%) were used for data in the study. Secondly, based on the mean scores of the questionnaire, ten (20%) principals, five (10%) with the highest mean score and five (10%) with the lowest mean score, were selected to participate in an interview. The data collected from the interview were compared to the data collected from Howell's study.

The data was analyzed in two ways. First, the raw score thirty item questionnaire was averaged, yielding a mean score. The items on the questionnaire were then divided into three categories: items that addressed whether or not the Administrators' Academy met: the principals personal needs, increases one's level of competency, and improve the school's organizational effectiveness. The raw score for each category was then averaged, yielding in a mean score. The results of this study were compared to those of Howell's study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data presented in this chapter was collected through a 30 item questionnaire and interviews with ten secondary school principals. The target audience of secondary school principals was derived from five Regional Offices of Education within the northern Illinois area. The five regional offices of education included districts in north, south and west Cook County, Lake County and DuPage/Kane County, excluding the city of Chicago. The data was presented and analyzed in this chapter.

Data from the questionnaire were represented in tables to effectively display the findings. Data from the questionnaire included three professional development categories as related to the offering of the Administrators' Academy, demographic information, mean scores of the respondents and the frequency of grouped scores.

Spearman Correlation was used to analyze the data. The Spearman was used to test for significant correlation between the three research questions and specific demographic information. Three research questions were address in the study. The questions were:

1. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy satisfy one's personal needs for professional development?
2. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy increase one's level of competency as part of one's professional development?
3. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy aid one's ability to improve the school's organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

For purposes of the Spearman test the specific demographic subscale information used as variables included: total student enrollment, number of years of experience as a principal, and highest educational degree earned.

The first variable, enrollment, was tabulated using the Spearman coefficient. The result of the tabulation, 0.5423, showed no significant correlation between the questionnaire mean score and the student enrollment of the high school. The Spearman coefficient tabulation, 0.1736, indicated no significant correlation between the questionnaire mean score and the number of years of experience of a principal. Finally, the Spearman coefficient, 0.2552, indicated no significant correlation between the mean score of the questionnaire and the level of education accomplished by the principals.

The interview schedule consisted of six questions. Ten secondary school principals, five with the highest mean questionnaire score and five with the lowest mean questionnaire score, were interviewed. Their answers were briefly summarized with supporting quotes. Additionally, answers were compared for commonalities.

Questionnaire Data

The 30 item questionnaire was sent to ninety secondary school principals. Fifty (55%) principals returned the questionnaire. Of the fifty, forty-seven (94%) were complete and used in the analysis of the data. All questions were designed to enlist from the respondent his or her opinion regarding the effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy offerings. Each question fell into
one of three categories addressing three questions: (1) Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy meet one’s personal needs for professional development; (2) Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy increase one’s level of competency as part of one’s professional development; (3) Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy aid one’s ability to improve the school’s organizational effectiveness as a goal for professional development?

The questionnaire also included demographic information. The information identified the school’s name, enrollment, principal’s name, number of years of experience as a principal, number of years in current position, and the highest degree of education held by the principal.

**Demographic Information**

Included in the questionnaire completed by each principal, was a section of demographic information. The information included: the principal’s and school’s name, enrollment, number of years as a principal, number of years in current position, level of education and whether or not the principal had participated in Howell’s study. Enrollment at the schools ranged from five hundred and forty-five students to three thousand one hundred students (Table 2). Thirty (64%) of the forty-seven schools had enrollments over 1500 students. Table 3 shows a break down of the principal’s total years of experience as a secondary school principal. The span of experience was from one year of experience to 20 years in the position. Thirty-four (85%) of the forty-seven principals had six or less years of experience as a principal. Only one (2%) principal of the forty-seven had participated in Howell’s study in 1990.
### Table 2

**Size of School by Enrollment Figures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-1800</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101-2500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

**Years of Experience as a Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A master's degree is one of the state of Illinois requirements for applying for an administrative certificate, therefore, all respondents earned at least a master's degree. Of the forty-seven principals, 18 (38%) have not earned a degree beyond a master's. Twenty-eight (60%) have completed a doctorate degree. One (2%) principals has completed a Certificate of Advanced Study (C.A.S.) (See Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Education Earned by Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. / M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D / Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Scores

Forty-seven principals completed the thirty item questionnaire. Principals were asked to rate their personal perceptions of how well the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs. All items on the survey were declarative in nature to evoke a rated reaction regarding one's agreement of disagreement with the statement" (Howell 1990). The option of "non-applicable" was deliberately omitted to force the principals to commit to an answer.

