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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Development of Staff Development Studies

In the early 1970's there was increasing concern about the effectiveness of staff development programs in schools.\(^1\) This concern resulted in a number of studies related to teacher attitudes about staff development. Although many researchers found teachers were dissatisfied with existing staff development, most educators agreed that school improvement could not take place without staff development.

During the late 1970s and early 1980s several major studies on staff development contributed to the existing body of knowledge on best practices. These studies produced the following list of effective elements of staff development:

1. Effective staff development is conducted in schools and relates to school-wide efforts.
2. Teachers participate actively as helpers to each other and as planners.
3. Effective staff development involves self instruction and individualized training.

---

opportunities.
4. Teachers help define goals and select activities.
5. Staff development emphasizes demonstration, trials, and feedback. There is concrete training which continues over time.
6. There is a support system which provides help as needed.\(^2\)

The rest of the 1980s brought more research on staff development issues. There were numerous conferences, workshops, and studies on the subject. Legislation was passed in many states, including Illinois, to promote staff development as a key ingredient in school improvement. School districts expanded and modified staff development in order to improve student achievement. The staff development initiatives in the 1980s and continuing into the 1990s have provided an expanded research base and data on effective practices.

Much research has been done recently about the involvement of teacher leaders in staff development. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley stated that "While much research points to administrators being key leaders in staff development and change, it is also true that others (including teachers) can take on leadership and support roles-- and may in fact be

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 5.
better placed to do so."³ Ron Brandt said that there is a need to see teachers as leaders and the principal as a leader of leaders. Moreover, he stated that the principal is not an instructional leader, but a leader of instructors.⁴ Donaldson described the new roles that teacher leaders and principals could play in helping teachers work collaboratively—the crux of professional development. He suggested that principals must act differently from the "strong leaders of the Effective Schools Era." Principals must avoid the urge to "control, direct, and ultimately decide" whatever goes on in their schools.⁵

As in most states, however, Illinois requires that the principal be the "instructional leader" of the school. The challenge to the schools is to define the respective roles of the principal and teachers as instructional leaders in staff development.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine how effective teachers perceive the involvement of past or present principals in staff development activities and the extent to which they believe this involvement has affected their

---

³ Ibid., p. 20.


classroom performance. In this study, effective teachers are those who have been selected as finalists for the Golden Apple Award, a highly competitive award which recognizes excellent teachers.

Each year, the Golden Apple Foundation calls for teachers in the Chicago metropolitan area to recognize excellence in their peers. The foundation receives 700 names and letters of recommendation. From the 700 candidates, the Foundation and a panel of readers select thirty finalists. Being selected as a Golden Apple finalist is an indication of effectiveness.

This study is intended to describe the principal's staff development activities which a representative sample of elementary and middle school Golden Apple finalists perceive as impacting their effectiveness in the classroom.

Procedure

Identifying the Sample

The Golden Apple Foundation sent the researcher the names of Golden Apple Finalists from 1993 and 1994. In those years, the awards were for elementary and middle school teachers. Most elementary and middle schools are smaller than high schools. Their principals are generally more visible, and, therefore, it is easier to analyze their involvement in staff development.

A letter explaining the purpose of the study and asking
for participation was sent to each of the sixty Golden Apple Finalists. Of the sixty potential participants, thirty-two responded. Two of the finalists could not participate at this time. Thirty agreed to participate in the study. Of this group of thirty, fifteen participants were selected at random.

Demographics of the Teacher Respondents

Of the participants selected, four (26.67%) taught in suburban public school districts, three (20%) taught in suburban private schools, two (13%) taught in Chicago private schools, and six (40%) taught in Chicago Public Schools. Six (40%) participants taught in elementary schools, and nine (60%) taught in middle schools. Three (20%) had bachelors degrees, and twelve (80%) had masters degrees. Twelve (80%) of the respondents were female, and three (20%) were male. The average number of years that the respondents were in education was 21.47, with a range from eight to thirty-three years. They could be considered veteran teachers.

Development of the Interview Schedules

The teacher respondents were interviewed over the telephone, using a semi-structured interview schedule. (See Appendix A, page 168.) The principal respondents were interviewed using a similar schedule (See Appendix B, page 176.). The interview schedules differ primarily in point of view. For example a question in Focus One in the Teacher Interview Schedule asks, "Can you describe any instances when staff development has helped you adjust to a new curriculum
or develop strategies you needed to use in your classroom?" In the Principal Interview Schedule, the question is worded, "Can you describe any instances when staff development helped teachers adjust to a new curriculum or develop strategies they needed to use in their classrooms?"

The researcher used the following methods to develop the interview schedules:

1. The interview schedules were based on the Review of Related Literature:
   The Review of Related Literature provided the theoretical framework and content validity for the study. The focuses in the schedules reflect current literature on staff development and relate directly to topics which researchers in the field consider important. For example, one of the questions in Focus One in the two schedules relates to the need for staff development to deal with practical skills teachers can use in their classrooms. The question grew out of the research of Daresh, who stressed that teachers value topics of immediate concern to practice (job-embedded topics).  

of the Interview Schedules to the Review of Literature is Focus Eight (the principal's role in encouraging collaboration). The focus developed from the research of DuPfour and Berkey which stressed that principals must take the initiative and foster collaboration at their schools. For a complete cross reference of the focuses in the interview schedules to the Review of Literature, see Appendix C.

2. The interview schedules were submitted to a panel of experts in the field of staff development:

The preliminary schedules were sent to the director of teacher development in the Department of Professional Development of the Chicago Public Schools. She had over four years experience in planning, delivering, and evaluating staff development for the teachers in the over 500 Chicago Public Schools. She shared the schedules with her department, which consisted of twelve individuals who had an average of six years of planning staff development through the central and/or regional

offices for teachers in the Chicago Public Schools. Because the Department of Professional Development had extensive experience in staff development for teachers, the researcher considered them a panel of experts and believed they could offer valuable input into the interview schedules. The director and the department suggested two minor changes which were incorporated into the schedules: including the concept of ongoing staff development (as opposed to one-shot deals) in Focus One in the Principals' Interview Schedule and considering collaboration among teachers as an important aspect of staff development in Focus Eight in both schedules. In submitting the schedules to the panel of experts, the researcher sought what Maxwell described as "theoretical validity."

The experts whom the researcher consulted helped to establish the "theoretical building blocks" which were the basis of the study. Their comments helped her define on the schedules "the concepts and relationships [associated with staff development] which

---

explain the meaning of [the] actions [of principals]."\(^9\) Also, submitting the schedules to the panel of experts helped provide "construct validity," what Kirk and Miller meant by theoretical validity.\(^10\)

**Analysis of the Data**

The participants' responses to the interview were recorded and then analyzed for various types of principal involvement in staff development. The researcher used the technique of pattern coding in the analysis of the data. Upon reviewing the summaries of the responses to the interview questions, positive instances of certain principal behaviors related to staff development were noted, what Miles and Huberman described as "common threads in informants' accounts."\(^11\) These threads, or themes, translated into the codes which were later used in the matrix analysis. Pattern codes provided a means of grouping the summaries of the data into themes related to principal involvement in staff development.\(^12\) The codes were verified by reviewing the data compiled from the interviews.

---


\(^10\) Maxwell, p. 291.

\(^11\) Miles and Huberman, p. 70.

\(^12\) Ibid.
The summaries of the interviews were then sent to the respondents. The rationale for following this step was to increase what Maxwell describes as interpretative validity.\textsuperscript{13} As Maxwell wrote, the central concern of qualitative research is the "meaning of what...behaviors mean to the people engaged in and with them."\textsuperscript{14} Submitting the summaries of the interviews to the respondents could have resulted in increased bias in the results. For example, the respondents could have changed the results to make themselves look better. However, the researcher sought to view the data from an emic point of view. As Miles and Huberman in citing Guba pointed out, submitting the summaries to the respondents helped increase the "confirmability" of the results by using "members' checks."\textsuperscript{15} The researcher intended to correct for bias by interviewing a wide range of respondents across diverse settings.

Of the twenty respondents, six returned the summaries of the interviews with comments. Four of the respondents made only minor corrections to the summaries, for example, the gender of the principal or the respondents' names. Two of the respondents, however, returned the summaries with comments about the importance of teacher collaboration and leadership in staff development. One of the respondents wrote, "The

\textsuperscript{13} Maxwell, p. 288.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{15} Miles and Huberman, p. 275.
principal has to be a master of letting teachers initiate the ideas... If staff development is totally 'top-down,' no matter how good the idea, most teachers will be resistant to various degrees." Another respondent wrote, "Change and reform at our school have come primarily from the bottom up." These comments led the researcher to include more positive responses to the principal behavior "collaboration," (COLL), to which the teachers gave 66.67% positive responses and the principals gave 100% positive responses.

An explanation of the pattern codes used in the study, a rationale for including them, and their connection to the questions in the interview schedule follows:

**CODE: ACT**

This code describes the principal's active participation in staff development. The code is related to respondents' answers to the questions in focuses three (the principal's role in designing staff development plans at the schools), five (the principal's role in encouraging professional development), six (the principal's role in monitoring staff development), seven (the principal's role in scheduling staff development), eight (the principal's part in encouraging collaboration), nine (the principal's role in promoting sharing of skills among teachers), ten (the principal's part in evaluating teachers for changes accomplished through staff development), eleven (the various roles principals played in staff development), and thirteen (the active involvement of the principal in staff development). Thirteen of the teachers and all five principals reported behaviors such as chairing and sitting on committees, providing funding for staff development, and visiting classrooms to observe how staff development improved teacher performance, which suggested active participation in staff development.

**CODE: FAC**

This code describes the principal's facilitation of staff development. The code is related to respondents' answers
to the questions in focuses three (the principal's role in helping formulate staff development), five (the principal's role in encouraging professional development), eight (the principal's role in encouraging collaboration), and eleven (the role principals play in staff development-- e.g., catalyst vs. facilitator). Generally, the teachers who said that their principals were facilitators said that they made staff development easier at their schools in several ways-- e.g., by encouraging teacher leadership or by providing resources for teachers to use. They did not necessarily initiate staff development at their schools. These behaviors, reported by four of the teachers and three of the five principals, suggested facilitation of staff development.

**CODE: ENC**

This code describes the principal's encouragement of staff development. The code relates to the respondents' answers to the questions in focuses five (formal or informal encouragement of staff development by principals), eight (principal's encouragement of collaboration), and nine (the principal's part in encouraging sharing among teachers). Eight of the teachers and all five of the principals reported that principals engaged in behaviors which suggested encouraging staff development. These behaviors included engaging in informal conversations with teachers regarding their staff development needs or their reactions to inservices, helping to schedule common planning periods for teachers so that they could collaborate, and showing an interest (verbal praise, etc.) when teachers tried to improve their performance.

**CODE: COLL**

This code describes the principal's collaboration with teachers in staff development. The code relates to respondents' answers to the questions in focuses three (the principal's part in helping formulate staff development) and eight (the principal's role in encouraging collaboration among teachers). Ten of the teachers and all five of the principals reported that principals worked as a team member with teachers on various committees and fostered informal mentoring among teachers, behaviors which suggested collaboration.

**CODE: RESP**

This code describes how the principal shows respect or
demonstrates faith in teachers. The code grew out of respondents' answers to questions in focuses three (the principal's part in formulating staff development), five (ways in which principals encouraged their teachers professional growth), and fourteen (how principals helped further respondents' professional development). Four of the teachers and one principal said that their principals had helped them by showing respect and having faith in their abilities. Teachers reported that principals who were respectful remained flexible and stayed out of their ways when they took advantage of professional growth opportunities. The behaviors described by the respondents suggested showing respect for teachers.

CODE: EVAL

This code relates to the principal's involvement in helping with the evaluation of teachers/staff development, also in monitoring teachers for implementation of changes brought by staff development. The code is based on respondents' answers to questions in focuses six (the principal's part in monitoring staff development for effectiveness) and ten (the principal's part in evaluating teachers vis a vis the changes accomplished through staff development. Six of the teachers and four of the principals reported that principals monitored staff development by visiting classrooms often and by asking questions about the changes staff development brought about. By attending staff development committee meetings, they gathered data about the effectiveness of staff development. These reported behaviors suggested evaluation as an important aspect of staff development.

CODE: KNE

This code relates to the respondents' perceptions of the principal's knowledge or expertise on the classroom and professional growth opportunities. The code grew out of respondents' answers to the questions in focuses five (the principal's role in encouraging professional growth) and eight (the principal's encouragement of collaboration). Seven of the teachers and five of the principals said that in order for a principal to be perceived as truly helpful, s/he must be knowledgeable about the classroom. The principals demonstrated their knowledge by teaching students, asking relevant questions about what was going on in classrooms, or presenting at workshops. These reported behaviors suggested knowledge as important to staff development.
CODE: ACC

This code relates to the accessibility of the principal. The respondents said that it was important that the principal show support for staff development by maintaining a presence and being available to staff. The code emerged from respondents' answers to the questions in focuses six (the principal's part in helping to monitor staff development for effectiveness) and thirteen (the various roles the principal plays in staff development). Principals who visited classrooms often and were available to staff and students had far more credibility in relation to staff development, according to two of the teachers and two of the principals. These reported behaviors suggested accessibility as a component of staff development. Even though a relatively small number of respondents described this behavior, the code was still included in the analysis because the respondents who described it said that it was possibly the most important aspect of staff development for them.

CODE: TRAD

This code relates to the traditional (i.e., directive rather than collaborative or facilitative) administrator, also one who advocates a more traditional approach to the classroom. The code is based on two teacher respondents' and a principal's answers to the question in focus eleven (the roles principals play in staff development). The respondents described principals' behaviors such as demanding that teachers adhere to requirements of faculty dress codes and that teachers follow strict procedural guidelines. The behaviors, which suggest a traditional approach to staff development, were described by a small number of respondents. The code was included in the analysis because two of the respondents said that traditional administrators were crucial to their development as teachers in the early stages of their careers. This code represents what Miles and Huberman call "outlier" cases, which are defined as "discrepant cases." Whereas most of the teachers interviewed preferred principals who gave them autonomy in staff development, two of the respondents said that they appreciated principals who had been directive during the early stages of their careers. The crucial difference appeared to be the stage of the teachers' careers.

16 Miles and Huberman, p. 271.
17 Ibid., p. 168.
CODE: INIT

This code relates to the principal's role in the initiation of staff development. The code grew out of respondents' answers to the questions in focuses three (the principal's role in helping to formulate staff development) and eleven (the various roles the principal plays in staff development). Six of the teachers and two of the principals described principal behaviors such as initiating staff development, suggesting topics for inservices and setting new directions for schools. Teachers who perceived their principals as initiators made comments such as, "She's at the forefront of staff development at the school." The described behaviors suggested the initiation of staff development.

CODE: MOD

This code refers to the principal's serving as a role model in relation to staff development. The modeling of lifelong learning by the principal is included. The code grew out of respondents' answers to the questions in focuses eight (the principal's role in fostering collaboration) and thirteen (the various roles a principal plays in staff development). Principals who were role models for staff development modelled collaboration by serving as team members on various committees at their schools, attending staff development, or chairing committees. Two of the teachers and two of the principals specifically described such behaviors as acting as a role model for staff development. Although a relatively small number of teachers and principals named serving as a role model as an aspect of staff development, the code was included in the analysis because of the importance these respondents gave to the behavior.

Matrix Analysis

The data were reported both in narrative form and in matrices on pages 152 and 153. The researcher used what Miles and Huberman called "role-ordered matrices," with roles...
being defined as "a complex of behaviors that make up what you do, and should do, as a certain type of actor in a setting." Her intent was to describe principals' behaviors in staff development. The researcher sorted through the coded summaries of the interviews and entered the positive responses for each teacher and principal respondent on the matrices. The researcher used what Miles and Huberman called "cross case analysis." Using this technique allowed her to count and make comparisons relating to the principal's role in staff development within and between the teachers' and principals' groups.

**Triangulation**

The participants identified a total of seven past or present principals who had been instrumental in their professional growth. Five of these principals were then selected at random and interviewed using the interview schedule in Appendix B to provide within method triangulation. The researcher triangulated by what Denzin called data source. By interviewing both teachers and principals about the principal's role in staff development, she sought to view principals' involvement in staff development from different perspectives. The results of the principals' interviews were reported in narrative form and in a matrix analysis.

---

19 Ibid., p. 173.

20 Miles and Huberman, p. 267.
Demographics of the Principals Interviewed

The principals interviewed were 80% female and 20% male. Four (80%) of the principals had masters degrees, and one (20%) had a doctorate. They had an average of 12.8 years of experience and a mean of 24.2 total years in education. Two (40%) of the principals worked in Chicago Public elementary schools, two (40%) in suburban middle schools, and one (20%) in a Chicago Public middle school.

Reliability Issues

The researcher sought what Kirk and Miller called "synchronic reliability," stability in the same time frame.21 The following aspects of reliability were considered in the study:

1. The research questions are clear, and the codes and matrices are consistent with them. (See Appendix F.)
2. The findings of the study show parallelism across data sources (i.e., informants).
3. The constructs (i.e., the codes) are connected to the theory (Review of Literature). (See Appendix C.)
4. The data were collected across a wide range of respondents and settings as suggested by the research questions. (See page 4 above.)
5. The codes were checked many times across the data

21 Miles and Huberman, p. 278.
collected (i.e., the summaries of responses to interviews).

**Validity Issues**

**Internal Validity**

In the study, the researcher sought internal interpretive validity by submitting summaries of the interviews to the respondents for comments. (See above-- page 10.) In addition, there were other considerations:

1. There was triangulation among data sources (i.e., teacher and principal respondents).
2. The data were linked to categories of prior theory. (i.e., to the Review of Related Literature, see Appendix C, page 179; to the theories offered by the panel of experts, see pages 11- 12)
3. Negative evidence was sought in "outlier cases." See page 14 above.
4. The conclusions for the most part were considered accurate by the informants. (See page 10 above.)

