

1-1-2001

## The professional development needs of high school principals for school improvement

Pamela Cummins Salazar  
*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds>

---

### Repository Citation

Salazar, Pamela Cummins, "The professional development needs of high school principals for school improvement" (2001). *UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations*. 2475.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.25669/bsce-tf1p>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

**ProQuest Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**



**THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS  
OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS  
FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

by

**Pamela Cummins Salazar**

**Bachelor of Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
1974**

**Master of Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
1985**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the**

**Doctor of Education Degree  
Department of Educational Leadership  
College of Education**

**Graduate College  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
December 2001**

**UMI Number: 3049552**

**Copyright 2002 by  
Salazar, Pamela Cummins**

**All rights reserved.**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

**UMI Microform 3049552**

**Copyright 2002 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.  
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**ProQuest Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

**Copyright by Pamela Cummins Salazar 2002  
All Rights Reserved**



**Dissertation Approval**  
The Graduate College  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

November 7, 2001

The Dissertation prepared by

Pamela Cummins Salazar

Entitled

The Professional Development Needs

of High School Principals

for School Improvement

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

## **ABSTRACT**

### **The Professional Development Needs of High School Principals for School Improvement**

by

**Pamela Cummins Salazar**

**Dr. Teresa Jordan, Examination Committee Chair  
Professor of Educational Administration  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

**This study examined the professional development needs of high school principals for school improvement. Successful educational reform and school improvement within a high school ultimately hinges on the leadership skills of the principal. If schools are to successfully confront the complexities of a changing society and improve learning for students, then school leaders must be provided with professional development activities that improve their ability to lead schools through a school improvement process. The purpose of this study was to determine professional development needs of high school principals for school improvement and their preferred delivery system for that professional development. A questionnaire based on the ISSLC Standards and the NSSE framework for school improvement was used to determine their**



professional development needs. The study also identified the perceptions of state agency professional development providers regarding principals' professional development needs and compared their perceptions to principals' perceptions.

The study found that the greatest needs for professional development were in the areas of Building Team Commitment and Creating a Learning Community. The findings also revealed that professional development needs differed significantly with all of the demographic characteristics that were examined. Principals reported that workshops and seminars/conferences were their most preferred delivery systems for their professional development. In addition, they indicated that on-line/self-paced and university coursework were the least preferred delivery methods. State agency personnel rated the training areas of Setting Goals and Determining Outcomes and Developing and Implementing Strategic Action Plans as areas of highest needs for principals. Both groups placed Facilitating the Change Process and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement in the top five areas to be addressed.

These findings provide direction for the development of professional development activities that will enhance the leadership skills that principals need to guide school reform and reach higher standards of student achievement. The investment of time and resources for the planning of an effective professional development program to enhance the educational leadership skills of high school principals to lead schools

**which are focused on continual improvement will greatly impact the ultimate quality of education for our students.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>LISTS OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background of the Study .....	3
Statement of the Problem .....	8
Purpose of the Study .....	10
Research Questions .....	10
Research Design .....	11
Conceptional Framework .....	15
Limitations.....	19
Delimitations .....	20
Assumptions .....	20
Definition of Terms.....	20
Summary .....	23
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Introduction .....	25
The Structure of the Review .....	28
Schooling for the 21st Century .....	29
Leadership and the Changing Role of the Principal .....	33
Accreditation and School Improvement.....	53
Effective Professional Development.....	63
Summary .....	73
<b>CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>76</b>
Introduction .....	77
Purpose of the Study .....	77
Research Questions .....	77
Selection of the Subjects .....	78