The principals had the choice to respond to each question with strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree. Each response was assigned a numerical value; strongly agree 4.0, agree 3.0, disagree 2.0 and strongly disagree 1.0. The mean score was calculated for each questionnaire. The totals are represented in Table 5.

The individual overall mean scores indicated general agreement or disagreement with the Academy meeting the principal's professional developmental needs. A mean score of 4.00, strongly agreed that the Academy met professional development needs and a low score of 1.00 indicated strong disagreement that the Academy met the principal's professional development needs. For example, a mean score of 2.53 indicated general agreement by the principal that the Academy did meet his/her professional development needs. A mean score of 2.46 indicated general disagreement by the principal that the Academy met his/her professional development needs.

When the questionnaires were tabulated not one principal rated the Academy with a perfect score of 4.0. Seventeen (22%) of the forty-seven agreed that the Academy did meet their professional development needs. Twenty-seven (57%) principals disagreed that the Academy met their
professional development needs. Three (6%) of the forty-seven principals strongly disagreed that the Academy met their professional development needs (See table 5).
Table 5

Frequencies of Questionnaire Mean Scores
By Individual Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Distribution of Scores by ROE</th>
<th>Principal (N)</th>
<th>Total by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROE 2</td>
<td>ROE 3</td>
<td>ROE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The grouped mean score of the questionnaires are represented in Table 6. Overall, 30 (64%) principals disagreed that the Academy met their needs. Three (6%) principals strongly disagreed that the Academy met their professional development need. This general disagreement was also reflected in Howell’s study. Forty-nine (64.5%) of the seventy-six principals who participate in Howell’s study disagreed with the statements that the Administrator’s Academy was effective in meeting their professional development needs.

Like Howell’s study, no principals rated the Academy as 4.0, the highest score, which would have indicated a strong agreement that the Academy met their professional development needs. Seventeen (22%) of the forty-seven principals rate the Academy between 2.50 - 3.49, reflecting their feeling that the Academy enhanced their professional development needs (Table 6). Twenty-seven (35.5%) of the seventy-six principals who participated in Howell’s study rated the Academy as meeting their professional need.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>Mean score of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50 - 4.00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.50 - 3.49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.50 - 2.49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Spearman Coefficient was computed between the mean scores of the grouped averages and three variables. The three variable were selected from the geographic information given by each principal. Tabulations were made using the Spearman coefficient to determine if there was any significant correlation between: the mean score and the size of the high school (enrollment), the mean score and the principal's level of education (degree) and the mean score and the number of years experience of the principal.

The data from the questionnaire was compared to the information related to student enrollment from the questionnaire. These results are represented in Table 7. The Spearman coefficient was tabulated to 0.5423. The results of the tabulation showed no significant correlation between the questionnaire mean score and the student enrollment of the high school.

The data displayed in Table 8 represents the comparison between the questionnaire data information and the principals' level of education. The Spearman coefficient, 0.2552, indicated no significant correlation between the mean score of the questionnaire and the level of education accomplished by the principals.

Finally, the data from the questionnaire, using the Spearman coefficient, was compared to the number of years of experience of a principal. The tabulation, 0.1736 indicated no significant correlation between the two variables (Table 9).

The following section of data collection is divided into two sections. In the first section the data collected from the questionnaire is divided into the three sections each corresponding to one of the three research questions. The second section of the analysis represents each of the six interview questions. Each question is summarized and supported by quotation for the principal.
Overall nineteen principals agreed that the Administrators’ Academy met their professional development needs. However, twenty-one principals felt their professional development needs were not met by the Administrators’ Academy.