**External Validity**

The researcher sought external validity for the study, that is, to answer the question if the conclusions had any wider applications. She considered the following aspects of external validity described by Miles and Huberman:\(^{22}\)

1. The characteristics of the sample were described fully enough to permit comparisons with other

\(^{22}\) Miles and Huberman, p. 279.
samples. (See pages 5 and 20.)
2. The limitations of the study which could have affected generalizability were fully discussed on page 20.
3. The researcher defined the scope and boundaries of the study on page 20.
4. There was a congruence of the findings with prior theory. The codes were connected to the Review of Literature in Appendix C, page 179.
5. The findings in the Conclusion section at the end of the study were generic enough to be applicable in other settings.

Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. The interview schedule focuses on the elements of staff development considered essential by research and experts in the field.

2. The participants' responses indicate varying degrees of involvement by principals in staff development.

3. The participants found involvement by principals to be of varying degrees of usefulness, depending on their individual needs, i.e., years of experience, their own self-sufficiency and motivations, etc.
Limitations of the Study

The interviews focused on selected Golden Apple Finalists as exemplars of excellent teachers. The study therefore has possibly eliminated many expert teachers who for whatever reason have never been nominated for the award.

The Golden Apple Award is limited to the Chicago metropolitan area. It is important not to generalize the findings to other geographical areas.

The participants were elementary and middle school teachers. The results of the surveys should not be applied to high school principals.

The respondents could possibly have exaggerated the participation by the principals in staff development to present themselves, their principals, and/ or their schools in the most positive light.

The study focuses on excellent teachers. The conclusions may not be applicable to mediocre teachers or those in need of remediation.

Significance of the Study

Staff development is a critical element in school improvement efforts. Because principals are ultimately responsible for the quality of instruction in their schools, and because continuous improvement is needed for schools to improve or maintain the quality of educational programs, it is essential that principals understand how staff development affects teachers.
This study focuses on excellent teachers and how they perceive the involvement of principals in their professional growth. A topic of interest to principals is how to motivate their teachers to grow professionally and improve the delivery of instruction in the classroom. Hopefully, from this study, principals can learn what motivated the Golden Apple Finalists to develop into excellent teachers and the impact of staff development on their professional growth.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The Review of the Related Literature focuses on four areas surrounding the role of the principal in staff development. The first area defines elements of staff development. The second area names indicators of an effective staff development program. The third area describes the relationship of staff development to school improvement and change. The fourth area describes the principal's role in school change through staff development.

Elements of Staff Development

For this study, staff development is defined as dissemination of best practices related to the improvement of instruction. Staff development can also be defined as "processes that improve the job-related knowledge, skills, or attitudes of (teachers)." Staff development can either be formal, as in inservice education, or it can be informal, for example, the daily interactions which a principal has with

---


24 Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, p. 5.
his/her staff. Staff development can either be inservice education, which focuses on immediate needs, or professional development, an ongoing process which promotes genuine professional growth.

Sometimes, as in the case of computer education, staff development must rely on inservice education. School districts have invested heavily in computer technology, and there are many teachers who are not computer literate. Therefore, to ensure that the computers will be utilized to enhance instruction, many districts have instituted inservice education to address a real need.

Inservice education is sometimes synonymous with "training programs." In this model, a presenter who is considered an "expert" controls the content and activities at workshop-type sessions. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley cited the research and concluded that inservice education can be fairly effective, although not with all teaching practices and not with all teachers. Effective training programs have helped teachers develop cooperative learning strategies, improve interactions with low-achieving students, and increase their students' engaged time and achievement in reading and math. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley reported that based on the

25 Golden., p. 54.
26 Daresh, p. 252.
28 Ibid., p. 15.
substantial research body on training, "under the appropriate conditions, training has the potential for significantly changing teachers' beliefs, knowledge, behavior, and the performance of their students." To be most effective, training must involve the participants in planning teams which conduct needs assessments, explore approaches, set the content, define the goals and objectives, schedule the training, and monitor implementation.

Most researchers, however, believe that it is preferable to focus on the professional growth aspect of staff development because the latter can help schools improve their instructional programs in meaningful ways. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley acknowledged that professional development/improvement holds great promise, although the research base for this model is not yet as extensive as that for the training/inservice model. The assumptions of the professional development/improvement model are consistent with Adult Learning Theory in that it includes active participation by teachers. The professional development/improvement model is based on the two assumptions that "adults learn most effectively when they have a need to know or a problem to solve" and "people working closest to the job best understand what is required to improve their performance." 

---

29 Ibid., p. 16.
31 Ibid., p. 11.
Golden described the formal and informal aspects of staff development. Goal setting is an example of the formal part of staff development, and the daily interactions which a principal has with his/her staff are examples of informal staff development. Golden described the instructional leadership functions of the principal and postulated that almost all of them can be interpreted as staff development.\textsuperscript{32}

Golden described the legislative and research supports for the principal's role as an instructional leader.\textsuperscript{33} In Illinois, the 1985 Illinois General Assembly passed two bills, Senate Bill 730 and House Bill 1070 which require school boards to specify that principals [have the] "primary responsibility [for the] improvement of instruction and that a majority of their time be spent on curriculum and staff development." Therefore, the principal is required to spend 51\% of his/her time as an instructional leader.

Golden cited various research supports for the instructional leadership role of the principal. Effective instructional leaders, according to Golden, are not content to "keep the peace," but rather focus on innovative ways to improve student learning.\textsuperscript{34} Gordon Donaldson recommended that principals should nurture new efforts at their schools, that

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item[32] Golden, p. 54.
  \item[33] Ibid., p. 4.
  \item[34] Ibid., p. 29.
\end{itemize}}
they should involve the whole staff in implementing change.\textsuperscript{35}

An essential component of instructional leadership is staff development. In fact, one indicator that a principal is a true instructional leader is the development of a school based staff development program.\textsuperscript{36} Moreover, the principal plays a key role in staff development in articulating the direction and goals of the school and providing supports and resources so that staff development can take place.

One form of formal staff development is clinical supervision. John Daresh stated that a primary goal of clinical supervision is to help teachers develop skill in using instructional strategies.\textsuperscript{37} He described clinical supervision as a collegial process in which the principal as supervisor can play the role of a true instructional leader. He stipulated that an atmosphere of mutual trust between the teacher and the principal is essential to the process, particularly during the pre-observation conference.

Clinical supervision is a powerful means of staff development. It involves the principal in planning the observation lesson, and it focuses on providing formative evaluation feedback to classroom teachers.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{35} Donaldson, pp. 16- 17.


\textsuperscript{37} Daresh, p. 218.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., p. 230.
supervision, according to Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, can be a good source of information for individually guided staff development.\textsuperscript{39} The principal helps set goals and helps choose the activities teachers engage in to meet mutually agreed upon goals. Decisions are based on the individual teachers' developmental level, interests, concerns, and instructional problems. Nolan, et. al., described some case studies which proved that clinical supervision, under the proper conditions, can further teacher growth.\textsuperscript{40} Through clinical supervision, teachers in the study improved interactions with students, learned to use wait time effectively, and changed their questioning strategies. The success of clinical supervision, according to the authors is based on collegiality, teacher control of products, continuity, and reflection by both the teacher and the supervisor.

Some schools, in this era of collegiality and shared decision making, are experimenting with peer supervision. Linda Darling-Hammond and Milbrey McLaughlin advocated peer evaluation and coaching as a means of furthering professional growth.\textsuperscript{41} Rooney described the principal's role in this

\textsuperscript{39} Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, p. 8.


process as one of a facilitator. As a principal, she performed such functions as substituting for teachers when they observed in each other's classes and facilitating post-observation conferences between teachers. She felt that by playing the role of a facilitator in evaluation, she enabled teachers to be "responsible for their own growth-- both individually and as a group."

Barbara McEnvoy described the informal aspects of staff development. She stated that instructional leadership involves keeping teachers informed about professional growth activities, circulating materials about curriculum and professional matters, bringing educational issues to the attention of staff, encouraging teachers to express their opinions, facilitating experimentation, and recognizing teachers for their accomplishments. Even if done in a very informal manner, the instructional leader, by communicating about these areas, conveys a personal interest in each teacher's professional development.

Maran Doggett supported a principal's encouraging staff discussion of best instructional practices and demonstrating knowledge of current learning theory. These behaviors support

---


43 Ibid., p. 44.

a school's staff development. Written correspondence with staff, faculty meetings, and grade level meetings can facilitate an ongoing discussion of sound instructional strategies. This discussion is essential if school improvement is to take place. At times, the discussion may evolve spontaneously, as in a conversation with a colleague or reflection on a problem. At other times it may be initiated by the principal.

The principal's involvement in staff development is considered crucial by most researchers. Duckworth and Carnine, for example, stressed that principals need to conduct faculty meetings, participate in staff development activities, and observe and consult with individual teachers. He/she need to communicate consistent standards for all teachers and students. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley cited the research of McLaughlin and Marsh, Stallings and Mohlman, and others which concluded that staff development which involves the principal produces longer term and more profound school improvement.

Staff development, according to Sparks and Loucks-

---


46 Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, p. 8.


48 Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, p. 20.
Horsley, requires both a "top-down" and "bottom-up" approach. The principal communicates a general direction for the school and communicates expectations for performance. The teachers help establish goals and design appropriate staff development activities. The new paradigm for the schools in the 1990s, according to Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, is "top down support for bottom up reform."  

Susan Loucks-Horsley, et. al., named the following behaviors by principals which promote staff development:

1. [Helping to formulate] a common, coherent set of goals and objectives...reflecting high expectations...
2. Exercising strong leadership by promoting a 'norm of collegiality,' minimizing status differences between themselves and their staff members, promoting informal communication, and reducing their own need to use formal controls to achieve coordination.
3. [Placing] a high priority on staff development and continuous improvement.
4. [Making] use of a variety of formal and informal processes for monitoring progress towards goals, using them to identify obstacles to such progress and ways of overcoming these obstacles rather than

49 Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, p. 21.
50 Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, p. 598.
using them to make summary judgements regarding the 'competence' of particular staff members.

5. [Drawing] on knowledge, expertise, and resources, including time...appropriately, yet liberally to initiate and support the pursuit of staff development goals."51

Thomas Hoerr described collegiality as a means of maximizing and improving the instructional leadership in schools. The principal's role, according to Hoerr, has expanded to the extent that it is virtually impossible to lead the school without enlisting the help of teachers to serve in leadership roles.52

Apparently, since Golden's research on instructional leadership in the 1980s, the concept of leadership in the schools has changed significantly. Teacher leadership plays a far greater role in school improvement in the 1990s, as evidenced by studies such as that done by Thurston, et. al.53

The researcher seeks to analyze the principal's role in staff development in accordance with more recent research on

---


educational leadership and staff development.

Indicators of Effective Staff Development

Daresh spent fifteen years evaluating staff development for effectiveness. He did a meta-analysis of previous studies and found that successful staff development programs share the following characteristics: they are based on local school needs; they actively involve the participants; they employ quality control in the form of constant feedback and monitoring; they take place during school time; participants share ideas and assist one another; and they are ongoing efforts rather than "flavor of the month" or "one shot deals."

More recent research has emphasized the need for effective professional development to have a direct connection to teaching and learning.

1. Basing Staff Development on Local School Needs

Connecting staff development to local school needs involves including teachers in planning inservices, workshops, and other professional development opportunities (including meetings), considering the varied needs of teachers at different stages of their careers, and linking the staff development to school-wide efforts.

Staff and professional development opportunities should

---

54 Daresh, p. 256.
be based on the self-reported needs of the participants. Teachers, according to Daresh, value topics of immediate concern to practice (job-embedded topics rather than those focusing on abstract subjects). For example, staff development centered on implementing a new textbook series would be perceived as being more useful than that dealing with building school climate to support learning.

Roland Barth emphasized the need for staff development to originate from within the school rather than be something which is done to teachers:

When a school or school system deliberately sets out to foster new skills by committing everyone to required workshops, little happens except that everyone feels relieved if not virtuous that they [sic] have gone through the motions of doing their job [sic]. So, by and large, the district staff development activities we employ insult the capable and leave the incompetent untouched.

When outsiders such as central offices in school districts promote a "one size fits all" solution to staff development, they often inhibit rather than promote school improvement and change. School improvement efforts are often based on school effectiveness research, but as Ronald Edmonds said, we often know more about the characteristics of

55 Ibid., p. 254.


57 Ibid., p. 50.
effective schools than about how schools became effective.\textsuperscript{58} Outsiders often promote a "one best way" model, encouraging teachers to become complacent "sheep" rather than more curious but definitely more troublesome "goats."\textsuperscript{59}

More recent research has underscored the need for teachers to be involved in planning their staff development. Darling-Hammond pointed out that because "reform requires teachers to rethink their own practice, to construct new classroom roles and expectations about student outcomes, and to teach in ways they have never taught before," it is essential that teachers participate in planning professional development opportunities at their schools.\textsuperscript{60} Hoerr stated that sharing the power in schools involves letting teachers help decide critical, substantive issues such as evaluation criteria and staff development because these issues directly affect them.\textsuperscript{61} Lee said that principals need to let teachers collaborate on staff development as a means of "putting learning in the hands of the participants."\textsuperscript{62} Lieberman described the need for direct involvement by teachers in staff development planning because the concept of professional

\textsuperscript{58} Barth, p. 40.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{60} Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, p. 597.

\textsuperscript{61} Hoerr, p. 381.

development has changed from "[the] conventional view of staff development as a transferable package of knowledge to be distributed to teachers in bite size pieces to authentic opportunities to learn from and with colleagues inside a school."\(^6^3\) Thurston, et. al. reported that staff development is successful in schools which involve teachers in planning. These schools have what Thurston describes as "distributive leadership," in which both the principal and teachers take on leadership roles.\(^6^4\)

Considering local school needs also entails factoring in the differing needs of teachers at various stages of their careers. Daresh described the needs of fairly inexperienced teachers as being more teacher-centered (feelings of insecurity, etc.) and the needs of more experienced teachers as child-centered (instructional strategies).\(^6^5\) He stated that teachers go through four phases during their professional careers-- preservice (student teachers and interns), initial training period (one to five years), building security period (five to fifteen years), and maturing period (master teachers with true expertise).

Principals generally deal with teachers in the initial training period or in the building security period, and

---


\(^{6^4}\) Thurston, et. al., pp. 259-265.  

\(^{6^5}\) Daresh, p. 255.
therefore, their staff development needs to focus on these two groups. Teachers in the first group would have concerns about discipline, routine organization, and curriculum development. Teachers in the second group want to build on their personal knowledge and skills. Staff development needs to be differentiated to accommodate the needs of the two groups.

The recent study by Nielsen and Montecinos, however, showed that there is a great need to accommodate individual differences among teachers who may be at the same career stage, but who may vary widely in "internal motivation, willingness to risk, and vision." The authors studied seven master teachers using Leithwood's Interrelated Dimension of Teacher Development Model. The model divides up a teacher's career into six stages:

I. Teachers develop survival skills, for example classroom management. They use summary evaluations of students' work. They do not reflect on instructional strategies.

II. Teachers gain competence in basic instructional skills, they are more skilled in classroom management techniques, and they may use several teaching styles. They begin to use formative student assessment.

III. Teachers have expanded instructional strategies. They explore alternate student assessment procedures.

66 Ibid., p. 161.

IV. Teachers have more variety in their teaching repertoire. They use feedback from their assessments to guide their teaching decisions. Their classroom management techniques are incorporated into their instruction.

V. Teachers share their expertise with colleagues.

VI. Teachers commit strongly to school improvement and assume leadership roles both inside and outside the school.68

The authors found that among the master teachers they studied there were variations in sequence, pace, and repetition. Two of the participants, for example, inserviced colleagues at the end of their first years of teaching (stage five. Some of the participants reported that when they were confronted with new situations, although they had largely progressed to stage six, they reverted back to stage one and survival skills. However, with some of the participants, the spiraling was fine. "I never want to stop growing," one of them explained."69

The authors found that even as first year teachers, the participants possessed considerable internal motivation, willingness to take risks, and vision. Participants said they had engaged in development opportunities because they had wanted to make their own opportunities and they were dissatisfied with their own performance in the classroom.

68 Ibid., p. 41.
69 Ibid., p. 42.
Also several expressed a sincere love of teaching. Teachers appreciated environments which encouraged them to "test a better way without worrying about what's going to happen to me if this doesn't work."70 The participants possessed a sense of vision. They expressed their love for children and their need to always continue growing.

Nielsen and Montecinsos said that their study had several implications for staff development:

1. **Recognize that beginning teachers differ in their professional needs and skills.**
   There are within-stage as well as between stage differences. Beginning teachers may vary widely in age, prior experience, and disposition toward the profession.

2. **There should be opportunities for exemplary beginning teachers to plan, deliver, and evaluate staff development.**
   The beginning teachers could attain a high sense of self-efficacy, which is a predictor of how well staff development will produce changes in the classroom.

3. **Staff development should foster experimentation.**
   Experimentation would empower teachers to lead educational change in their schools and districts.