Data Collection Procedures .....	85
Data Analysis.....	86
Summary .....	87
<b>CHAPTER 4    FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>89</b>
Introduction .....	89
Characteristics of the Participants.....	91
Presentation and Analysis of the Data .....	101
Summary .....	121
<b>CHAPTER 5    SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>122</b>
Introduction .....	122
Findings of the Study .....	124
Conclusion.....	131
Recommendations for Further Study .....	134
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>152</b>
Summary Tables of Survey Items.....	152
Survey Instrument.....	185
Correspondence .....	193
<b>VITA .....</b>	<b>199</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Numbers and percent of returns by States .....	92
Table 2	Personal Characteristics.....	93
Table 3	Professional Characteristics.....	94
Table 4	School Characteristics .....	98
Table 5	Rank Order of Professional Development Needs as Identified as Extremely Important.....	102
Table 6	Rank Order of Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by the Means and Standard Deviations of Principal Perceptions of their Professional Development Needs.....	104
Table 7	Significant Differences in Perceptions by States and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level) .....	107
Table 8	Significant Differences in Perceptions by Size of School District and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level).....	109
Table 9	Significance Differences in Perceptions by Size of School and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level) .....	110
Table 10	Significance Differences in Perceptions by Years in Administration and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level).....	112
Table 11	Significance Differences in Perceptions by Level of Education and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level) .....	113
Table 12	Professional Development Delivery Method.....	114
Table 13	Rank Order of Principals' Preferred Delivery of Professional Development by Means and Standard Deviations .....	115
Table 14	Rank Order of State Agency Personnels' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Means and Standard Deviations.....	118
Table 15	Mean and Rank Comparisons of Principals and State Agency Professional Development Providers .....	119

## APPENDIX A TABLES

Table 1	Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs.....	153
Table 2	Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by States.....	155

<b>Table 3</b>	<b>Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of District .....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>Table 4</b>	<b>Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of School .....</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>Table 5</b>	<b>Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Years in Administration.....</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Table 6</b>	<b>Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Degrees Earned .....</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>Table 7</b>	<b>State Agency Professional Development Providers' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs.....</b>	<b>182</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

**Graduate work is an arduous and challenging task and when the work is coupled with being a wife and a mother of two teenagers, and a high school principal, it could be impossible without the support and encouragement of family, friends, and colleagues.**

**Special thanks to my advisor, Dr. Teresa Jordan, for her untiring assistance, patience, and infinite wisdom. Special thanks to my committee members, Dr. Chance and Dr. McCord for their time and critical input and helping me reach my goal. Special thanks to Dr. Zane for all of his support throughout the years. Special thanks to John Gilmour, my friend and exemplary English teacher, at Basic High School, for all of his editing assistance.**

**My incredible family has been and continues to be an unending source for inspiration and support. My wonderful husband Tom never stops believing in me. To my daughters, Cortney and Cresen, they have been so patient, understanding and very supportive. I hope that this work will inspire them to pursue academic excellence. To my son, Jason, and my daughter-in-law, Christa for their constant help and encouragement. To my brother, Ray, who told me that I could do it, I could do it.**

**Finally, I dedicate my work to my parents, who gave me a strong work ethic and an intrinsic desire to achieve. I thank them for their unconditional love and support and I know they are so proud of me.**



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

According to the document, Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1996), for school reform efforts to be successful, strong leadership must prevail. As we look into the new millennium, education is facing many challenges. Sava and Koerner (1998) contended that if these challenges are to be met, every school in the nation must be led by an effective instructional and administrative leader. According to a report by the National Staff Development Council, Learning to Lead, Learning to Learn (NSDC, 2000), “Improving the quality of America’s school leaders is the most feasible way to make a significant difference in American education. ...Without a sustained focus on improving the quality of school leadership, this nation’s reform efforts will falter” (p. 15).

In recent years, school improvement and school reform have moved to the forefront of our nation’s educational agenda. In this atmosphere of education reform, there is a search for ways to improve school performance for our nation’s students. According to Tirozzi (2000), reforming educational practice and realizing student

achievement gains will require enlightened leadership. Moreover, Hausman, Crow, and Sperry (2000) asserted that for education reform efforts to be successfully implemented educational leadership must be strengthened and professional development for principals must be restructured.