*Total mean score of the 30 item questionnaire.
Table 8
Comparison Between Questionnaire Data and the Principals' Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50 - 4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.00 - 3.49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50 - 2.99</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.00 - 2.49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.50 - 1.99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman Correlation</td>
<td>.2552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 8 above, twenty-four (57%) of the forty-two principals earned a doctorate degree. Of the twenty-four, thirteen (54%) disagreed to some degree with the Administrators' Academy's ability to meet their professional development needs. Seventeen (40%) of the forty-two earned a master's degree. Ten of the seventeen agreed that the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs. The one (3%) principal with the CAS disagreed that the Academy met his/her professional developmental needs. This indicated that the principals who earned a doctorate degree were not having their professional development needs met by the Academy, whereas principals who had not earned doctorate degrees felt the Academy better met their professional development needs.
Table 9
Comparison Between Questionnaire Data* and Principals' Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Response</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Year of Experience</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50-2.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.00-2.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.50-1.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall twenty-one principals agreed that the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs. However, twenty-one principals felt their professional development needs were not met by the Administrators' Academy.

*Total mean score of the 30 item questionnaire.
Questionnaire Data

The questionnaire was divided into three categories, each corresponding to one of three research questions. The three categories addressed the principals perceived effectiveness of the Administrators’ Academy meeting one of three professional development needs. Each category included ten questions. The three research questions were:

1. Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy satisfy one’s personal needs for professional development?

2. Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy increase one’s level of competency as part of one’s professional development?

3. Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy aid one’s ability to improve the school’s organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

Research Question 1 - Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy satisfy one’s personal needs for professional development?

Table 10 displays the forty-four principal’s response to the first research question; did participation at the Administrators’ Academy satisfy one’s personal needs for professional development? Thirty-eight (8%) of the four hundred forty principal responses indicated they strongly agreed that the Academy met their personal needs for professional development. One hundred seventy-one (38.8%) of the four hundred forty responses indicated agreement that the Academy met their personal needs. One hundred eighty-two (41.3%) responses disagreed that the Academy met their personal needs and forty-nine
(11.1%) responses strongly disagree. Overall, 47.5% of the principals agreed that the Academy met their personal needs, whereas 52.5% disagreed; resulting in a difference of 4.7% (See Table 10). This closely paralleled Howell’s study in which 8.7% strongly agreed, 39.7% agreed, 37.1 disagreed and 14.5% strongly disagreed; resulting in an overall score of 48.4% agree, 51.6% disagree and a difference of 2.8%. This parallel indicates that secondary school principals six years after the first study, still feel the Administrators’ Academy is not meeting their professional development needs.

Research Question #2 - Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy increased one’s level of competency as part of one’s professional development?

Table 10 displays the results of the second research question of the survey. Thirty-two (7.2%) of the four hundred forty responses indicated that principals strongly agreed that the Administrators’ Academy increased their level of competency as part of professional development. One hundred seventy-three (39.3%) responses indicated they agreed they experienced an increase in their level of competency; one hundred seventy-eight (40.4%) indicated disagreement and fifty-seven (12.9%) indicated strong disagreement. Overall, 46.5% agreed that the Academy increased their level of competency, while 53.3% disagreed; resulting in a difference of 6.8%. Howell’s study showed overall 39.8% agreed and a 60.2% disagreed that the Academy increased their level of competency; resulting in a difference of 20.4%. The difference indicates that over the last six years the margin between agreement and disagreement has lessened, however, principals still do not feel their professional development needs are met by the Administrators’ Academy.
Research Question #3 - Did participation in the Administrators’ Academy aide one’s ability to improve the school’s organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

The results of the third research question are displayed in Table 10. Nineteen (4.1%) of the four hundred sixty principal responses indicate strong agreement that the Academy improve the school’s organization effectiveness. Of the four hundred sixty responses, two hundred six (44.7%) indicate agreement, one hundred eighty-one (39.3%) indicate disagreement while fifty-four (11.7%) indicated strong disagreement. Overall, 48% of the respondent felt the Academy meet their professional development needs with regards to school organization effectiveness. However, 51% of the principals did not feel their professional development needs in this area were met; resulting in a difference of only 3%. When compared to the results of Howell’s study, 64.5% of the principals felt their needs were not met by the Academy in the area of school organization effectiveness.