4. **Staff development should promote the development of an educational vision.**
   The authors conclude that in order for teachers to progress professionally, they must have a "clear vision of what they want to accomplish in the classroom and the self-determination to pay the price in personal time and effort to realize this effort."71

---

70 Ibid.
71 Ibid., p. 43.
Effective staff development, as Odden and Wohlstetter explained, must be part of a school-wide effort. The school must organize to accomplish a vision. In professional development, schools must make a unified effort and focus to "strengthen teaching, management, problem solving, and the skills of teachers." 72

2. Actively Involving Participants

Teachers need to be actively involved in the planning as well as the delivery of staff development. Orlich stated that staff development should be based on the "visions of the participants." 73 Daresh's research indicated that demonstrations and hands-on activities are more highly valued than lectures. 74

Darling-Hammond described some staff development opportunities offered by schools working with Professional Development Schools, school district-university partnerships. Teachers are actively involved in task force study groups (e.g., School Quality Review), regional National Council of Teachers of Mathematics groups, and also in preparing a national portfolio to meet the National Board of Professional


74 Daresh, p. 552.
Teaching Standards. The teachers involved in such activities claim that they have learned more from their participation than from other staff development.\textsuperscript{75}

Other researchers emphasized the importance of active participation by teachers in staff development. Odden and Wohlstetter described schools with successful site-based management as those in which "all teachers participate in the work of the school," including staff development.\textsuperscript{76} Teachers in such schools get input from other teachers and often help present at workshops. Lieberman concluded that teachers it is essential to use teacher expertise when planning and delivering staff development. Teachers, she concluded, often learn more from their own involvement than from direct instruction by outsiders.\textsuperscript{77}

3. Employing Quality Control: Constant Feedback and Monitoring

Most successful inservice programs utilize questionnaires and surveys to monitor effectiveness. Daresh suggested evaluating programs in three critical areas—human resource development (how it provides for school, individual, and district initiatives), system and its health (how well school, individual, and school district changes are being accomplished), and specific programs and aspects of staff

\textsuperscript{75} Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, p. 599.
\textsuperscript{76} Odden and Wohlstetter, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{77} Lieberman, p. 592.
development (e.g., the extent to which staff development is helping improve the performance of students.\textsuperscript{78}

The research indicates that data in addition to surveys and questionnaires should be used when monitoring the effectiveness of staff development. Principals and teacher leaders can use techniques such as asking classroom teachers questions about strategies they have transferred from staff development, looking for evidence of new skills on bulletin boards and in students' work, and "managing by wandering around."\textsuperscript{79}

The success of the Richmond County Project, as reported by Orlich, et. al., underscores the need for constant monitoring during staff development programs. The authors reported significant gains in student achievement and improvement in student behavior resulting from a staff development program which included ongoing monitoring and support.\textsuperscript{80}

Todnem and Warner called for adapting Kirkpatrick's ROI (Return on Investment) model to educational settings in order to monitor staff development. This model evaluates impact at

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{80} Donald C. Orlich, Anne L. Renaley, Kevin C. Facemyer, Jerry Logan, and Qin Cao, "Seeing the Link Between Student Achievement and Staff Development." \textit{Journal of Staff Development,} Vol. 14, No. 3 Summer, 1993), pp. 2-8.
\end{flushleft}
four levels:

Level 1: Participants' reaction to the staff development.
Level 2: Participants' learning.
Level 3: Participants' use of their new skills and knowledge while performing their jobs.
Level 4: Measurement of the organization's results.81

The authors stated that most staff developers measure only participants' reaction to the training and how much they have learned. Very few staff developers actually follow teachers back into the classroom to monitor if they are actually putting the skills and knowledge gained through staff development into practice.82 Todnem and Warner suggested modifying the business use of ROI, i.e., the bottom line, usually money, into "change units most meaningful for each staff development program."83 These units may include teachers' attitudes, teachers' skills, student achievement, or student discipline. Staff developers must ask, "How must the data change, and by how much, in order for us to feel that the time and effort we spend in staff development would be worthwhile?"84

82 Ibid.
83 Ibid., p. 33.
84 Ibid., p. 33.
4. Scheduling Staff Development During the School Day

Many schools have restructured their day to include staff development activities. In Chicago, for example, many of the public schools begin or end later so that students can be dismissed on a given day and teachers can be involved in staff development. Also, School District 125 in the south suburbs of Chicago provides released time for some of its teachers to participate in staff development.

Gary Watts and Shari Castle conducted a study of how school districts make more time for collaboration and staff development. The study, done for the National Education Association Center for Innovation, involved fourteen school districts and thirty-one schools. The authors found that there were five common solutions to the problem of making more time for professional development:

**freed-up time:**

This solution involves using administrators, resource teachers, parents, interns, parents, or others to provide classroom coverage to free up teachers for professional development. Some schools have implemented creative variations of this solution. For example, one school in the study had "theme and team teaching" days. On selected Friday afternoons, teachers from three grades planned a combined theme day. Parents, older students, community volunteers, and teachers from one of the three grades planned and delivered special presentations on

---

the theme of the day. The teachers from the other two grades were freed up for professional development.

restructured or rescheduled time:

This solution entails modifying the time frame of the traditional calendar, school day, or teaching schedule. Students arrive earlier at school or leave later. The schools then "bank" the time gained and dismiss the students on given days, making time for professional development. Stakeholders such as parents and teachers need to be consulted because restructuring time impacts them. There are practical problems such as changing bus schedules, but restructuring time is a permanent solution to finding time for professional development.

common time:

In the common time solution, team or grade level teachers are scheduled to have common planning times together. Common time reduces the isolation of individual teachers and facilitates collaboration.

better-used time:

This strategy involves the more efficient use of currently scheduled faculty and professional development meetings and better dissemination of information using means other than meetings (e.g., E-mail, memos, newsletters, pass and read folders, etc.) Schools can thus concentrate on more crucial issues such as curriculum planning and goal setting during faculty meetings. A school district in California allowed schools to use six of the seven professional days before students began class for local school staff development. In the past most of the time had been taken up with central office meetings. The central office meetings now take up only one day.

purchased time:

This solution may be unrealistic in some school districts. School districts hire additional personnel to cover classes while classroom teachers attend professional development
activities or pay stipends to teachers for writing curriculum or for retraining in the summers or after school.

Despite the difficulties in making more time for professional development, the authors stressed that schools and school districts must make the efforts because more time is needed if true change is to occur. Adelman and Pringle concurred and furthermore stated:

"Most administrators, school boards, and taxpayers understated how much time is needed for school faculty members to individually and collectively imagine and examine radically different conditions of schooling; to coordinate efforts to experiment with these new conditions; to reflect on and evaluate these experiments and then institutionalize the most worthwhile, discard the unacceptable, and refine the rest; and to maintain simultaneously the daily functioning of the school." 

Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin called for schools to reorganize to promote professional development, to reschedule if necessary, and modify staffing patterns and grouping arrangements in order to "create blocks of time for teachers to learn and work together." Lieberman called upon schools to reschedule so that teachers have common planning periods. Odden and Wohlstetter advocated creating "learning communities by scheduling common lunch periods for students and staff and

---
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5. Encouraging Participants to Share Ideas and Assist One Another

Collaboration is the key to successful staff development. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin stated that in effective staff development, teachers collaborate and share knowledge, thereby creating a community of learners. Also, professional development enables teachers to work together collegially. Donaldson pointed out that in schools with effective staff development teachers are treated as a responsible community of adults. Krovetz and Cohick described the need for teachers to talk daily and observe in each other's classrooms as a means of promoting collegiality. Moreover, collaboration reduces isolation. One teacher expressed his feelings about reduced isolation in the following way:

"Teaching is so isolating. You don't realize this until you are given the opportunity to go outside your own department to observe someone else and comment on his style."  

Lieberman called for transforming the culture of the

---
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schools "so that people can work together to solve problems collectively." 95 Lugg and Boyd pointed out that collaboration depends on collegiality, which in turn is built on trust and community:96

Teachers need to...have one to one and group opportunities to give and receive help and more simply to converse."97

Reitzug and Burrello called for principals to create teaming "structures to foster collective responsibility" and to reduce isolation:

One person doesn't own a child. You may be able to work well with a child in one area of his or her life, and some one else needs to give you some ideas to work in another area...It's not only team teaching, but it is collaborative consultation."98

Pink also considered teaming as a form of staff development.99 Eisner reported that a successful staff development program focusing on computer literacy in Cherry Creek, Colorado involved training head teachers and administrators who in turn shared their knowledge with

95 Lieberman, p. 592.
97 Lugg and Boud, p. 258.
98 Reitzug and Burrello, p. 49.
teachers. Stager reported on the success of a professional development program to promote the use of laptop computers in elementary schools. The program used in-classroom collaboration in which teachers who were experienced in technology provided ongoing support for implementation of computer use. The program enabled teachers to take risks because they felt more comfortable when a colleague was there to help.

6. Promoting Ongoing Initiatives

Research shows that staff development is effective only when it occurs over time. "Flavor of the month" or "one-shot deals" produce no lasting results. Lieberman concluded that successful professional development is continuous and takes place over time. Nolan, et. al., described effective clinical supervision, which is a form of professional development, as a continuing effort. Odden and Wohlstetter said that schools skilled in using site-based management make multiyear commitments to staff development for all teachers.

---
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Stager attributed the success of his computer education program to the ongoing assistance and inservice which were offered to teachers.\(^{105}\)

7. Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Because the purpose of staff development is the dissemination of best instructional practices, it must focus on teaching and learning. Professional development must, as Brandt said, "make a difference in what happens to kids in the classroom," enabling schools to develop the capacities of all students.\(^{106}\) Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin called for staff development to be connected to teachers' work with students and to develop teachers' abilities to be responsible for student learning.\(^{107}\) Schools, she said, need to have a "learner-centered view of teaching and a career-long conception of teachers' learning."\(^{108}\)

An interesting corollary to establishing the link between staff development and instruction is defining the connection between staff development and student achievement. In their study, Orlich, et. al., sought to establish this connection. They concluded, however, that whereas "most studies indicate

\(^{105}\) Stager, p. 78.

\(^{106}\) Brandt, p. 9.

\(^{107}\) Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, p. 601.

\(^{108}\) Ibid., p. 601.
that staff development has some observable effects on teacher behavior and initial teacher enthusiasm... [they] are inconclusive in their implications for student achievement."\textsuperscript{109}

The authors studied the implementation of Madeline Hunter's Program for Effective Teaching and Instructional Theory into Practice models in several school districts. They concluded that "as an exemplar of staff development, Madeline Hunter's ITIP lacks empirical evidence to support its claims of improved student achievement as a consequence of its use."\textsuperscript{110} The only research cited by the authors which demonstrate increased student achievement is the Richmond County study, although the authors question some of its research methodology. In this study, students improved in achievement and behavior as reflected in grades, promotion rates, standardized test scores, and suspension rates as a result of a staff development program which had included intensive training over time, ongoing monitoring, and support. The authors called on educators to publish studies linking staff development with student achievement. However, they cautioned against the use of weak research designs.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{109} Orlich, et. al., p. 2.

\textsuperscript{110} Orlich, et. al., p. 7.
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School Improvement and Change as a Purpose of Staff Development

The goal of staff development is school improvement, which necessitates change. As Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin pointed out, professional development may be connected to reform efforts, which result in fundamental changes in the ways schools do business.\(^{112}\) A principal can help support effective long term change through his/her involvement in staff development.\(^{113}\) It is important, therefore, that principals be aware of research on change processes and its application to schools.

As many researchers have emphasized, authentic change takes a great deal of time, typically from three to five years.\(^{114}\) True change, according to Swensen, needs to be structured within the context of the total school culture and should focus on curriculum improvement, individual improvement, individual change, and organizational development.\(^{115}\) Sergiovanni proposed a systems view of change

\(^{112}\) Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, p. 604.


and described the four interacting units of change as being the individual teacher, the school, teaching and learning, and the political and administrative context. Sergiovanni described the ultimate goal of change as institutionalization and said this was accomplished when money was budgeted for it. Pink believed that school change should be structured within its conceptions, beliefs, and cultural settings.

Hall and Loucks focused on the Concern Based Adoption Model (CBAM) which states that teacher concern should be considered when planning staff development. As interpreted by Sergiovanni, the stages of CBAM and the concerns of teachers are the following:

**Awareness:** I have not heard about it.

**Informational:** I would like to know more about it.

**Personal:** How will using it affect me?

**Management:** I seem to be spending all my time getting materials ready.

**Consequence:** How is my use affecting students?

**Collaboration:** How is what I am doing affecting what I do with other teachers?

**Refocusing:** I have some ideas about something that

---
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would work even better.\textsuperscript{120}

Daresh believed that Owen's Research, Development, Diffusion, and Adoption Model of Change could effectively be applied to K-12 schools.\textsuperscript{121} The model incorporates a research component and might result in more well planned changes. Daresh explained, however, that this model of change might be difficult to apply to schools because "practitioners often need immediate responses to their concerns."\textsuperscript{122}

McLaughlin and Marsh suggested that for school change to be effective, it is necessary to apply the principles supported by the Rand Study, also known as the Change Agent Study, sponsored by the United States Office of Education in the 1970s. The study described five basic assumptions dealing with school change:

- Teachers possess important clinical expertise.
- Professional learning is adaptive, heuristic, long-term, and non-linear.
- School change must be tied to school site programmatic building efforts in the school site and in the district.\textsuperscript{123}

Watts and Castle described the DDAE model and claimed that it is associated with successful change. The model

\textsuperscript{120} Sergiovanni, p. 259.
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incorporates the following steps:

**Dialogue:** The stakeholders (parents, teachers, and others) must engage in focused discussions about the proposed changes.

**Decision making:** The constituents then make decisions based on their dialogue.

**Action:** The school then takes part in activities and processes which emerge from the decision making.

**Evaluation:** Those promoting the changes then evaluate and reflect on the consequences of the actions.\(^{124}\)

Schools committed to true change must have a mission or vision of what they seek to become. Odden and Wohlstetter called for schools involved in change to have "well-defined visions of their missions, values, and goals regarding student outcomes."\(^{125}\) The goals may be arrived at either formally through consensus building or through informal and frequent interactions.

Roland Barth described a vision as a "coherent core of values to which every practice [in schools] is related."\(^{126}\) He claimed it is absolutely necessary that schools create a shared vision of where to go and strategies of how to get there. He said that there are the following nine means of arriving at a vision:

---

\(^{124}\) Watts and Castle, p. 309.

\(^{125}\) Odden and Wohlstetter, p. 35.

1. inheriting a vision:
Barth described institutions such as New England preparatory schools as having been founded with certain missions. The schools continue following the principles of the original founders. The advantage of this route to a vision is that school personnel do not need to engage in the difficult work of crafting a vision. The disadvantage of this strategy is that the vision produced is static and may not reflect present needs or those to be encountered in the future.

2. explicating a vision:
Schools using this strategy explicate what they have been doing all along. They make "overt what has been covert." To arrive at a vision, they ask questions such as, "What have we been doing and why?" An advantage of this method is that it reflects existing conditions. The disadvantage of the method is that it does not enable schools to contemplate changes they would like to make in the future.

3. refining a vision:
Schools using this route to a vision simply update a previous mission statement to bring it into the 21st century. The advantage of the method is that it enables schools to continue what they feel are sound pedological programs. A disadvantage of the method is that it does not encourage schools to examine what might have been defective in the previous mission statement.

4. borrowing a vision:
Schools adopt parts of mission statements from other schools when they use this route of crafting a vision. An advantage of this strategy is that it builds on existing best practices. A disadvantage of the method is that schools may emerge with a "patchwork" rather than a coherent vision statement.

5. buying a vision:
Schools buy approaches such as the Comer model or the Paidea Proposal which already have vision statements. An advantage is that these approaches often engender true change. A disadvantage is that teachers may not have true ownership of the vision, as it is often brought to the school by outsiders.
6. **inflicting a vision:**
A central office may impose a mission statement on a school. An advantage of this method is that schools can come to vision statements quickly and that there is uniformity in the approach. A disadvantage is that principals and teachers may give only token compliance with the vision statement because they had no part in formulating it.

7. **firing or hiring a vision:**
A principal is either fired or hired based on his/her ability to "produce" a vision. An advantage is that a change in school leadership may indeed result in school change. A disadvantage is that the new principal may try to "inflict" his/her vision.

8. **homogenizing a vision:**
This method involves consensus building. All stakeholders bring their personal visions and then arrive at a common vision through consensus. An advantage of the approach is that the resulting vision may lessen conflict. A disadvantage is that none of the participants may not feel ownership since it is a composite and not "his/her" individual vision.

9. **growing a vision:**
Barth advocated this method because it involves deep reflection on what does and what does not work at the school. The method also involves considering the future which the school desires. Barth felt that this method offers a sense of ownership and opportunities for true growth not present in the other methods. He stated, "Those who have felt empowered as architects, engineers, and designers are likely to feel empowered as builders." ¹²⁷

To facilitate innovations in schools, the principal must

¹²⁷ Barth, "Coming to a Vision," p. 10.
also be aware of potential barriers to change. Sergiovanni described some reasons why teachers might be resistant to change. Teachers have a need for clear expectations, especially in how they will be evaluated and how change will affect their relationships with others. They also need certainty about their futures and how they fit into the changed school. Teachers need social interaction, support, and acceptance from others at work. They also need to have control over work environments and events, to be "origins" not "pawns." If any of the proposed changes alter teachers' responsibilities or their relationships with other teachers, they may be opposed to the changes.

The Principal's Role in School Change through Staff Development

Golden found that the roles principals take in implementing school change varies, from those who are extremely involved in innovations to those who are only minimally involved. Of the twenty-one principals he interviewed, only two described themselves as implementers of school change. One principal stated that he participated in

---
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staff development every Thursday for one hour. Five principals described themselves as facilitators, six as coordinators, four as tabulators, and three as resource people.

Principals can be catalysts for change in the schools. Barth felt that the best way in which they can promote school improvement is by being the head learners, that is by modeling learning for others.\footnote{Barth, p. 41.} Another way to promote professional growth is by being aware of the characteristics of individual teachers and their amenability to growth. Barth stated that there are three groups of teachers in any school:

--teachers who are unwilling or unable to reflect on professional practice and who do not want others' scrutiny or suggestions.
--teachers who can reflect on practice, but who do not want others' scrutiny
--a small group who can reflect on practice and are open to others' scrutiny.

The principal must do all within his power to move teachers from the first to the third group. Some examples of professional development which helps accomplish this change are holding faculty meetings in different teachers' rooms and letting teachers have input into placement decisions for the following year by allowing them to observe next year's
students in their current placements.\textsuperscript{132}

Helping to change teachers is the biggest challenge to principals' jobs, but it is a challenge which principals must accept if they are to change their schools. Linda Sadowski pointed out that it is often difficult to change veteran teachers but that it is often necessary because "the longer teachers teach the greater the need that will update the person."\textsuperscript{133} There can be considerable apathy among such teachers-- many are proud that they have not had to update their lesson plans for several years. With \textit{all} teachers there often have to be incentives for professional growth. Intrinsic rewards are often insufficient. Sadowski suggested the following rewards: "verbal praise, notes..., occasional perks such as taking the staff to lunch, giving certificates, providing mentoring opportunities, financial renumerations such as stipends, release time or coverage for project work, speaking opportunities in the school or district, systemwide recognition, and press releases of accomplishments."\textsuperscript{134} Principals can also motivate teachers to participate in professional development by maintaining positive relationships with them and by providing a role model of their own self-

\textsuperscript{132} Barth, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., pp. 49-50.
Richard DuFour and Timothy Berkey defined the changes which principals can bring about through their participation in staff development. They stated, "The fundamental role of the principal is to help create conditions which enable a staff to develop so that a school can achieve its goals more effectively."\(^{135}\) Moreover, the role of the principal is to change people because in the words of the authors, "Programs and materials do not bring about change, people do."\(^{136}\)

DuFour and Berkey described ten ways in which principals can bring about change through staff development:\(^{137}\)

1. **Creating a consensus on the school which change will bring about:**
   The principal must be able to articulate his/her vision for the school and rally support for that vision.

2. **Identifying, promoting, and protecting shared values:**
   The values show what teachers must do in order to advance the goal articulated in the vision statement. The values are the necessary means to move a school towards its vision. They also provide a focus on the present and a set of concrete actions a school must take.


\(^{136}\) Ibid.

\(^{137}\) Ibid., pp. 2-6.
3. monitoring essential elements of school improvement:
The principal must continually assess whether his/her school is moving towards its desired goals. He/she must monitor and assess staff development at many levels. The assessments can include teacher satisfaction with professional growth programs, helping teachers with guided practice and self assessment of new skills, classroom observations to monitor whether teachers are using the new skills, and changes in student achievement.

4. ensuring systematic collaboration in the school:
The principal must take steps such as forming teams within the school. The teams could engage in meaningful tasks such as developing curriculum outcomes, assessing student achievement, selecting materials for instruction, participating in peer observation and coaching, and pursuing professional growth topics. The principal must create a culture in which teachers talk about teaching and learning, plan design and evaluate the curriculum, and teach each other what they have learned about their profession.

5. encouraging experimentation:
The principal must persuade teachers to approach their jobs from a different perspective and to try out new techniques. Willingness to experiment is an essential element of school improvement. The principal must communicate to the teachers that even failed experiments will be regarded as learning opportunities.

6. modeling commitment to professional growth:
Principals can demonstrate their personal commitment to lifelong learning by pursuing training opportunities, distributing professional articles to teachers and asking for their comments, and participating in action research at their schools. Principals serve as important role models for their teachers.

7. providing one on one staff development:
Clinical supervision is a good example of one on one staff development. The process involves
planning a lesson, collecting objective data, assessment, and then planning future lessons. Clinical supervision is one on one staff development because it requires talking and thinking about effective teaching.

8. **providing purposeful, research based staff development:**
Staff development must include the following elements if teachers are to master new skills and include them in their teaching repertoire:
--presentation of the theory which supports the proposed skill or innovation
--demonstration
--guided practice in the training session
--immediate feedback on the teachers' efforts in using the new skill
--coaching, i.e., sustained practice including ongoing feedback and support, until teachers master the new skill

9. **promoting individual and organizational self efficacy:**
Principals must "encourage teachers to acquire new skills, support them during the inevitable frustrations, and recognize their efforts." Teachers will thus gain a sense of self confidence and a belief that they can truly make a difference in what goes on in their classrooms.

10. **staying the course:**
Principals must avoid unfocused, fragmented staff development programs. It is important to support and sustain school improvement efforts until they are institutionalized. Also, schools must be committed to continuous improvement.

Reitzug and Burrello studied thirteen outstanding principals who had been recommended by school administrators and university colleagues. They found that these principals engaged in behaviors which facilitated changes in teaching.

---
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Specific practices described by Reitzug and Burello included the following:

Providing a Supportive Environment

The principals in the study provided support for their teachers in four ways:

1. **They encouraged teachers to justify practice.**
   One principal, when asked by teachers whether they should be using whole language or phonics in their reading programs, replied, "Each of you needs to justify what you're doing. You don't all need to be doing the same thing." The principals in the study required that teachers do their own thinking and that students learn. Teaching is individual and context-specific.

2. **They provided alternative models of instruction.**
   The principals in the study helped teachers learn other perspectives by creatively using staff development opportunities. They provided classroom coverage so that teachers could attend staff development activities. They also modified school schedules to provide time for staff development during the school day. They added a personal touch by placing professional articles in teachers' mailboxes and soliciting their comments. They attended and participated in team meetings. They framed ideas as possibilities by making suggestions such as, "Maybe you could give [this method] a try."

3. **They encouraged risk-taking.**
   The principals studied provided moral support and resources for teachers trying new methods and techniques in their classrooms. They communicate that unsuccessful tries would be viewed as learning opportunities.

4. **They created opportunities for teachers to work as teams:**
   The principals recognized the unique opportunities teaming provides for teachers to share ideas, strategies, and students.
Facilitating Reflective Practice

The principals encouraged teachers to examine their teaching in the following ways:

1. They asked questions:
The principals stimulated the teachers to reflect on their teaching by continually posing challenging questions about their methods. They also required teachers to resolve some policy and practice issues themselves. One principal, rather than impose a solution about scheduling on teachers, asked that the teachers involved work the issue out.

2. They critiqued by wandering around.
Wandering around helped the principals stay informed. The principals asked questions which helped strengthen teachers' personal visions. Teachers were not threatened by the principals' presence. They interpreted the principals' frequent visits as ongoing support.

3. They challenged some existing practices:
The principals at times challenged program regularities at their schools. One principal in the study, for example, challenged his school's practice of separating regular and learning disabled students for reading. He initiated a discussion on exclusionary tracking systems. The result was that the regular education and learning disabled students were placed together for reading instruction (with the help of the special education teachers).

Enhancing Possibilities

The principals in the study helped teachers implement new ideas and programs. They provided resources, i.e., the money, materials, and time teachers needed. Often, even if principals could not provide money for new programs, they often helped teachers write grants to obtain funding. Even if schools were unsuccessful in obtaining funds through grant
writing, principals solicited funds from businesses, used state incentives, or creatively administered their school budgets so that new programs could be implemented. The principals in the study demonstrated the changing role of the principal in the school improvement process. The schools they led became truly "self-renewing schools."^\textsuperscript{139}

Principals play different roles in changing schools. Sergiovanni described the three types of change facilitator styles:

**responder--**

The responder lets others lead. He/she sticks to administrative tasks and tries to keep teachers happy. He/she gives everyone input and tries to make decisions based on immediate circumstances rather than long-term goals.

**managers--**

Managers respond and initiate. They are highly supportive of staff and facilitators. When central office imposes a change, they help it happen, but they do not move beyond what is expected of them.

**initiators--**

Initiators make decisions based on long range plans and goals which transcend but include implementation of current innovations. They

\footnote{Reitzug and Burrello, pp. 48-50.}
act in what they perceive as the school's best interests even if some members of the faculty are displeased.

Sergiovanni stated that innovators are the best and responders are the worst change facilitators.\textsuperscript{140}

Seller described the principal as the transformational leader and suggested the following roles:\textsuperscript{141}

\textbf{cheerleader}

A metaphor for the encouraging behaviors of the school leader. The principal becomes the team motivator, encouraging the team and providing a link between the "players" (teachers) and the "fans" (community). Even when the "game" appears to be lost and nothing seems to go right, the principal as cheerleader remains enthusiastic and optimistic. Like the cheerleader, the principal encourages the staff to participate in activities and supports their efforts. He/ she acts as a facilitator and also helps the parents and the community understand the importance of staff development.

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., p. 277.

**high priest/ priestess:**
A metaphor for the ceremonial role the principal assumes in relation to staff development. As the high priest or priestess, the principal is the center of activities, rituals, and ceremonies. He/ she can sanction staff development activities by attending them and offering a few remarks. He also performs a "priestly" function by highlighting teachers in professional development activities and having them present at workshops.

**wizard:**
A metaphor for the almost magical results the principal appears to produce in staff development. The principal, wizard-like, possesses a knowledge of resources and the environment. He/ she makes professional development happen as if by magic, through budgeting and bringing together the right combination of people and resources.

**architect:**
The principal can act as an architect in implementing new ideas and designs. He/ she helps people realize their visions. As part of a team, the principal works collaboratively
with a client and oversees the work of construction, making sure it is carried out according to specifications and guaranteeing the quality of work. The principal is involved in the delivery of professional development. This delivery is based on a vision of the end product. He/she listens to the dreams of staff about professional development and can help realize them through a set of actions. He/ she must be a consultant and team member.

**caretaker:**

The principal often works in the background after everyone has gone home, fixing up little things that get broken and calling in outside experts when needed. He/ she provides a clean environment for the next day's work. The principal's caretaker-like duties are preparing timetables and assigning rooms for staff development.

Seller gave equal value to all the roles which a principal plays in professional development. He stated that each is necessary to the success of staff development.

**Conclusion**

As evidenced by the review of literature, staff development is a true vehicle for engendering change in schools. A principal can foster change and improvement in
the instructional program in his/her school by being aware of the needs of his/her faculty, the factors involved in school change, and best practices in staff development. Staff development is an important responsibility for school principals and is an essential element in good schools.

The review of related literature provided a basis for developing the questions which were used to interview the participants in this study.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Part A: Interviews with Teacher Respondents

The researcher asked the teacher respondents questions about staff development and its usefulness to them. For the purposes of this study, staff development was defined as any courses, workshops, experiences, or opportunities either inside or outside their schools which enabled the respondents to learn best instructional practices. The staff development opportunities could have been presented or mandated by their schools, or the respondents could have independently selected them.

The following section lists each of the fourteen focuses in the interview schedule followed by a summary of teacher responses. (N.B.: If the respondents answered any of the questions with a "Yes" or "No," they were asked to expand on their answers.) There is a discussion of the results for each focus, and also, the results are connected to the codes on the matrix and/or the charts.
Focus One

1. How useful do you feel staff development has been to you? Has staff development at any school where you have worked focused on skills you can put into practice? Can you describe any instances when staff development has helped you adjust to a new curriculum or develop strategies you needed to use in your classroom?

Results

One respondent said that staff development had been fairly useful, four said that it had been useful, one said it had been incredibly useful, one said it had been of limited usefulness, one said it had been crucial to her development as a teacher, one said it had been sometimes useful depending on the topic, three said it had been very useful, one said it had great impact on her classroom, and one said it had helped quite a bit. In general, the respondents seemed to have a more favorable reaction to their self-selected staff development than to that selected by the school or the district.

There was a great variety in the topics chosen by the respondents for staff development. Two respondents chose math skills, four chose technology, one chose learning styles, one chose how to deal with parents, two chose middle school philosophy, one chose reading skills, one chose inclusion, four chose science methods, one chose higher level thinking skills, one chose brain research, one chose whole language, and one chose other cultures, and one chose Esperanto. The
topics varied by the needs of the respondents and the various needs of their students.

All of the fifteen respondents mentioned that they had gone to workshops and conferences on their topics, and five said they had taken courses. The workshops and conferences included those offered by Biotech, the QUEST center of the Chicago Teachers Union, TESA (Teachers' Expectations and Student Achievement), the Children's Museum, the Botanic Garden, the Golden Apple Foundation, and the Illinois Distinguished Educators' Award Foundation. Of the five respondents who mentioned taking courses, two did not state where they had been offered, one said that she had studied the rain forest in Peru (She had spent the summer there.), one said she had spent the summer studying in France, and one said he had taken courses on the Foundation Approach to Science Teaching through the University of Hawaii. One of the respondents considered the years she spent teaching in Japan as part of her professional development.

The respondents implemented the ideas which they learned through staff development, particularly those which they had focused on during self-directed staff development. Two of the respondents wrote proposals to implement new programs. One of the respondents had obtained funding through her proposal to the Golden Apple foundation to take her middle school special education students to France in the summer of 1996.
Discussion

The respondents seemed to appreciate opportunities to grow. They had been quite active in staff development and had taken advantage of many opportunities offered through their schools and districts or those they had chosen themselves. They had studied a great variety of topics and appeared to be motivated to continue growing. They expressed appreciation for the skills staff development enabled them to bring back to their students--e.g., good listening skills, positive discipline, and techniques to use in a variety of subjects. One of the respondents said that what staff development enabled her to learn as a teacher, she was not taught as a student. Another respondent said that staff development has played a large part in "rekindling her enthusiasm" and giving her opportunities to network.

Moreover, respondents often impacted their whole school by bringing back skills they had learned through staff development and sharing them with their colleagues. One respondent, for example, as a result of her study of the rain forest, initiated a cross grade rain forest project. Many of the respondents studied topics which would be useful for their schools, e.g., the implementation of technology. Staff development, if it is to be effective, must be a schoolwide
The respondents, while they appreciated individual autonomy to choose staff development activities, were for the most part somewhat critical of their schools' or districts' staff development offerings. One respondent called his district's institute days "practically useless." Another respondent said that staff development at his school has been a weak area, although it is improving. Schools and districts must consider the needs of individual teachers when planning inservices and workshops. They must also consider the age, experience, and interests of the participants, as well as the needs of the schools. Having "fashionable speakers" deliver talks on the topics of the day is definitely not productive.

**Connection to Charts**

The respondents' answers to this question were analyzed and used in Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development," which appears in Chapter Three, Part C of this study.
Focus Two

How have staff development plans been specifically tailored to the schools where you have worked?

Results

Fourteen of the fifteen respondents indicated that there was a concrete staff development plan designed specifically for the schools where they have worked. One respondent said that there was more district designed staff development at her school. Nine respondents said that there was a district level in addition to a schoolwide staff development plan. Two of the respondents said that the development of an individual plan for professional growth was part of their goal setting every year.

Seven of the respondents described their school's staff development plans as related to their yearly school improvement plans. One participant said that his school's staff development plan was "connected to everything we do at school." Three of the respondents said that their school's staff development plans were driven by their schools' missions. Two of the respondents named the implementation of technology as the missions of their schools; one respondent described the mission as "providing academic excellence."

Six of the participants described the schools' staff development plans as having a continuous focus for the year. One participant said that her school's plan was tied into this
year's theme, "wellness." Two respondents described their schools' staff development programs as "one shot deals" with no followup. One respondent stated that her school's plan was "not stagnant." One respondent said that his school's staff development plan is part of a multiyear, continuing effort.

Topics chosen by the schools varied considerably. Four respondents named the implementation of technology in the classroom as their schools' focus, one said that it was multicultural education and African-American culture, one named incorporating Madeline Hunter's methodology into the classroom, two named "middle school philosophy," one named using the Internet, one named conflict resolution, one named interdisciplinary teaching, and one named developing learning outcomes.

Discussion

The teachers interviewed seemed to value the individual self-selected staff development they had participated in more than either that planned at the school or at the district level. The schoolwide and district level staff development, because it had been directed to a diverse audience, had generally not been perceived as meeting the participants' needs. In fact, one of the teachers described his district's institute days as a "waste of time." Another described his district's staff development as "fractionated." The only schoolwide courses and workshops which the respondents thought useful were those dealing with technology.
Research shows that staff development, if it is to help change schools, should be tied to individual needs and to schoolwide efforts. There also needs to be continuity because true change takes a great deal of time, typically from three to five years. The schools' visions, which should drive the staff development plans, ideally need to come from all the participants. Usually schools arrive at their visions through the process of consensus, what Barth calls "homogenizing" rather than by growing a vision. If consensus is used it is possible that none of the stakeholders will feel ownership. It is important that everything in the school-- including the curriculum and the staff development be interconnected.

However, as one of the teachers interviewed stated, the principal must let the teachers of the school initiate staff development ideas or else convince teachers and let them take ownership of the ideas. If staff development is totally "top down," no matter how good the ideas, teachers will be resistant to various degrees.