Overall, the indication from the three categories is that the principals are generally dissatisfied with the Academy’s ability to meet their professional development needs in the area of personal needs, level of competency and school organization through their current programming. Although the division between general agreement and general disagreement is slight it never the less weighs heavy toward general disagreement. The division between satisfaction and dissatisfaction has lessened however, since Howell’s study, it is still apparent the professional development needs of all secondary school principals are not being met by the Administrators’ Academy.
Table 10
Frequency Distribution by Means for each Subscale
Subscale #1 Personal Needs
Subscale #2 Competency
Subscale #3 School Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale #1: Personal Needs</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1  4  7  10  13  16  19  22  25  28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3   0   8   3   3   5   4   9   3   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17  10  19   8   7  24  19  22  19  16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21  24  13  24   19  12  19  10  18  22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3   10   4   9   5   3   2   3   4   6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44  44  44  44  44  44  44  44  44  44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale #2: Competency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>2   5   8   11  14  17  20  23  26  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2   4   11   7   3   0   1   2   2   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20  20   1  25  20  28  23  10  15  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17  16  25   9   12  13  15  24  20  27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3   4   7   3   9   3   5   8   7   6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44  44  44  44  44  44  44  44  44  44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale #3: School Organization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>3   6   9  12  15  18  21  24  27  30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2   5   0   5   0   2   1   0   1   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8   17  24  25  19  22  20  21  27  23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24  17  17  14  20  29  18  20  14  18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12   7   5   2   7   3   7   5   4   2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46  46  46  46  46  46  46  46  46  46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 shows the comparison of the difference in the two study’s totals.

Table 11
Comparison of Overall Percentage Differences divided by the Three Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Howell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As represented in Table 11, overall the principals disagreed that the Administrators’ Academy’s is effective in meeting their professional needs. The overall level of disagreement is less than in Howell’s study six years ago, however one area of disagreement has increased. There is greater disagreement in the Administrators’ Academy ability to meet the principals’ personal professional development needs, than there was six years ago. The second research question regarding the principals’ increased level of competency as part of their professional development, shows that 6.7% of the principals are more satisfied with the Academy than six years ago. The third research question which addressed the Academy’s ability to provide
professional development for principals in the area of improving the school's organizational effectiveness, also showed an increase in satisfaction by principals of 13.3%.

Analysis of Data

Interview Schedule

Based on their mean score, ten (21%) of the forty-seven principals were interviewed. The five principals with the highest mean score and five principals with the lowest mean score were selected. The interview process was conducted by telephone and took approximately ten minutes.

The total mean score of the questionnaire was tabulated by averaging the three category scores. None of the category scores for the principals in the two respective groupings, agree or disagree, differed by more than four-tenth of a point. For example the resulting mean score of 3.5 was derived by averaging the three category scores of 3.2, 3.4, and 3.9 (Table 12).

Of the fifteen individual scores for the three categories, personal need, competency and for school effectiveness, of the five lowest scoring principals, 8 (53%) of the answers given by the principals indicated that they strongly disagreed, 1.9 or less on the Likert scale. Of the fifteen individual scores for the three categories, of the five highest scoring principals, 3 (20%) of the answers given by the principals indicated that they strongly agreed, 3.5-4.0 on the Likert scale, that the Academy met their professional needs.

An interview schedule of six questions was used for each interview. Seven interviews occurred over the telephone and took no more than ten minutes. The other three principals asked to have the questions faxed and returned their answers via fax. The questions, as designed by Howell, were
"open-ended so as to allow the respondent a frame of reference within which to react, without placing any constraint on the reaction." One of the principals, with one of the lowest scores, answered the interview questions from a very positive

Table 12

Purposes of Professional Development with Categorical Mean Scores of Interviewed Principals

Averaged Scores by Category of Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals Interviewed</th>
<th>Personal Needs</th>
<th>Professional Competency</th>
<th>School Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total Mean Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All scores based on data provided by the questionnaire.
view. This begged an interesting question regarding the consistency of human responses to questionnaires versus human interaction.

The interview notes were transcribed immediately following each interview. The response for each question were summarized individually and then compared to the others. The similarities and differences are presented in the following pages. Within the summaries are direct quotes from the principals which further support their opinions.