**Connection to the Charts**

This question does not deal with the principal's role in staff development. Therefore, it was not used in the matrix analysis in Part C. However, the responses were utilized in formulating Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development," which appears on page 154.
Focus Three

How have your schools' staff development plans been formulated? Have the principals of the schools played roles in their designs? If so, what specifically were their roles? Did you also feel you have played a part in planning staff development? If so, what has that role been? How was your input sought?

Results

The teachers interviewed reported that staff development at their schools was planned primarily by teachers, sometimes together with administrators. One of the respondents described his school's approach to planning staff development as strictly "bottom up," that the principal had enough faith in his staff to allow a great deal of autonomy in planning staff development. Another respondent said that staff development was developed partly at the district and partly at the schoolwide level. One teacher said that her principal appointed members of the staff development committee at her school. Three of the teachers interviewed said that their schools had committees of teachers who formulated staff development and had quite a bit of teacher generated leadership. One respondent said that a voluntary committee of teachers at her school planned staff development.

Five of the teachers, who taught in Chicago Public Schools, said that their schools' Professional Problems Advisory Committees planned staff development. The Professional Problems Advisory Committee is a committee which exists at each school in Chicago. Its members are elected by
the various departments of the schools, and the committee's purpose is to advise the principal of the school on curriculum and on staff development.

Teachers' input into staff development was sought in various ways. Five of the participants' schools conducted surveys or administered questionnaires to find out what teachers wanted in staff development. Nine of the participants' schools got input from teachers as a result of departmental or team meetings. One of the schools got suggestions from teachers on good speakers for workshops after the teachers had attended conferences and workshops.

The roles of the principals in staff development varied. One of the teachers' principals attended departmental meetings on a rotating basis so that he could give input into staff development. One principal had a "pivotal" role and was in charge of staff development at her school. One of the respondents described her principal as "very involved in staff development," the most of any principal with whom she had worked. Two teachers described their principals' parts in bringing resources (getting funding) so that staff development could take place. One of the teachers said his principal was on the staff development committee and helped think of topics. One of the respondents described her principal's role in staff development as "quietly coaxing and asking questions about changes in the school." Two described their principals as being "supportive" of staff development and showing
appreciation for their staffs' hard work. Six teachers appreciated the facilitating role of their schools' principals in staff development.

The respondents' roles in whole school staff development varied widely. All fifteen participated by providing input to their staff development committees through surveys, questionnaires, team meetings, and departmental meetings. Four of the respondents also brought back quality staff development programs to the schools. Three of the respondents presented at workshops at their schools. One of the respondents represented her school by presenting at state conferences and also taught university courses. One of the teachers was on her school's staff development committee.

Discussion

The respondents' answers to this part of the interview underscores the need for teachers to feel ownership in their schools' staff development plans. In general, they appreciated administrators who participated in staff development if they were really in touch with what was happening in the classrooms. They also valued principals who recognized their efforts (showed appreciation for teachers' hard work), were accessible, and maintained a presence in their classrooms.

The respondents' involvement in staff development varied to a significant degree. Teachers, as Leithwood pointed out, vary widely in initiative and a sense of vision.
Connection to the Matrix

The respondents answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), COLL (collaboration), RESP (respect), and INIT (initiation). The codes were tabulated and used in Matrix One on page 152.
Focus Four

What has been the relation of your school's staff development to the improvement of instruction?

The self-selected staff development which the teachers had participated in related directly to what they were doing in their classrooms or to changes they wanted to implement their classrooms, according to the fifteen participants. Their choices of subjects varied according to their focus in the classroom. Two of the respondents, for example, taught gifted students. Therefore, they concentrated, in their self-selected staff development, on learning methodologies which would help them deliver a better quality of instruction to their students. Four of the respondents either taught science exclusively or taught in schools which emphasized science and technology. Therefore, in their individual staff development, they concentrated on science and technology. All of the respondents said that they had chosen their subjects for staff development because they wanted to make a difference in their classrooms.

The staff development at the school level was perceived by fourteen of the respondents as being directly related to instruction. One respondent, however, said that the staff development in his school was only "50% related to instruction." Although seven of the teachers directly linked their schools' staff development plans to the improvement of instruction as stated in their school improvement plans, only
five of these respondents said that these plans had impacted how they taught their students.

Fourteen of the respondents said that they had used the knowledge gained through their individual staff development. For example, one of the teachers said she had, after taking courses and studying in France, begun to teach French to her special education students. Another teacher said, after attending workshops and conferences, that she began to teach her students true mathematical skills, not always just computation.

Discussion

Effective staff development, the dissemination of best practices in instruction, must be directly related to improving instruction in the classroom. Although fourteen of the respondents perceived their schools' staff development as directly related to teaching, only five considered the skills presented useful enough to impact their classrooms in meaningful ways. Effective staff development must use the expertise of teachers and involve teachers actively as planners.

Connection to Charts

The respondents' answers were used to formulate Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development," which appears on page 154.
Focus Five

Think of any principal with whom you have worked in the past or present. Could you describe some ways in which this principal has encouraged your professional growth formally (as in goal setting) and informally (e.g., accessing you to workshops, etc.)

Results

Five of the teacher respondents said that they appreciated principals who have facilitated their professional growth. Three teachers said that they were helped most by principals who modelled the importance of staff development by their personal involvement in the process (staying informed and current, attending faculty meetings, etc.); two appreciated principals' "encouraging" behaviors; and two described their principals as supportive. One teacher did not believe that a principal had helped him grow professionally in any way. He felt that his colleagues had been far more instrumental in his growth as a teacher, that his principal, although a fine educator, was very traditional in his approach and was not very open to change in his own teaching.

Two of the teachers interviewed, in contrast to the other respondents, had appreciated the involvement in their formative years of principals who had been quite directive in their approach to staff development. Of one of the principals, a respondent said, "Every faculty meeting she held
was staff development. I owe a great deal to her." Another of the respondents said that she was very influenced in her professional growth by a previous principal who was structured, demanding, and effective. The principal truly pushed her to do her best, and the respondent appreciated her involvement and interest.

One of the respondents mentioned, in addition to her previous and present principals, a teacher leader at her school who influences teachers in staff development. The teacher leader is very involved in all aspects of staff development. Also, because he is a teacher, he has a great deal of credibility and has inspired many teachers to become involved in staff development.

Six of the respondents described their principals role in helping them set goals as part of their professional development. The other nine respondents described more informal ways of accessing teachers to staff development, such as informal conversations, notes in their mailboxes, articles disseminated by the principal which related to their professional growth.

Discussion

The principals described by the respondents exhibited behaviors supported by research on staff development. They encouraged experimentation, they modelled commitment to professional growth, they often provided one on one staff development, and they were highly encouraging to their
teachers. Often, in the words of one of the respondents, the principals "stayed out of the teachers' ways" so they could take advantage of professional growth opportunities. The principals were for the most part highly collaborative and showed great faith in their faculties.

The respondents who described principals who were more directive appreciated the principals' interventions in the formative stages of their careers. The principals they work with now are far more collaborative and facilitative. This phenomenon underscores that teachers have different staff development needs at various stages of their careers.

One of the teachers reported that a teacher leader at her school helped further the teacher's professional growth. The research on instructional leadership supports the effectiveness of teacher generated leadership in staff development.

Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers to this question were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), ENC (encouragement), RESP (respect), and KNE (knowledge). The codes were tabulated in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.
Focus Six

Does (or did) this principal participate in monitoring staff development for effectiveness? If so, how? Does (did) the principal remain involved when changes initiated by staff development are (were) being implemented?

Results

Twelve of the respondents reported that staff development was monitored in a variety of ways at their schools. Four of the teachers said that their principals make staff development part of their formal evaluation; one said that her principal monitors staff development by observing teachers; four said there was no direct monitoring; one said there was no direct monitoring, but there was feedback from parents; one said that her principal monitored by being visible in the school, by "wandering around;" three said staff development was part of their yearly goal setting; and one reported that a former principal monitored staff development for effectiveness by communicating high standards to her staff and making teachers accountable for these standards.

Principals who monitored the effectiveness of staff development often attended faculty meetings. They often asked questions and made suggestions about proposed changes. Their involvement in professional growth at their schools helped with quality control. Two of the respondents reported that their principals helped them with goal setting and then discussed the changes in their classrooms after observing and also at the end of the year. They helped with the "fine tuning" of most high quality staff development, the ongoing
evaluations and modifications which are part of the process.

The principals described by the respondents seemed to monitor three aspects of staff development--the participants' reactions to the inservices, growth in teachers' knowledge, and changes to teachers' behaviors in the classroom. None of the principals described monitored the ways in which staff development affected student learning.

Also, much of the staff development described by the respondents had an individual rather than a schoolwide focus. Individual staff development was monitored through goal setting and observations.

**Discussion**

Some of the respondents described the part staff development played in clinical supervision. The clinical supervision process, as described by research, can be an effective vehicle for staff development.

None of the respondents described growth in student achievement nor cost effectiveness as criteria for evaluating staff development. The research, however, describes the difficulty of using these criteria. Adverse teacher reactions were named as reasons not to continue particular types of staff development. For example, one respondent described a staff development activity at his school which was discontinued because, in the opinion of many teachers, it had been ill-timed and not needed.
Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers to the questions were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), EVAL (evaluation), and ACC (accessibility). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.
Focus Seven

Did (or does) the principal schedule staff development during the day? How is (was) classroom coverage provided?

Results

Three of the respondents reported that staff development was part of the school day. The other twelve teachers interviewed said that staff development takes place either before school, after school, or on institute days. Three of the schools had modified their school schedules to incorporate staff development (team meetings, curriculum meetings, etc.). At two of the schools, the students left early on certain days so that the teachers could meet. At one school, the teachers had one joint preparation period each day with members of their teams. The teachers thus had teaming, a form of staff development, built into their daily schedules. Two of the respondents said that "time constraints" often prevented staff development from taking place during school hours.

At one of the schools, teacher leaders got released time. Teachers participating in certain committees, such as that responsible for implementing TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) and peer coaching got substitute coverage part of the time they worked.

At the schools where staff development took place during the school day, there were often opportunities for additional professional growth after school, on weekends, or during summers. Three of the schools held very well attended faculty
retreats.

All of the teachers reported that their schools allowed them to attend off site staff development opportunities during the school day. Their principals were instrumental in providing coverage so that they could attend conferences and workshops. Two of the respondents got substitute coverage through their district's gifted center, two got it through grants or state funding, and eleven respondents used school or district monies. At five schools there were no limits on the number of conferences teachers could attend during the school year. At three of the schools, teachers were given a great deal of flexibility in the conferences they were allowed to attend. One said he pretty much had carte blanche for conferences as long as he could give a rationale.

Discussion

It is very important that schools make time for collaboration (part of staff development), if possible during the school day. However, time constraints often limit schools' staff development during the day. Changing the school calendar or the daily schedule is often problematic, as the research shows. The use of common planning times for team members is perhaps a more feasible solution.

Many of the respondents reported that their schools had purchased time to free up teachers for professional development. The hired substitutes or paid stipends to teachers for staying after school to write curriculum or to
for retraining after school. There is a need to build in collaboration into each day through planning for common time or better using time which is available to schools. It may be risky to depend too heavily on purchased time in this age of dwindling resources.

Many of the respondents, in their desire to improve and grow, had devoted a great deal of their personal time to professional growth. Many of them had taken courses after school or in the summer. One of the teachers considered the years she spent teaching preschool in Japan as part of her professional growth. Like the master teachers in Nielsen and Montecino's study, they had a need to continue growing, a vision of what they wanted to accomplish, and were willing to make the personal sacrifices necessary so that they could accomplish their goals.¹⁴²

Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers to this question were analyzed and used to formulate the code ACT (active participation). The code was tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.

¹⁴² Nielsen and Montecinos, pp. 40-41.
Focus Eight

Does (or did) the principal encourage teachers to collaborate with one another? If so, how?

Results

All of the fifteen respondents' principals encouraged and supported collaboration in various ways. Three of the principals were instrumental in providing time for collaboration (by finding funding, restructuring time during the school day, etc.), three of the principals were described as "good role models" and as being very collaborative themselves, one principal was reported as being "very respectful" of teachers, five principals facilitated committee meetings as vehicles of collaboration, one principal was described as "enthusiastic, conscientious, hands on, and always available," and one principal gave the respondent flexibility to collaborate in the way she wanted. One administrator, a respondent reported, facilitated collaboration at his school, but he was reported as being "too detached from the classroom to be truly helpful."

Most of the collaboration at the schools took place as part of various types of committee meetings. However, five of the respondents reported unique types of collaboration at their schools. One of the teachers described her district's satellite hookup as a means of collaboration among teachers. Another teacher said that teachers at her school collaborate through a school and a teacher newsletter. One said that
teachers at her school collaborate in "informal" ways--i.e., through informal conversation. A fourth respondent said that her principal encouraged teachers to collaborate through informal mentoring. Another respondent described a unique "reverse inclusion" project at her school as a means of teaming and collaboration. Reverse inclusion is a way of facilitating inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular education program. Instead of sending special education students into regular education classrooms, in reverse inclusion, regular education students are incorporated into special education classrooms for all or part of each school day.

Two of the respondents reported that although collaboration takes place at their school, there are time constraints. Three other respondents reported that time at their schools has been restructured to include collaboration as part of each school day.

The respondents' schools have accomplished various tasks through networking and collaboration at their schools. Five of the schools have written new curriculum (interdisciplinary units, new science curriculum, etc.). Thirteen of the schools have planned staff development through collaboration. Two of the respondents reported that their schools wrote learning outcomes and developed portfolios and assessments through collaboration. Four of the respondents described how their schools' implementation of technology was facilitated through
Three of the respondents mentioned their schools’ cultures as a factor in collaboration. "Team efforts" are highly valued at their schools. The teachers mentioned that the principals were very instrumental in the teaming.

Discussion

The teachers interviewed seemed to value certain leadership styles in the principals they described. They seemed to appreciate a collaborative and participative rather than a directive style in principals. However, the respondents gave the principals a lot of credit for the collaboration which took place at their schools. The research shows that principals must ensure collaboration at their schools. The principals described by the teachers in the study facilitated collaboration by helping to form teams and by creating an encouraging culture.

The respondents seemed to give more credibility to principals who had expertise and understanding about classroom issues. Two of the principals, for example, taught courses or presented at workshops to their faculties. Research shows that it is important to model commitment to professional growth. One of the participants admired her principal partially because the principal taught a course to students at the school. Moreover, the principal required all personnel with teaching credentials, including the counselor and the assistant principal, to teach students. She felt it was
important that administrators not lose touch with the classroom.

The principals described by the respondents seemed adept at creating self efficacy among the teachers at their schools, which research shows, is a strong predictor of how changes brought by staff development transfer to student achievement in the classroom. Also, teachers who feel confident about their skills are more likely to collaborate with others.

Several of the principals described by the teachers interviewed seemed to promote experimentation in their schools. The schools the participants worked in were experimenting with new ways of approaching curriculum, for example, interdisciplinary units. One of the participants' principals encouraged the teacher interviewed to experiment with reverse inclusion. The experimentation, because it involved fundamental changes in the way the teachers taught, often resulted in collaboration.

Connection with the Matrix

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), ENC (encouragement), COLL (collaboration), KNE (knowledge), and MOD (role model). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.
Focus Nine

Does (or did) the principal encourage the teachers to share their skills with others (e.g., demonstrating, coaching, mentoring, etc.)?

Results

All fifteen of the respondents reported that their principals encouraged teachers to share ideas in a variety of ways. Five of the respondents reported that teachers share ideas at team and departmental meetings. Two of the teachers reported that teachers shared ideas and skills with other teachers in informal ways (one to one teacher conversations, etc.). One teacher said that there is a school and teacher newsletter to promote sharing at her school. Two of the teachers said that sharing is done at their schools in committee meetings. Four teachers said that teachers share ideas at whole faculty meetings. One teacher reported that teachers often visit her reverse inclusion project, and that these observations often represent a type of sharing.

The teachers interviewed were very active and collaborative at their schools. They brought back and shared ideas from conferences or workshops. They, as teacher leaders, were often successful in convincing other teachers to use new techniques and participate in unique projects such as the multigrade rain forest project described by one of the respondents. They were sometimes successful in initiating a
discussion about a particular technique, such as TESA (Teacher Expectation and Student Achievement), which resulted in their schools' exploring how to bring certain courses to their schools.

Some of the teachers interviewed shared ideas not only with their colleagues, but also with teachers outside their schools. Two of the teachers taught university courses. One also welcomed visitors to her unique reverse inclusion project in which she taught special education and regular education students real life skills such as cooking, applying for jobs, and filling out applications for apartments. Teachers from all over the world correspond with her and her students.

**Discussion**

The majority of the respondents reported that their principal played an active role in encouraging teachers to share their skills. The principals' involvement, they felt helped create an encouraging culture in which there was a great deal of team spirit at their schools. One of the teachers said that at her school, teachers are expected to share. Another of the respondents said that teachers, as a condition of conference attendance, must report to the faculty.

Research such as that done by Thurston, et. al. shows that schools which are change oriented have a strong tradition
of sharing.\textsuperscript{143} Collaboration and cooperation are valued in such schools. Collegiality promotes change and improvement.

\textbf{Connection to the Matrix}

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation) and ENC (encouragement). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.