**Interview Question #1**

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

Three of the principals participated only in the state mandated Academy programs over the last three years. Principal F reflected, “I was disappointed in the required strand. I learned nothing new.” Principal H stated, “I have been an administrator for 26 years, I only attend the mandated strands and usually they are not beneficial.” Principals have instead, designed programs that were offered to their administrators on site, “The Academy was cooperative in working with me to develop programs for my building. The Academy granted credit for all the programs we designed to meet our needs,” stated Principal E. The Academy has given credit for such programs if they meet the Academy’s specific guideline. Additionally, Principal F stated, “Workshops I participated in in the past have been a waste of time and so elementary in nature I felt like I was in an Education 101 class.”

- Principals who attended workshops offered by the Administrators’
Academy, found the majority of them useful. One principal felt that the Academy was more beneficial and current when it first began to offer Academies, "I take a long hard look at what is offered and select only those programs that interest me," Principal D stated. Programs attended by principals included: Ancillary Personnel, Total Quality Management, School Improvement Plan, How Effective Leadership Get Results, Investment in Leadership and Executive Thinking, Dealing with change and Building Bridges to Improve Learning.

Interview Question #2:

How did participation in the Administrators’ Academy workshops meet your personal need for professional development?

Principals who scored the lowest on the questionnaire felt that the offerings of the Academy did not meet any of their personal needs for professional development. "I felt the Academy offerings were beneficial in the late '80s. I learned from the sessions and had an opportunity to interact with colleagues. However, more recently offerings seem to be very limited. Progressive districts are developing workshops on their own," stated Principal G. Principals F stated, "The offerings did not appeal to me. They did not meet any of my professional development needs." Several cited developing their own programs because the programs offered by the Academy were of such poor quality.

Even though principals who scored high on the questionnaire had positive comments in regards to the Academy's offerings, they still admitted that they had to be very selective about which programs they attended. "I felt the workshops helped keep me on top of current issues. I only
participate in the “quality” workshops, workshops that introduce quality ideas I can incorporate at my school,” reflected Principal A. The programs which the principals had attended that they were positive about were where programs with presenters who were knowledgeable. Principal I stated, “The presenters need to be experts in the subject area. It’s very discouraging when I know as much as the presenter.” Additionally, one principal cited selecting programs based on job responsibilities. Principal B said, “Personally, the more one knows about job expectations, the more self-assured the individual becomes which leads to better job performance.”

Interview Question #3:

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

Principals who rated the academy as poor, felt that their professional competency needs were not met by attending any of the programs. “Workshops developed by the individual district better meet the staff development needs of the administrators and faculty,” shared Principal G. “I developed my own programs to meet my needs,” stated Principal G. Districts that offered staff development workshops during the summer found them more beneficial and enjoyed them more. Principal F stated, “The programs are not designed to meet individual needs. No one bothers to get our feedback or take our needs and level of experience into consideration.”

On the other hand, principals with a positive attitude toward the Academy, felt the workshops attended provided new skills which aided in their
role as educational leader. Principal B stated, “The Academy enabled me to be a better educational leader, the chief role of the school principal.”

**Interview Question #4:**

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

Principals who felt the Academy did not meet any of their professional development needs designed workshops that were specific for their district. They evaluated the individual needs of their district and addressed those needs through their own workshops. Principal E stated, “The quality of the workshops is lacking.”

Principals who found the Academy met their needs for improvement in their school felt the Academy aided in the development of a School Improvement Plan. Principal G stated, “Many of the concepts needed to head the School Improvement Committee were clearly explained at the Academy.” Principal C agreed, “The reference material provided by the Academy regarding school improvement were helpful.” They also felt it was a positive opportunity to share ideas and get ideas from other principals regarding improvements in other schools. “Participants were willing to share ideas for improvement.” stated Principal A.
Interview Question #5:

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

Principals viewed the Academy as having many purposes. Many saw the Academy as politically motivated. "It was developed by bureaucrats in Springfield who knew nothing about education," state Principal I. They felt more attention needed to be given to the offerings so that they were relevant to educators. "I keep myself current through the use of books, journals and workshops for implementing ideas and information, the Academy doesn't keep current," stated Principal I.

Others felt the Academy's purpose was to provide current information to teachers and administrators to increase their knowledge for an area of interest. Principal B reflected, "The state should use the Academy as an avenue through which it keeps its districts current on the legislation and trends." Principal H stated, "The Academy provides programs at a dollar savings to the school district." Principals felt the Academy should provide low cost workshops in close proximity to their districts. The Academy should allow administrators to interact with each other, to share with and learn from each other. Principal E stated, "Principals are responsible for modeling learning for the building. If I expect my teachers to keep current, I must also. The Academy should provide for this." Principal C stated, "The purpose of course, should be professional growth. Perhaps it is helpful to young, new, less experienced administrators, I find none of the offerings helpful." Finally, Principal D stated, "Programming should be based on the local needs of administrators, not a state-wide purpose."
Interview Question #6:

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

Overall, the principals suggested similar recommendations for the Academy. First and foremost, program coordinators need to asked the participants what they want in workshops and programs and utilize the local administrators or experts in a specific topic area as presenters. Principal A stated, "Workshops must address current and relevant issues. Networking with other principals is the biggest benefit of participating in the Academy. I've developed an excellent network of principals with whom I round table on a regular basis." Principal B stated, "Ask the participants!" "Lack of state support has diluted the offerings of the Academy." reflected Principal C. Principal G offered, "A strand of programs should be designed for the mid-career to late-career administrator. Our needs are different from those of a less experienced administrator."

Secondly, keep the information relevant and timely. "The state does not show the ability to grow and change as quickly as schools and administrative needs grow and change, we need to learn from each other," said Principal H. Principal I suggested, "In the rapidly growing age of technology, the internet should be designed so that we can interact with all the district of the state, country and world." Principal C added, "The Academy should look at current research and design professional development programs based on that."

Third, use the resources available in area districts, use presenter how are experts in the subject being presented. Principal F stated, "Tap into the
area principals and superintendents for their areas of expertise. Use local
talent in developing and presenting workshops.” Principal A agreed, “We
should utilize each other as resources.”

Finally, offer programs on the weekends or during the summer. “In my case,
often 15-20 staff members attend meetings during the week. This creates a
huge problem of finding substitute teachers for them,” stated Principal F. “A 3-5
day retreat where the participant prepared prior to attending the retreat to give
the opportunity for more interaction between the presenter and the participants,”
suggested Principal G.

Overall, the feelings of the principals were consistent with their
responses to the questionnaire. The principals who disagreed with the
Academy’s ability to meet their professional development needs reemphasized
their dissatisfaction through their answers to the interview questions. Only one
principal who rate the Academy dissatisfactory answered the research
questions from a supportive side.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the study

Since the “Nation at Risk” report in 1983, a significant amount of literature and research have been compiled to evaluate and improve the American education system. As part of Illinois’ response to the “Nation at Risk Report”, the Illinois Senate passed Bill no. 730 in July 1985. The bill gave the Illinois Board of Education the responsibility of establishing a training program for Illinois administrators. The Illinois Board of Education established the Administrators’ Academy for this purpose. As of January 1986, all administrators had to participate in the Academy as cited in the Illinois School Code:

S2-3.53. 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.

The Illinois State Board of Education established an Illinois Administrators’ Academy for development of skill in: instructional staff development, effective communication, public-school relations, and evaluation of personnel. At the regional level, Academy programs and services are
coordinated and delivered through the network of the Regional Offices of Education (ROE), formerly known as Educational Service Centers. The ROE, under the guidelines established by the state, has the primary responsibility of developing the programs and services. Most recently, the Academy has established guidelines through which professional groups or school districts can design programs specific to their needs, while meeting the requirements set forth by the state.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived effectiveness of the Illinois Administrators' Academy on the professional development of secondary school principals. This study was a replication of a doctoral study conducted by Marilyn A. Howell at the Loyola University of Chicago entitled: *A Study of the Perceived Effectiveness of the Administrators' Academy on the Professional Development of Secondary School Principals in Northern Illinois*. One of the recommendations for further study from Howell's study suggested replication at a later date after the Academy has grown in tenure status. This study compared her 1988 data results with those collected in 1995 to assess if the secondary principals' perceptions of the Academy had changed in any way.