\textsuperscript{143} Thurston, et. al., p. 260.
Focus Ten

Does (or did) the principal clearly convey how teachers would be evaluated in relation to the changes accomplished through staff development? If so, how?

Results

Seven of the respondents reported that their principals factored in professional development into their formal evaluations. One teacher said that the grade level chairpersons at her school help evaluate teachers. The peer evaluations include professional growth. One respondent said that although the administration helps teachers set goals, staff development is not necessarily part of the evaluation process. The remaining six respondents said that staff development is not considered in evaluating teachers at their schools.

One of the respondents reported that staff development is part of yearly evaluation and goal setting in her district. It is expected that teachers will participate in staff development. Administrators must take part in professional development, also.

Three of the respondents said that staff development is not part of their evaluations because it is not directly monitorable. One suggested that teachers could evaluate staff development as they go along. One respondent said that
although her principal does not directly factor staff development into teacher evaluations, it is unnecessary to do so because, in any case, her school strives for constant improvement. Most teachers at the school have accepted the school's culture and mission, and they take advantage of many staff development opportunities on their own.

All fifteen of the teachers said that their principals observe them in order to evaluate them. However, according to the respondents, only four of the principals looked for specific improvements which staff development had helped bring about in their schools while they were observing.

Discussion

Staff development, if it is to be effective, must be closely monitored. Although staff development activities are often monitored by distributing surveys and questionnaires dealing with teachers' knowledge and attitudes, the activities are not often monitored to see if there is follow through.

Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation) and EVAL (evaluation). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.
Focus Eleven

In relation to you consider the role the principal plays (played) to be principally one of--

catalyst for change?
facilitator?
resource person?
coordinator?
head learner?

Explain your choice.

Results

Four of the respondents described their principals as catalysts, three said they were facilitators, three said they were resource people, two reported they were head learners, and three said that the principals played all roles in staff development. One of the respondents described her principal as a catalyst, but very quiet in her approach. She said the principal asked questions and coaxed teachers to accept change. Another respondent described her principal as a head learner who attends staff development and chairs some committees. Three of the respondents said that their principals were facilitators, and that it is very important that principals "get out of teachers' way," but still remain encouraging and positive.

Two of the respondents said that their present principals were very facilitative, but that in their formative years they had principals who were catalysts for change. At the early stages of their careers, they reported, they needed a far more
directive approach.

All of the respondents said that no matter what the role principals played in staff development, they needed to retain the trust of their teachers. The teachers interviewed also said that principals must be effective in working through teachers, that they need to foster a team spirit teacher generated leadership at their schools.

Discussion

The principals played a variety of roles in staff development. Most of the principals described by the teachers were fairly active in promoting professional development in their schools. Whatever their roles, principals who were involved, showed interest, and modelled commitment were appreciated by the respondents.

Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), TRAD (traditional), and INIT (initiation). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.
Focus Twelve

Which do you think describes this principal's leadership style? Is/was s/he a--

responder who lets other lead, keeps teachers happy, usually makes decisions based on immediate circumstances rather than long term goals?

manager who meets the expectations of central office and is supportive of staff?

an initiator who acts on long range plans and who generally makes decisions in the best interests of the school even if some faculty members are displeased?

Please explain your choice.

Results

Six of the respondents described their principals as initiators, four said that they were responders, one said that her principal was a manager, and four said that their principals used all leadership styles. One respondent, who described her principal as an initiator, said that she is at the forefront of staff development at her school. Another of the respondents, who also described her principal as an initiator, said that although he has been at her school for only two years, he has already made a great impact and effected great changes.

The teachers who said that their principals were responders said that these principals were concerned about keeping their teachers happy. The principals were described
as "very respectful of teachers" and also facilitative of teacher leadership.

The teachers who said that their principals used all leadership styles said that the principals modified their styles depending on circumstances and the people involved. They were also described as very skilled at knowing when to be more or less directive.

Only one respondent described his principal as a manager. The teacher reported that the principal was very concerned about keeping parents and the school board happy.

Discussion

The principals' change facilitator styles varied according to the needs of their schools. The schools differed in their approaches to staff development and their adaptability to change. It is interesting that a majority (eight) of the respondents perceived their principals' leadership styles as either those of the responder or a combination of all leadership styles.

Most of the respondents valued principals who were facilitative in staff development. They also appreciated principals who facilitated staff development and encouraged collaboration and/ or teacher leadership. Collaboration involves "letting others lead" and perhaps "keeping teachers happy (or at least, not making them unhappy)." Six of the respondents said their principals were initiators, a leadership style which is perhaps more consistent with the
Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes FAC (facilitation) and INIT (initiation). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears on page 152.
Focus Thirteen

In your opinion, does (did) the principal play an active role in staff development? Does (did) s/he--

encourage staff development through praise and recognition?

attend workshops and offer remarks?

bring together resources?

collaboratively help implement visions of the participants?

prepare timetables, assign rooms (e.g., logistics)?

All fifteen of the respondents reported that their principals performed all the functions named above in staff development.

One of the respondents said that her principal is very dynamic and active in staff development. The principal attends staff development and contributes ideas. She finds the resources to make staff development happen at the school.

Two of the respondents described their principals as encouraging of their teachers' efforts. One of the respondents praised her principal's ability to encourage teachers to improve. The other respondent said that her principal encourages teachers to use informal mentoring.

A respondent described her principal's approach to staff development as very conscientious and enthusiastic. She said that he is very available to teachers and that he practices
hands on leadership.

Discussion

The respondents praised the principals' active participation in the planning and delivery of staff development. They said they appreciated principals who worked with and through teachers to make staff development happen. They said they especially appreciated their principals' part in providing resources (funding) for professional development.

Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), ACC (accessibility), and MOD (role model). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix One, page 152.
Focus Fourteen

Overall, how do you think staff development has related to your becoming a superior teacher? How? Has staff development helped you feel more confident in your teaching skills? What part has any principal with whom you have worked helped in this process?

Ten of the respondents reported a high relationship between staff development and their competence as a teacher, four of the respondents reported a moderate relationship, and one reported a weak relationship.

The respondents who reported a strong relationship between staff development and their development as a teacher reported that professional development had given them access to some fantastic programs in such areas as technology, science, mathematics, and reading. One respondent said she had benefitted a great deal from staff development because it has been intellectually stimulating. Another respondent said that partially as a result of staff development, she feels she is getting better each year. Also, she said that her personal growth and classroom performance have been "intertwined."

The respondents who reported a moderate relationship between staff development and their growth as a teacher distinguished between their individually chosen professional
development activities and schoolwide staff development at
their schools. In general, they said their schools' or
districts' staff development had not been very useful and that
self planned staff development had helped them far more.
However, one respondent said that while staff development
helped him acquire certain skills, he had learned almost as
much on the job.

The teacher who reported a weak relationship between
staff development and his teaching competency expressed
dissatisfaction with recent staff development at his school
which was ill-timed and "not needed." He said he learned far
more from working on a daily basis with students.

Most (thirteen) of the respondents reported that
principals helped them most in staff development when they
were facilitative rather than directive. They appreciated
principals' involvement when it enabled them to do what they
wanted to do. Several respondents said that they valued their
principals' faith in them. The remaining two respondents said
that whereas they appreciated their present principals'
facilitation of staff development, they had needed and
received a far more directive approach as beginning teachers.

Discussion

A majority of the respondents, in the words of one of
Nielson and Montecino's participants, seemed to be able to
"make their own opportunities" in staff development.\textsuperscript{144} They

\textsuperscript{144} Nielsen and Montecinos, p. 42.
sought out and found professional growth which enabled them to implement changes in their classrooms. Many of the respondents said that they hoped to continue growing as long as they taught.

Connection to the Matrix

The respondents' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the code RESP (respect). The code was tabulated and reported in Matrix One, which appears in Part C, Chapter Three. The respondents' answers to the questions were also incorporated into Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development."
Part B: Interviews with Principals

The researcher interviewed five principals whom the teacher participants described as instrumental to their growth through professional development. The teachers named a total of seven principals who had furthered their professional development. Five of the principals named were selected at random and interviewed, using a semi-structured schedule about staff development and its role in helping teachers improve instruction in the classroom. (N.B. If the principals answered any of the questions in the focuses with a yes or no response, they were asked to expand upon their answers.)

The following section lists each of the fourteen focuses in the interview schedule followed by a summary of principal responses. Next, there is a discussion of the results for each question and its relation to the matrix and/or charts in Part C of this chapter.
Focus One

How important is staff development to you as an administrator? Has the staff development in your school helped teachers focus on skills they can put into practice? Can you describe any instances when staff development helped teachers adjust to a new curriculum or develop strategies they needed to use in their classrooms? Do you promote ongoing staff development? Describe.

Results

All five of the principals said that staff development was extremely useful to them as administrators. The staff development at each of the schools was ongoing and central to the improvement of instruction. All of the principals interviewed played central roles in promoting staff development. Four of the principals said that they promoted schoolwide efforts, whereas one principal said she supported primarily individually selected staff development.

The principals reported that staff development helped move their schools forward. They stated that professional development was "absolutely essential" and "very crucial" to their schools' improvement. One principal said that staff development has helped her articulate her focus (whole language as opposed to basal readers and interdisciplinary studies) throughout the grades. Another principal asked,
"How could an administrator not find staff development useful?" A third principal said that staff development is "integral to systemic improvement," but he said it is only a "piece of the puzzle." He explained that a school must have a culture which promotes growth--a level of competence and a comfort level with change. The fourth principal interviewed said that staff development helps teachers "stay abreast and keep current to meet changing students' needs.

The principals said that staff development helped change many aspects of their schools. One principal said that professional development was largely responsible for reducing students' absences and tardiness, articulating her school's vision and mission, improving students' social behavior, and improving school climate, especially in safety and security. Three principals named curriculum changes which had occurred because of staff development--interdisciplinary teaching, inclusion of special education students, and the use of technology in the classroom.

All of the principals interviewed described staff development as a process which occurs over time. One principal, for example, said that it is important to think of staff development in far broader terms that "retraining." Rather, she explained, staff development is a process which enables educators to modify what they do in the classroom. Another principal said that the crucial question to ask when planning staff development is, "How can we make what's good
even better?'

Four of the five principals said that they concentrated on whole school efforts in staff development. However, one principal said that at her school, she concentrates on facilitating individually selected staff development because it is "more consistent with adult learning theory."

The principals all participated very actively in staff development at their schools. All of them said that they either chaired or participated as team members on various committees at their schools. Also, two of the principals reported that they tried to be role models for professional growth for their teachers. One of the principals presented workshops and inservices to her staff. The other principal said that she tried to encourage teachers to seek advanced degrees because she had received so much satisfaction from her own studies. The principals appeared to be committed in their own professional growth: three of the principals interviewed were studying for their doctorates.

Discussion

The principals seemed to recognize the importance of staff development in improving their schools and teachers' competencies. However, unlike the majority of teacher respondents, four of the five principals spoke of schoolwide rather than individually selected staff development. The research suggests that individually selected staff development is important, but that truly effective staff development also
relates to schoolwide efforts.

The principals were very actively involved in promoting ongoing staff development, which has been proven to be far more effective than "one shot deals." Also, research such as that done by Sparks and Loucks-Horsley shows that staff development has far greater impact when principals are actively involved.145

Connection to the Charts

The principals' responses were analyzed and incorporated in Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development," which appears on page 154.

145 Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, p. 15.
Focus Two

How has your staff development plan been tailored specifically to your school?

Results

All of the principals interviewed reported that there were specific staff development plans for their schools and that the plan grew out of local needs. One of the principals said that there also was a district plan which impacted his school.

Two of the principals described their plans as focusing on needs identified in their schools' school improvement plans. They described the process which the schools' teams used to identify the needs which resulted in their staff development plans. At one school, cycle teams (primary, intermediate, and upper grades), grade level teams, and parent groups played a part in developing the plan. At the other school, interdisciplinary and school improvement teams focused on curriculum changes, whole language, and using teaming and collaboration.

At two of the schools, various committees crafted staff development plans in order to change their schools. One school addressed the need to develop learning outcomes as mandated by the state. The other school concentrated on
integrating subject matter—i.e., science with mathematics and social studies with language arts.

The fifth principal interviewed described a comprehensive staff development process. At her school, teachers met for three inservice days at the end of the 1994-95 school year to articulate their crucial needs. An inclusive staff development plan was formulated over the summer to address these needs. The plan was viewed by the researcher and includes faculty meetings and symposia on curriculum integration, attendance, social behavior, mission statements, teaching strategies, analyses of assessments, and teaching strategies.

Discussion

Four of the five principals, unlike the majority of teacher respondents, focused on comprehensive whole school staff development plans. They connected their schools' staff development to other aspects of the school such as the school improvement plan. They described the part that teachers had played in formulating the plans. The principals seemed to appreciate a collaborative over a directive process. Research shows that collaborative planning is necessary for successful staff development. The plans incorporated "top down" support for "bottom up" initiatives.

Connection to the Charts

The principals' answers were analyzed and incorporated into Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development," page 154.
Focus Three

How has your school's staff development plan been formulated? Specifically, what was your part in formulating it? How do you seek input from teachers?

Results

Each of the five principals actively participated in formulating his/her school's staff development plan.

The first principal, Principal A, worked with parent groups, grade level clusters, and primary, intermediate, and upper grade cycles to formulate the plan. The school used item test analysis of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills to plan and revise professional development.

Principal B helped to plan a school-university partnership at her school. Teachers met in grade level teams and in cycles on several occasions with university professors on several occasions. These meetings provided a face to face needs assessment for the participants. Then the teachers were involved in a number of half day inservices in which they discussed materials appropriate to new instructional approaches. At times, there was a bit of resistance, but when good programs were implemented, most teachers accepted the changes.

At Principal C's school, the principal worked with the Professional Problems Advisory Committee and various departments at her school to help plan staff development. Sometimes there was resistance to the principal's initiatives,
for example, the staff once objected to an inservice at which teachers were directed to use rubrics to correct student compositions. Later, however, the teachers generally realized how useful the inservice was.

At Principal D's school, teachers take center stage when planning staff development. There is a building level staff development/leadership team and also a district level leadership team. There are interdisciplinary representatives on each of the teams. Also, the principal facilitates the teams. Staff development at the school is an ongoing process. There is a five year strategy.

At Principal E's school, there is a "professional development infrastructure team," which consists of teachers and coordinators. The team formulated the school's staff development plan over the summer. They collected data on the teachers' crucial needs prior to the summer. This step was important because as the principal explained, "You must recognize that anytime you plan staff development, staff must be included and bring its needs to the table." The principal, as she is in all phases of the school, was an active participant. She reported that teachers at the end of the year analyzed the school's strengths and weaknesses. The infrastructure team said that the school needed to reduce absences and tardiness, to articulate its vision, and improve social behavior.
Discussion

The principals and the majority of teacher respondents agreed that collegiality and collaboration are essential if teachers are to feel ownership in schools' staff development plans. The principals were very involved in formulating staff development at their schools. Moreover, they were very much in touch with what was happening in the classrooms, were accessible, showed appreciation for teachers' efforts, and maintained a presence in the classrooms. The teacher participants appreciated the principals' involvement in staff development, especially when they helped fund initiatives.

Connection to the Matrix and the Charts

The principals' answers to the question were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), COLL (collaboration), RESP (respect), and INIT (initiation). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix Two, page 153. Also, there are comparative analyses of teacher and principal responses in Charts Two (page 155), Three (page 156), Four (page 157), and Six (page 159).
Focus Four

What is the relationship of your school's staff development plan to the improvement of instruction?

Results

All five of the principals reported that their school's staff development plan had a direct relationship to the improvement of instruction.

Principal A said that without staff development, changes at her school could not have occurred. Her school's staff development plan had enabled teachers to learn to include special education students in classes and how to use technology in the classrooms. Her school was part of the Chicago Public Schools' Learning Mosaic Project, which focuses on upgrading technology in the schools. Also, the school was moving away from the "computer laboratory" approach. The computer specialist worked with teachers to ensure that computers were being used efficiently in the classroom.

Principal B reported that without staff development, teachers at her school could not have learned to stop using a basal approach to reading. The change to whole language at the school involved intensive professional development and took several years to implement. Her school then began to focus on integrating subjects such as science with mathematics.

Principal C described the changes that staff development helped bring about at her school. She said that as a result of staff development, teachers were learning to develop
outcomes and assessments as required by the State of Illinois.

Principal D said that staff development had a direct relationship to the improvement of instruction at his school. As an outgrowth of staff development, interdisciplinary teaching was implemented. The staff development plan at his school grew out of the goals and outcomes in the school improvement plan.

Principal E delineated the part that staff development played in changing the delivery of instruction at her school. She explained that whereas the content was not changing, students had changed from those in the past. She said that staff development was helping teachers learn to effectively teach students who were "feed on demand" types—used to immediate gratification.

Discussion

The principals and fourteen of the fifteen teacher respondents agreed that the staff development at their schools related directly to improving instruction. However, they differed in their perceptions about the usefulness of schoolwide staff development. Fourteen of the fifteen teacher respondents reported that they had implemented strategies learned in individually selected staff development, whereas only five of the teachers reported they had implemented strategies learned in schoolwide staff development. The principals, on the other hand, attributed several changes the teachers had made in instruction to staff development at the
schoolwide level.

Connection to the Charts

The principals' responses to this question were used to formulate Chart One: "Usefulness of Staff Development," page 154.
Focus Five

How do you encourage teachers' professional growth both formally (as in goal setting) and informally (e.g., accessing teachers to workshops)?