Three specific research questions were addressed:

1. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy satisfy one's personal need for professional development?

2. Did participation in the Administrators' Academy increases one's level of competency as part of one's professional development?

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

The investigator compared the results of this study with those of the same study conducted in 1988 to ascertain what changes, if any, had occurred in the principals' perceptions of the Academy.

The target audience for this study were secondary school principals from five Regional Offices of Education within the northern Illinois area. The five regional offices serviced districts in north, south and west Cook County, Lake County and DuPage/Kane County, excluding the city of Chicago. The five Regional Offices of Education provided the names of the secondary schools within their regions. The principals were identified through a phone contact to each high school.

Data for this study was collected in two ways. First, a thirty item questionnaire was sent to 90 secondary school principals identified by five ROE’s. Ninety questionnaires were sent and 50 (55%) were returned. Of the 50 returned 47 (94%) were used for data in the study. Secondly, based on the mean scores of the questionnaire, ten principals, five with the highest score and five with the lowest score, were selected to participate in an interview. The data collected from the questionnaire was compared to the data collected from Howell’s study.

The data was analyzed in two ways. First, the score for each 30 item questionnaire was averaged, yielding a mean score. The items on the questionnaire were then divided into three categories each corresponding to the three research questions: items that addressed whether or not the Administrators’ Academy met: the principals personal needs, increases one’s level of competency, and improve the school’s organizational effectiveness. Secondly, the score of each of the three research questions was then averaged,
yielding a mean score. The results of this study were compared with those of Howell's study.

Conclusions

Although the overall feeling regarding the Administrators' Academy's ability to meet the principals' professional development needs was negative, with 63% of the principals disagreeing with the Academy's ability to meet their professional development needs, the margin of difference from six years ago when Howell conducted her study was only 1%. Overall, seventeen (36%) principals agreed that the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs, while thirty (63%) disagreed. In Howell's study, 27 (35%) of the seventy-two agreed that the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs, while forty-nine (64%) disagreed.

The results indicate that the Administrators' Academy does not meet the personal professional development needs of a secondary school principal; it does not increase one's level of competency as part of one's professional development; nor does it aid one's ability to improve the school's organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development.

Research question #1 - Did participation in the Administrators' Academy satisfy one's personal need for professional development?

1. Forty-seven (47.5%) of the principals agree that the Administrators' Academy met their personal need for professional development.

2. Fifty-two (52.5%) of the principals disagreed that the Administrators' Academy met their personal need for professional development.

3. Overall, the principals felt the Academy did not meet their person need
for professional development.

**Research question #2** - Did participation in the Administrators' Academy increase one's level of competency as part of one's professional development?

1. Two hundred and five (46.5%) of the four hundred and forty responses indicated principals agreed that participation in the Administrators' Academy increased their level of competency.

2. Fifty-three percent (53.3%) disagreed that participation in the Administrators' Academy increased their level of competency.

3. Overall, the principals disagreed that the Administrators' Academy increased their level of competency.

**Research question #3** - Did participation in the Administrators' Academy aid one's ability to improve the school's organization effectiveness as a goal of professional development?

1. 48% of the respondent felt the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs with regards to school organization effectiveness.

2. 51% of the principals did not feel their professional development needs were met in the area of school organization effectiveness.

3. Overall the principals did not agree that the Administrators' Academy met the professional development needs in the area of school organization effectiveness.

Comparison between the questionnaire data and the three demographic variables led to several conclusions. The first variable analyzed was total
school enrollment:

1. Twenty-one principals (52.5%) disagreed with the Academy's ability to meet their professional development needs.

2. Of the sixty percent (60%) of the schools with enrollments of 1501 or greater 50% agreed with the Academy's ability to meet their professional development needs and 50% disagreed.

The second variable used in comparison to the questionnaire responses was the principals' level of education.

3. Of the forty-two (42) principals, twenty-four (57%) earned a doctorate degree.

4. Of the twenty-four holding a doctorate degree thirteen (54%) disagreed with the Academy's ability to meet their professional development needs.