Results

Principal A uses a somewhat informal approach to encourage teachers' professional growth. She accessed teachers to professional development opportunities in a variety of ways-- e.g., notes in their mailboxes, informal conversations, etc. She also showed an interest in their independent staff development. For example, many teachers were studying for advanced degrees. She frequently asked about their progress.

Principals B, C, D, and E used a combination of formal and informal approaches to staff development. At Principal B's school, goal setting for the year included staff development. At Principal C's school, there were onsite and offsite professional growth opportunities. In addition to required inservices at the school during regular school hours, there were also after school planning periods at which teachers were paid their regular salaries for working on curriculum. There were also retreats which were well attended by 90% of the faculty.

Principal D used goal setting to help plan professional growth with individual teachers. There were opportunities for teachers to attend workshops during school hours. The district, the principal reported, "put its money where its mouth was" and provided funds for substitutes to free teachers
to attend conferences and to pay conference fees. Also, the district paid for outside coursework to train teachers in essential areas. For example, all sixth grade teachers were trained in teaching the gifted as a result of this funding.

Principal E encouraged teachers to set their own goals when appropriate. She called the goals "expectations for the classroom." She also gave 38 teachers the opportunity to attend a conference in Denver and will send four teachers to a conference for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in New Orleans.

**Discussion**

Principal A, who reported a highly informal approach to staff development, seemed to offer the type of encouragement a majority of the teachers described as most helpful. Nine of the teacher respondents said they appreciate principals who were facilitative, encouraging, or supportive of staff development.

The other principals in the study used a combination of formal and informal approaches to staff development. They used goal setting with teachers and encouraged teachers to attend offsite conferences and workshops. The principals interviewed were also very knowledgeable about their schools. Research shows that teachers appreciate principals' direct involvement in staff development if they are knowledgeable about what goes on in the classroom.
Connection to the Matrix

The principals' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), ENC (encouragement), RESP (respect), and KNE (knowledge). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix Two, on page 153. There are comparisons of teacher and principal responses in Charts Two (page 155), Three (page 156), Four (page 157), and Five (page 158).
Focus Six

How do you monitor staff development for effectiveness? How do you remain involved when changes are being implemented?

Results

The five principals interviewed monitored staff development at their schools in a variety of ways.

Principal A used formal and informal means of monitoring staff development. She reported collecting lesson plans, visiting classrooms, viewing bulletin boards, attending assemblies, and engaging in informal discussions with teachers. She also sat in on various committee meetings on a rotating basis.

Principal B monitored professional development by collecting artifacts such as the interdisciplinary planning guides and observing in classrooms. She participated in various teachers' planning periods and inservices at the school.

Principal C viewed lesson plan books and observed in classrooms in order to monitor if changes were being implemented. However, she said that the changes occurred over time. She said, "Changing a school is like planting seeds on a farm. At times they don't grow right away."

Principal D said that he required teachers to report to the whole faculty or to their departments after attending conferences. Also, the conferences teachers attended had to
relate to the school improvement plan. He observed and evaluated teachers as a means of monitoring staff development. He was dissatisfied with his school district's checklist for classroom observation and evaluation. He said that one area administrators need to consider more when monitoring staff development is its affect on student achievement. He said, "We often consider how staff development affects teachers, but not students."

Principal E said that she constantly monitored her school. Each class was visited three to four times by the administrative team—some visits announced and some unannounced. The principal explained, "Education is an ongoing process. I should be able to see students being educated whenever I visit classrooms." When she visited classrooms, however, she was not always "evaluating." Rather, sometimes she was "seeking information." The school's staff development plan was constantly evaluated and modified as needed. The plan was under revision when the researcher visited the school.

Discussion

Monitoring and ongoing collaboration are essential to maintaining high quality staff development. Most (ten) of the teacher respondents and all five of the principals agreed that a system for monitoring staff development was in place at their schools. However, only one of the principals and none of the teacher respondents said that staff development
should be monitored and evaluated for its effect on student achievement. Most of the evaluation occurring in their schools assessed the impact of staff development on teacher behavior and attitudes.

Connection to the Matrix and Charts

The principals' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), EVAL (evaluation), and ACC (accessibility). The codes were tabulated and reported in Matrix Two, page 153. There are also comparisons of the teachers' and principals' responses on Charts Two (page 155), Four (page 157), and Five (page 158).
Focus Seven

Do you schedule staff development during the school day? If so, how do you provide for classroom coverage?

Results

All five of the principals scheduled staff development during teachers' work day. They had various ways of providing for classroom coverage.

At Principal A's school, when teachers went to conferences during the school day, team members provided classroom coverage for them. Principal B used district money to pay for substitutes to cover classrooms. When the district money was unavailable, she wrote grants to enable teachers to participate in onsite meetings with university professors. At Principal C's school, there was a very active parents' group which helped provide classroom coverage by parents so that teachers could meet during the school day, when necessary. Principal D said that the culture in his district supported staff development. Substitutes were provided when teachers attended conferences during the school day.

Principal E devised a very innovative solution to finding the time for staff development. Her school utilized flextime. Teachers went home early four out of five days (after the students had gone home). They banked their time, and then on the fifth day, stayed after school for staff development.

Discussion

One of the indicators of effective staff development is
that it takes place during the school day. All five of the principals had systems to release teachers to attend offsite conferences during the school day. Three of the principals also had built in onsite collaboration and staff development as part of the regular school day.

The teacher respondents' perceptions differed from those of the principals. Only three of the fifteen respondents considered staff development as part of the school day. It is possible that they did not consider common planning periods which offered opportunities to collaborate as staff development. However, many researchers name teaming and collaboration as forms of staff development.

Connection to the Matrix and Charts

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the code ACT (active participation). The code was tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There is a comparative analysis of teacher and principal responses on Chart Two, page 155.
Focus Eight

Do you encourage teachers to collaborate with one another? If so, How?

Results

All five of the principals interviewed encouraged teachers to collaborate in a number of ways.

At Principal A's school, teachers met at least twice per week to collaborate on curriculum, teaching strategies, and outcomes. The principal reported that teachers worked together well and that the meetings were quite productive.

At Principal B's school, teachers planned for interdisciplinary teaching during their common preparation times each day. They shared strategies and wrote up a weekly or monthly lesson plan incorporating science with mathematics or language arts with social studies.

At Principal C's school teachers collaborated with each other during planning periods, at faculty meetings, and at departmental meetings. Also, they collaborated at faculty retreats which were attended by over 90% of the teachers.

Principal D encouraged his teachers to collaborate during their interdisciplinary team meetings. The teams met every week. There was also a school improvement planning team which met every two weeks. The principal reported that his school's culture supported collaboration: there was a comfort level and also a high level of competence at the school.

Principal E was very instrumental in collaboration at
her school. She encouraged collaboration by sending 38 interdisciplinary team members to a conference in Denver. Also, teachers were encouraged to visit one another's classes at the school. The principal wrote a State Title I Replacement Funds grant (STIR) to free up teachers to visit other schools. The principal reported that her faculty had become far more collegial. The school was large, but as a result of her efforts, the teachers were beginning to know one another.

**Discussion**

The principals and the teacher respondents agreed that the principals took steps to ensure collaboration at their schools. All of the principals interviewed were actively involved in the collaborative efforts at their schools. They often attended various team and committee meetings as active participants. They provided resources for collaboration. The principals created what one of the teacher respondents called "a culture of encouragement." Teaching, which has in the past been very isolating and insular, has become a far more collaborative effort.

**Connection to the Matrix and Charts**

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), ENC (encouragement), COLL (collaboration), KNE (knowledge), and MOD (role model). The codes were tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are
comparative analyses of the codes in Charts Two (page 155), Three (page 156), Five (page 158), and Six (page 159).
Focus Nine

Do you encourage teachers to share skills with one another? (e.g. demonstrating, coaching, mentoring, etc.)

The five principals encouraged teachers to share skills through mentoring, peer coaching, and demonstration.

Principal A used formal and informal means to encourage teachers to share skills with one another. Teachers shared at team and faculty meetings. Also, teachers presented to each other at meetings. For example, a teacher recently presented on how to write for the Young Authors contest. Sometimes mentoring was used as a form of pre-remediation. The principal often paired up teachers who might be weaker at certain skills, for example, classroom management, with those who might be stronger.

The four other principals interviewed also encouraged teachers to share with one another. At Principal B's and C's schools, teachers were encouraged to share during interdisciplinary and other team meetings. Principal B also shared with her faculty: she presented at various workshops for the faculty. At Principal D's school, there was a system of peer coaching and mentoring. At Principal E's school, teachers shared with one another in the school newsletter. Also, the administrative team mentored teachers. The principal "buddied up" teachers to proofread attendance books. Teachers facilitated and presented at symposia and on inservice days.
Discussion

The teachers' and principals' perceptions about sharing were similar: teachers at their schools often share skills with one another. Systems for mentoring, peer coaching, and demonstrating were in place. A strong tradition of collaboration and cooperation permeated the schools. Research supports collegiality in schools as a prerequisite to improvement. All of the principals reported that their schools were becoming more collegial. Principal E was especially proud that teacher worked together much better than when she had first come to the school. Despite the large size of her school, she influenced teachers to collaborate and share.

Connection to the Matrix and Charts

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation) and ENC (encouragement). The codes were tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are comparative analyses of principal and teacher responses in Charts Two (page 155) and Three (page 156).
Focus Ten

Do you communicate how teachers will be evaluated in relation to the changes accomplished through staff development?

Results

Three of the five principals considered the area of professional growth when evaluating teachers.

Principal A considered staff development as part of teachers' overall "self-improvement." She said that teachers, in order to continue growing, needed to take advantage of self-initiated efforts. The principal considered studying for advanced degrees a type of staff development.

In Principal B's district it was expected that teachers participate in staff development. Participation in professional growth opportunities is one of the criteria in the district's formal evaluation instrument. Administrators are also expected to participate in staff development.

Principal E tried to use formative evaluation as much as possible, especially for teachers in need of support, as a form of staff development. She encouraged teachers to set goals for themselves. She visited classrooms often and was an active participant when she visited. Sometimes when teachers' classes did not go well, she gave instant feedback and suggestions.

Principals C and D did not consider staff development when evaluating teachers. At Principal C's school, teachers were evaluated using a formal checklist. The principal did
not like this method of evaluation and was trying to help develop a better instrument. Principal D reported that there was no formal carryover from staff development to evaluation.

**Discussion**

Not all of the principals considered the area of professional development when evaluating teachers. Only seven of the teacher respondents and three of the five principals reported that professional development was taken into consideration for evaluation. The principals often visited classrooms and observed teachers, but they were not always looking for the changes brought about through staff development. Research says that teachers must know how they are to be evaluated in relation to the changes staff development brings. Also, one of the ways of assessing staff development is by how much it changes teachers' behavior.

**Connection to Matrix and Charts**

The principals' answers were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation) and EVAL (evaluation). The codes were tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are comparative analyses of principal and teacher responses on Charts Two (page 155) and Four (page 157).
Focus Eleven

Do you consider your role in staff development to be principally one of--

catalyst for change?
facilitator?
resource person?
coordinator?
head learner?

Explain your choice.

Results

Two of the principals described themselves as facilitators. The other three principals described themselves as catalysts for change.

The two principals who described themselves as facilitators stressed the importance of working with and through teachers. Principal A, when reporting her part in staff development, said, "I can't make it happen. I can make it easier to happen." Principal D described his part as a member of a team. His teachers had true ownership of the goals of the school because they developed them.

The three principals who described themselves as catalysts explained that they had the visions which resulted in fundamental changes at their schools. Principal B said that she envisioned a school which used whole language and brought her staff along. It was a process which took a number of years. Principal C said that she wanted teachers to use alternate assessments. There was some resistance at first, but she planted the seeds for change. Principal E's efforts
resulted in improvements, especially in the area of school climate. The school became far safer and more secure, also there was increased collegiality.

Discussion

The perceptions of the teacher respondents and those of the principals matched well for this question. The two principals who said they were facilitators also were described by their teachers as facilitators. The three principals who reported they were catalysts were described by their teachers as catalysts. All of the teachers retained the trust of their teachers. They were excellent educational leaders in that whether they used a directive or a facilitative approach, they ensured that teachers had ownership of staff development.

Connection to the Matrix and Charts

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), FAC (facilitation), TRAD (traditional), and INIT (initiation). The codes were tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are comparative analyses of principal and teacher responses on Charts Two (page 155) and Six (page 159).
Focus Twelve

How do you characterize your leadership style?

**responder:** lets others lead, keeps teachers happy, usually makes decisions based on immediate circumstances rather than long term goals

**manager:** meets the expectations of central office, is supportive of staff

**initiator:** acts on long range plans, makes decisions in the best interests of the school even if some faculty members are displeased

Explain your choice.

Results

Three of the principals described themselves as initiators. The other two principals interviewed said that they used all leadership styles, depending on the situation and the teachers with whom they dealt.

The principals who described themselves as initiators said that they were able to make fundamental changes at their schools. Principal B reported that partially because of her style, she was able to convince teachers to use whole language instead of a basal approach to reading. Principal C said that she was very proactive in getting her school to change its ways of assessing students' progress. Principal E reported that some of the teachers were surprised that she has been able to change so much at her school so quickly. The teachers noticed that there was a significant improvement in civility and respect at the school.
Principals A and D reported using all leadership styles. They said that depending on the situation and the people involved, at times an administrator might need to be a responder (letting teachers lead), a manager, or an initiator. An effective principal needs to be flexible, they explained.

Discussion

The principals interviewed were described by their teachers as either initiators or as using a combination of all leadership styles. The principals' descriptions of themselves matched their teachers' descriptions very well. The principals who used all leadership styles recognized what Sergiovanni called the nonlinear condition of schools and adapted accordingly. The principals who were described as initiators were able to make many changes in their schools. Thus, there are advantages to being an initiator and to using all leadership styles.

Connection to the Matrix and Charts

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the codes FAC (facilitation) and INIT (initiation). The codes were tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are comparative analyses of principal and teacher responses on Charts Two (page 155) and Six (page 159).
Focus Thirteen

Do you play an active role in staff development? If so, how?
Do you--

encourage staff development through praise and recognition?

attend workshops and offer remarks?

bring together resources?

help implement the visions of the participants?

prepare timetables, assign rooms?

Results

All five of the principals played very active roles in staff development at their schools. They agreed that if staff development was to be truly effective, they needed to show support and participate with teachers. They reported that they were directly involved with all of the functions associated with staff development, except perhaps logistics, which they generally delegated.

They encouraged staff development by praising and recognizing teachers' efforts. Principal A, for example, encouraged teachers to present at workshops and inservices. She also praised teachers for upgrading their skills and showed an interest in their outside coursework. Principal E made sure that teachers' accomplishments were recognized in the school newsletter.

Several of the principals attended workshops. Principal
D, for example, participated as an active member of the interdisciplinary and school improvement teams at his school. Principal B also attended team meetings on a rotating basis. Principal E was an active participant at several team and committee meetings at her school.

The principals were able to bring together resources to help facilitate staff development at their schools. Principal B for example, wrote grants to free up teachers for staff development. Principal E wrote a STIR grant to help fund staff development. She also was able to get more antipoverty funds into her school and used some of them to pay for staff development.

The principals helped the teachers at their schools implement their visions. In fact, part of Principal E's focus was to help the teachers articulate their visions better. All of the principals sought input from their teachers on staff development.

**Discussion**

The principals and the teacher respondents agreed that principals need to participate actively to ensure effective staff development. The principals interviewed reported that they played very active roles in their schools' staff development. They played four of the five roles described by Seller-- the cheerleader, the high priest/priestess, the architect, and the wizard. They offered encouragement to teachers while they were trying to improve and supported their
efforts in many ways.

Connection to the Matrix and Charts

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the codes ACT (active participation), ACC (accessibility), and MOD (role model). The codes were tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are also comparative analyses of principal and teacher responses in Charts Two (page 155), Five (page 158), and Six (page 159).
Focus Fourteen

Overall, how do you think staff development has related to your teachers' growth? In your opinion, has staff development helped your teachers gain confidence in their teaching skills?

Results

All five of the principals reported that staff development had a very strong relationship to their teachers' professional growth and helped their teachers gain skills which improved their performance in the classroom.

Principal A said that staff development was crucial to improving her school. There was a great deal of growth and change at her school, partially as a result of staff development and partly because there is high quality staff. The principal's part in staff development, she said, is that s/he can inspire teachers. The principal can demonstrate behaviors which s/he values. Through modeling the principal can impact staff. Trust is important, especially in the area of staff development. The principal's advice was to communicate clearly that what one wants is best for the teacher and community. Evaluation and staff development, she explained, should be formative. Principals can get a great sense of accomplishment through staff development.

Principal B agreed that principals can get satisfaction from involvement in staff development. She said that her school changed and improved partially as a result of staff development. However, to truly change, the principal
explained, schools must have teachers who love children and are committed.

Principal C felt that she accomplished a great deal through staff development. She reported, however, that some of the successes at her school happened because there was truly innovative and dedicated staff.

Principal D felt that staff development enabled his school to constantly and continuously improve. However, he said that staff development is "only a piece of the puzzle." It must be connected to everything done at the school.

Principal E said that staff development was essential so that teachers could "keep abreast and stay current" to meet students' changing needs. Staff development played a role in exposing staff to content competency and a wide range of top professional educators.