5. Of the seventeen principals who held a master's degree, 10 (59%) agreed that the Academy met their professional development needs.

6. The one principal with a certificate of advance study, disagreed with the Academy's ability to meet his/her professional development needs.

7. Principals who have earned a degree higher than a master's degree did not find that participation in the Administrators' Academy meet their professional development needs.

The third variable use was the principals total years of experience as a principal.

1. Thirty (71%) of the principals had six or less years of experience; 28.5% had seven or more years of experience.

2. Of the 71% (six or less years of experience), 56 % agreed that the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs; 43% disagreed that the Academy met their professional development needs.
3. Seventeen, the majority, of the total forty-two principals had six or less years of experience and felt the Administrators' Academy met their professional development need.

4. The less experienced administrators felt the Academy met their professional development needs.

5. Of the 28.5% (seven or more years of experience), 33.3% agreed that the Academy met their professional development needs, 66.6% disagreed that the Academy met their professional development needs.

6. Of the forty-two principals, twenty-one (50%) agreed and twenty-one (50%) disagreed that the Administrators' Academy met their professional development needs.
Recommendations for Action

The following recommendations for action are made based on the research contained in this study. They are made with the intent that the suggestions may improve the Illinois State’s Administrators’ Academy.

1. Ask the participants what their needs are and design programs that will address their individual needs.

2. Utilize the vast resources available in each of the areas the Regional Office of Education services as presenters.

3. Presenter must be experts in their fields so that the participants are able to gain information.

4. Focus the programs on topics that are relevant and timely. Adult learners are interested in the immediate application of the information gained.

5. Recognize that each participant brings with him/her his/her own set of experiences and problems and coordinate programs that allow for those people to share their problems, solutions and experiences.

6. Arrange for workshops to occur during the summer months when the pace of the day allows for principals to be out of their buildings.

7. Design programs that address the specific needs of the secondary school principal and the elementary school principals. Their needs are different and should be treated as such.

8. Provide an opportunity for the participants to round table to share problems and concerns.

9. Utilize the technology available to allow for interaction throughout the state.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER
June 13, 1995

Dear

I am conducting a research study for a doctoral dissertation on the topic of the professional development of secondary school principals. This study is under the chairmanship of Dr. L. Arthur Safer, Professor at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. The study is a replication of a study conducted in 1988 by a Loyola University doctoral candidate.

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

All information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for academic purposes only. Your answers will be analyzed anonymously.

Please return the completed survey on or before July 1, 1995. I have provided a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Kari King
APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE
School: ________________________________
Enrollment: __________
Principal's Name: ________________________________
Number of years of experience as a high school principal:

Years in present position: __________
Years in other high school principalships: __________
Highest degree held: __________
Did you participate in the 1988 study?: YES ____ NO ____

Please circle the response that most closely reflects your thinking regarding each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</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 a principal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Academy successfully synthesizes mandates and requirements for proper implementation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Academy provides me with adequate in service regarding the development and assessment of school climate.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication from the Academy is frequent and informal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Academy helps me learn how to model creative thinking for staff and students</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Academy provides me with new ideas, procedures, and strategies for student behavior management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Academy seeks me out for advice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</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>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The Academy provides me with help in the design and implementation of school improvement plans.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The Academy provides adequate time to meet with colleagues and reflect upon the job itself.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The Academy makes available to me current research findings regarding the learning process.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The Academy meets my need to provide in service on measurement and evaluation to include test construction, integration or selection.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The Academy maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with principals.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The Academy provides me with in service on varied instructional methods.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Academy workshops help me to focus on school goals in curriculum development.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Academy is receptive to my suggestions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Academy provides me with workshops on the legislation regarding student rights and responsibilities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Academy helps me to establish effective school/community communication and involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Academy workshops allow for active participation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Academy helps me to review fit between curriculum objectives and achievement testing.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Academy cares about me as a person as well as my professional needs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The Academy provides opportunities to work on challenging tasks.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>The Academy helps me in the selection and evaluation of instructional materials.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The Academy models group facilitation skills and processes in the team management process.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

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

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

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

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

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

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