Discussion

The principals' and the teacher respondents' answers to this question showed differing perceptions. While all of the principals linked fundamental changes to schoolwide staff development, the teachers connected changes and improvements to individually selected staff development. The principals also attributed part of the changes in their schools to staff development. They mentioned a factor in change, that of quality of teachers, which did not appear in the teachers'
responses. The research indicates that the true goal of educational leadership is to influence teachers to change and improve. Only then can schools improve their delivery of instruction. On the other hand, the research also describes the individual differences among teachers in their willingness to change.

**Connection to the Matrix and Charts**

The principals' responses were analyzed and used to formulate the code RESP (respect). The code was tabulated and reported on Matrix Two, page 153. There are also comparative analyses of principal and teacher responses on Chart Four, page 157. The responses to this question, which focuses on the overall usefulness of staff development, was also factored in Chart One, page 154.
C. Comparative Analysis of Teacher and Principal Responses

The following section is a visual representation of the data. There are two matrices which utilize the codes which are explained on pages 11 through 15 in Chapter One and again in Appendix D, page 181. The first matrix deals with teacher perceptions of principal involvement in staff development. The second matrix presents principal perceptions of their own involvement in staff development.

It is interesting to note that there is a great deal of between and within group difference in the perceptions of both the teachers and the principals. Teachers ranged from one to seven positive responses on the descriptors with a mean of 4.2 positive responses. The principals ranged from five to ten positive responses with a mean of seven positive responses.

Overall, the principals viewed their involvement in schoolwide staff development as extremely helpful to professional development, whereas the teachers focused more on individually selected staff development. Chart One on page 154 is a visual representation of the relative perceptions of teachers and principals on self-selected and schoolwide staff development. This chart was derived from an analysis of respondents' answers to the questions in Focuses One, Two, Four, and Fourteen. Over eighty percent of the teacher respondents as opposed to twenty percent of the principals reported that self-selected staff development had furthered
professional growth. On the other hand, thirty-three percent of the teachers as opposed to eighty percent of the principals reported that schoolwide staff development had been useful.

Charts Two through Six are visual representations of the relative perceptions of the teachers and principals on the eleven descriptors. On two of the descriptors, respect and initiation, there were the same percentage (40%) of positive responses by teachers and principals. On other descriptors, for example evaluation (40% teachers versus 80% principals) and role model (13% teachers versus 100% principals), there were substantial between group differences. The percentage of between group difference ranged from zero to eighty-seven percent, with a mean difference of 26.15.
### Matrix One: How Teacher Respondents View Principal Involvement in Staff Development

#### Codes

- **ACT**: active participation
- **FAC**: facilitation
- **ENC**: encouragement
- **COLL**: collaboration
- **RESP**: respect
- **EVAL**: evaluation
- **KNE**: knowledge
- **ACC**: accessibility
- **TRAD**: traditional
- **INIT**: initiation
- **MOD**: role model

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ENC</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>RESP</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>KNE</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>TRAD</th>
<th>INIT</th>
<th>MOD</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentages

- **%**
  - **86.67%**: respect
  - **26%**: evaluation
  - **53%**: knowledge
  - **66.67%**: accessibility
  - **20%**: traditional
  - **40%**: initiation
  - **13%**: role model
  - **13%**: traditional
### Matrix Two

**Principals' Perceptions of Their Own Involvement in Staff Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>ENC</th>
<th>COLL</th>
<th>RESP</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>KNE</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>TRAD</th>
<th>INIT</th>
<th>MOD</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes**
- ACT: active participation
- FAC: facilitation
- ENC: encouragement
- COLL: collaboration
- RESP: respect
- EVAL: evaluation
- KNE: knowledge
- ACC: accessibility
- TRAD: traditional
- INIT: initiation
- MOD: role model
**Self Selected School Wide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Staff Development</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Selected</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Wide</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART TWO

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Involvement</th>
<th>Active Participation</th>
<th>Facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

![Bar chart showing comparative perceptions between teachers and principals for active participation and facilitation. Teachers have higher perceptions for active participation and facilitation compared to principals.]
CHART THREE

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Encouragement</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS
CHART FOUR

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

Principal Involvement

- Respect
- Evaluation

Percent Respondents

- Teachers
- Principals
CHART FIVE

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS

Principal Involvement

Knowledge

Accessibility

Percentage Respondents

Teachers

Principals
### Comparative Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Model</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the 1970s and 1980s there were a number of studies focusing on defining effective staff development programs in schools. These studies continue in the 1990s and have helped define best practices for teachers' professional development. This study focuses on the extent to which excellent teachers believe their past or present principals' involvement in staff development has affected their teaching.

Golden Apple elementary and middle school finalists were defined as the group from which to draw participants for the study. The respondents were selected from this group because to become finalists they were recognized by their peers and the Golden Apple Foundation for excellence in teaching. Some of the teacher respondents named principals who were instrumental in their professional growth through staff development. Elementary and middle school teachers and principals were the sample population from which respondents were selected. Elementary and middle schools are generally smaller than high schools, and therefore, their principals are possibly more visible and could have greater impact on staff development. Sixty of the Golden Apple finalists from 1993 and 1994 were contacted, and thirty-two responded.

From the thirty-two potential respondents, fifteen were randomly selected. The sample is small, but meaningful
conclusions can be drawn from the responses because the interview schedule was comprehensive and the respondents were invited to comment on the results. Also, five of the seven principals named by the respondents were visited and interviewed at their schools.

Both the teacher respondents' and the principals' interviews focused on five general aspects associated with staff development.

1. Usefulness of Staff Development: The teacher respondents and principals interviewed agreed that staff development is essential to improving instruction to students. However, whereas the majority of teacher respondents said that individually selected staff development helped them most, four of the five principals interviewed reported that schoolwide staff development was most helpful. This finding has implications for the principal trying to change and improve his or her school. Teachers need to feel a sense of ownership in staff development, and in order to view it as useful, it must correlate with their own personal interests and needs.

2. Formulation of Staff Development Plans: The teachers and principals in the study collaborated in a variety of ways to formulate staff development plans for their schools. They considered such issues as time, resources, and materials needed. The teachers appreciated top down support for teacher generated initiatives.

3. Implementation of Staff Development: The teacher
3. Implementation of Staff Development: The teacher participants worked very hard to implement innovations when they felt ownership. Most of them actively shared skills with other teachers at their schools. At the majority of the respondents' schools, systems for mentoring, peer coaching, and demonstration were in place. The principals interviewed supported the teachers' efforts at implementation.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation of Staff Development Plans: Ten of the teacher respondents and all five of the principals interviewed agreed that there were systems for monitoring and evaluating staff development plans at their schools. However, most of the evaluation focused on how staff development impacted teacher behavior and attitudes rather than on how it staff development affected student achievement.

5. Advancement of Staff Development by Principals: The active involvement in staff development by principals was appreciated most by the teacher respondents when the principals used a facilitative or collaborative over a directive approach, were knowledgeable about the classroom, recognized their teachers' efforts, and demonstrated faith in teachers.
CONCLUSIONS

1. The teachers in the study preferred a great deal of autonomy in planning and executing their own professional growth.

2. The principals who used a facilitative rather than a directive leadership style were generally more successful in encouraging their excellent teachers' professional growth.

3. Teachers may require different types of principal involvement in staff development at various stages of their careers. For example, the teachers in the study, who were veteran teachers, preferred principals who were non-directive. However, two of the respondents reported needing a far more directive approach in the early stages of their careers.

4. Principals' involvement was more favorably received when it was viewed as a true support, that is when principals showed interest and actively participated at each stage of staff development.

5. For principals to be credible in staff development, they must be perceived by teachers to be in touch
with what goes on in classrooms.

6. Monitoring and ongoing support were partially responsible for effective staff development in the schools. However, the evaluation did not include the impact of staff development on student achievement.

7. The principals and teachers differed substantially in their perception of the usefulness of schoolwide staff development. This dissimilarity may be due to the differing perspectives of the teachers and principals. Whereas the teachers focused for the most part on their own personal professional growth (which might incidentally upgrade the whole school), the principals focused on the growth of the whole school. Implicit in the job of the principal is a schoolwide perspective.

8. Professional development was not tied into formal evaluation by all the principals.

9. Effective staff development is only one component of school improvement. For schools to change and grow, principals reported that dedicated teachers are also needed.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Collaboration, teaming, peer coaching, and mentoring need to be more recognized by teachers and principals as types of schoolwide staff development.

2. Principals need to consider innovative ways of building staff development into the regular school day.

3. Professional growth needs to be considered when evaluating teachers.

4. Principals need to consider the substantial within group as well as the between group differences in individual teachers at various stages of their careers when helping to plan staff development.

5. Principals need to learn ways to allow flexibility for individual professional growth and yet help plan for meaningful schoolwide staff development.

6. Schools need to learn to evaluate staff development for its impact on student achievement.
7. To promote improvement, principals need to allow teachers to experiment with innovative instructional strategies and provide ongoing support systems so that they can be successful.

8. Further research needs to be done to define the respective roles of the principal and teachers as instructional leaders in staff development.
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. How can principals best help motivate all teachers in their schools to grow professionally?

2. How can principals balance the individual professional growth of their teachers with schoolwide needs?

3. What are more efficient ways of evaluating staff development?

4. How can teacher leaders and principals best work together to promote successful staff development?

5. How are universities preparing future principals to help plan, implement, and evaluate staff development?
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APPENDIX A

TEACHER INTERVIEW FOCUSES
Appendix A

Teacher Interview Focuses

1. How useful do you feel staff development has been to you? Has staff development at any school where you have worked focused on skills you can put into practice? Can you describe any instances when staff development has helped you adjust to a new curriculum or develop strategies you needed to use in your classroom?

2. Have staff development plans been specifically tailored to the schools where you have worked?

3. How have your schools' staff development plans been formulated? Have the principals of the schools played roles in their designs? If so, what specifically were their roles? Did you also feel you have played a part in planning staff development? If so, what has that role been? How was your input sought?

4. What has been the relation of your schools' staff development to the improvement of instruction?

5. Think of any principal with whom you have worked in the past or present. Could you describe some ways in which this principal has encouraged your professional growth formally (as in goal setting) and informally (e.g., accessing you to workshops, etc.)

6. Does (or did) this principal participate in monitoring staff development for effectiveness? If so, how? Does (or did) the principal remain involved when changes initiated by staff development are (were) being implemented?

7. Did (or does) the principal schedule staff development during the school day? How is (was) classroom coverage provided?

8. Does (or did) the principal encourage teachers to collaborate with one another? If so, how?
9. Does (or did) the principal encourage teachers to share their skills with others (e.g., demonstrating, coaching, mentoring, etc.)

10. Does (or did) the principal clearly convey how teachers would be evaluated in relation to the changes accomplished through staff development? If so, how?

11. In relation to staff development, do you consider the role the principal plays (played) to be principally one of--
   
   catalyst for change?
   facilitator?
   resource person?
   coordinator?
   head learner?

   Explain your choice.

12. Which do you think describes this principal's leadership style? Is/ was s/he a--

   responder: lets other lead, keeps teachers happy, usually makes decisions based on immediate circumstances rather than long term plans?

   manager: meets the expectations of central office and is supportive of staff?

   initiator: acts on long range plans and generally makes decisions in the best interest of the school even if some faculty members are displeased?

   Please explain your choice.

13. In your opinion, does (did) the principal play an active role in staff development? Does (did) s/he-

   encourage staff development through praise and recognition?
   attend workshops and offer remarks?
   bring together resources?
   collaboratively help implement visions of the participants?
   prepare timetables, assign rooms (e.g., logistics)?

14. Overall, do you think staff development has related
to your becoming a superior teacher? How? Has staff development helped you feel more confident in your teaching skills? What part has any principal with whom you have worked played in this process?
APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW FOCUSES
Appendix B

Principal Interview Focuses

1. How important is staff development to you as an administrator? Has the staff development in your school helped teachers focus on skills they can put into practice? Can you describe any instances when staff development helped teachers adjust to a new curriculum or develop strategies they needed to use in their classrooms? Do you promote ongoing staff development? Describe.

2. How has your staff development plan been tailored specifically to your school?

3. How has your school's staff development plan been formulated? Specifically, what was your part in formulating it? How do you seek input from teachers?

4. What is the relationship of your school's staff development plan to the improvement of instruction?

5. How do you encourage teachers' professional growth both formally (as in goal setting) and informally (e.g., accessing teachers to workshops)?

6. How do you monitor staff development for effectiveness? How do you remain involved when changes are being implemented?

7. Do you schedule staff development during the school day? If so, how do you provide for classroom coverage?

8. Do you encourage teachers to collaborate with one another? If so, how?

9. Do you encourage teachers to share skills with one another (e.g., demonstrating, coaching, mentoring, etc.)?

10. Do you communicate how teachers will be evaluated in relation to the changes accomplished through
staff development?

11. Do you consider your role in staff development to be principally one of--
   catalyst for change?
   facilitator?
   resource person?
   coordinator?
   head learner?

   Explain your choice.

12. How do you characterize your leadership style?

   responder: lets others lead, keeps teachers happy, usually makes decisions based on immediate circumstances rather than long term goals

   manager: meets the expectations of central office, is supportive of staff

   initiator: acts on long range plans, makes decisions in the best interests of the school even if some faculty members are displeased

   Explain your choice.

13. Do you play an active role in staff development? If so, how? Do you--

   encourage staff development through praise and recognition?
   attend workshops and offer remarks?
   bring together resources?
   help implement the visions of the participants?
   prepare timetables, assign rooms?

14. Overall, how do you think staff development has related to your teachers' growth? In your opinion, has staff development helped your teachers gain confidence in their teaching skills?
APPENDIX C

RELATIONSHIP OF CODES TO REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Appendix C: Relation of the Focuses to the Review of Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REVIEW OF LITERATURE PAGES AND AUTHORS CITED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>Need for staff development to focus on practical skills.</td>
<td>p. 40--Lieberman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO</td>
<td>Meeting needs of local schools in staff development.</td>
<td>pp. 32-33--Daresh; p. 33--Barth.; p. 36--Nielsen &amp; Montecinos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE</td>
<td>Formulation of staff development plans.</td>
<td>p. 39--Darling-Hammond; p. 40--Lieberman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>Relation of staff development to improving instruction.</td>
<td>pp. 49--50--Darling-Hammond &amp; McLaughlin; Orlich, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>Principals' part in encouraging professional growth.</td>
<td>p. 35--Thurston; p. 38--Nielsen &amp; Montecinos; p. 43--Watts &amp; Castle; p. 59--Sadowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN</td>
<td>Scheduling staff development during the school day.</td>
<td>pp. 43-45--Watts &amp; Castle; p. 45--Liebman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIGHT</td>
<td>Collaboration and staff development.</td>
<td>p. 27--Nolan, et al.; pp. 36-37--Nielsen &amp; Montecinos; 40, 54--Odden &amp; Wohlstetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINE</td>
<td>Encouraging staff development.</td>
<td>pp. 40, 54--Odden &amp; Wohlstetter; p. 46--Krovetz &amp; Cohick; p. 60--DuFour &amp; Berkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEVEN</td>
<td>Roles of principal: facilitator, head learner, catalyst.</td>
<td>p. 28--Rooney; p. 51--Darling-Hammond &amp; McLaughlin; p. 66--Seller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRTEEN</td>
<td>Principal's active involvement in staff development.</td>
<td>p. 24--Sparks &amp; Loucks-Horsley; p. 29--Duckworth &amp; Carmine; p. 39--Daresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTEEN</td>
<td>Contribution of staff development to the efficacy of teachers.</td>
<td>p. 35--Thurston; p. 38--Nielsen &amp; Montecinos; p. 43--Watts &amp; Castle; p. 66--Seller.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

EXPLANATION OF CODES
### Appendix D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Relation to Interview Focuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>active participation</td>
<td>Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>facilitation</td>
<td>Nos. 3, 5, 8, 11, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENC</td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>Nos. 5, 8, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>Nos. 3, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>respect</td>
<td>Nos. 3, 5, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>evaluation*</td>
<td>Nos. 6, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNE</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>Nos. 5, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accessibility</td>
<td>Nos. 6, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAD</td>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>No. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INIT</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>Nos. 3, 11, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>role model</td>
<td>Nos. 8, 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* of teachers, staff development
APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHICS OF TEACHER RESPONDENTS
## APPENDIX E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tchr</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ele./Mid.</th>
<th>Educ.</th>
<th>Yrs. Educ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sub Pub Mid</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sub Priv Elem</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sub Priv Elem</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sub Priv Mid</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chgo Priv Elem</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chgo Priv Elem</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sub Priv Mid</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sub Pub Mid</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS* Elem</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Mid</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Mid</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sub Pub Mid</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Elem</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Mid</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Mid</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CPS Chicago Public Schools

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Type School</th>
<th>Educ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3M(20%)</td>
<td>6 CPS (40%)</td>
<td>3 Bachelors (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12F(80%)</td>
<td>2 Chgo Priv (13%)</td>
<td>12 Masters (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Sub Pub (20%)</td>
<td>Mid/Elem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sub Priv (27%)</td>
<td>9 Mid (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs. in Ed. (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHICS OF PRINCIPALS
### APPENDIX F

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Elem.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sub. Mid.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Elem.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sub. Mid.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CPS Mid.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Educ.</th>
<th>Type School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% F</td>
<td>20% doctorate</td>
<td>40% CPS Elem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% M</td>
<td>80% masters</td>
<td>40% Sub Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% CPS Mid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs. in Admin.</th>
<th>Yrs. in Educ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.8 yrs</td>
<td>24.2 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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