America's public schools both need and deserve high-quality educational leadership. Michael Fullan (1991) wrote, "Principals are crucial in determining school success. Principals influence attitudes and motivation towards a climate of school achievement" (p. 144). In recent years, research studies on the effects of schooling continue to point out that effective instructional leadership in schools is perhaps the single most important determinant of improved student achievement (Hart, 1993). The school principal can make the difference in helping the classroom teacher set and reach instructional goals. The principal is the key person who will give direction to whatever is done in the school (Findley & Findley, 1992). Every school improvement plan depends on strong leadership.

Much has been written (Berlin, Kavanagh, & Jensen, 1988; Flath, 1989; Fullan, 1991) concerning the importance of the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal. As instructional leader, the principal is the pivotal person within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher instruction, the height of student achievement, and the degree of efficiency in school functioning. Findley and Findley (1992) stated, "If a school is to be an effective one, it will be because of the instructional

leadership of the school” (p. 102). Flath (1989) concurred: “Research on effective schools indicates that the principal is pivotal in bringing about the conditions that characterize effective schools” (p. 20). Principals set the tone and the standards at their schools, motivate and reward, do long-range planning, develop a vision for the school, and transmit it to the school community (Phay, 1997). The principal who does all these things well has a quality school and is an effective leader. However, many principals have not been trained for the complex leadership role that today’s schools demand (Hopkins -Thompson, 2000).

### **Background of the Study**

At a time when the public is demanding accountability and research has shown that the quality of the leadership demonstrated by the principal has a major impact on the overall effectiveness of schools, there has been a lack of focused attention on examining how people become school leaders or how they are supported once they assume these roles (Milstein, 1993). Prior to the mid-1980’s, the reform movement that swept across the educational landscape left educational administration and administrator preparation programs largely untouched (Chance, 1992; Murphy, 1992). However, the inadequacy of programs for developing school leaders began to take on a particular urgency during the 1980s as the nationwide effort to reform schools gained momentum.

As educational reform or change takes place throughout the nation, educational leaders will have to play a major role if such reform is to be successful. This places the principal at the center of these school improvement efforts at each school where the principal is central to a school's success and to students' learning (Deal & Peterson, 2000). However, according to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) report Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996), job responsibilities of the school principal will have to follow the changes brought about by the many and varied reform efforts and especially those responsibilities dictated by increased accountability. As increased accountability becomes the norm, leadership becomes more challenging and improved professional development for principals becomes more critical (Checkley, 2000).

Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1992) suggested that developing and sustaining school leaders is the most promising avenue available for successfully addressing the changes that will challenge future schools. Schools operate in a dynamic environment which exerts constant, often contradictory, pressures for change; future schools are likely to experience even greater pressures of this sort. For this reason, future school leaders will have to respond to these problems in what Vail (1989) referred to as "permanent white water"(p. 32). Turbulence will be the norm, not the exception. Clearly, the design and delivery of principal professional development programs are challenged.

The qualifications for both teachers and administrators have come under particular scrutiny as policymakers have sought points of leverage in the school improvement process. In both cases, the conclusion has been that “more of the same” is not the answer to addressing inadequacies in current teacher and administrator training programs (Daresh & Capasso, 2001). National and state reports on education generated during the early 1980s focused attention on issues of teacher competency and training, but the emphasis shifted somewhat during the implementation of the reform recommendations. It is now recognized that long-term institutional change is unlikely to occur unless the training of administrators is addressed as an issue of equal concern.

As a result, in recent years the school principal and the preparation of educational leaders has been pushed to the center of the educational reform stage (Murphy, 1992). A cry for leadership is being heard on all fronts. According to Miklos (1992), increased demands for fundamental improvements in administrator preparation programs are linked directly to pressures for educational reform. There is a need for a better program to prepare tomorrow’s leaders and to assist today’s practitioners. Orlich (1989) suggested that professional development is a basic and necessary component of the continuing preparation of administrators as they extend their professional and technical knowledge.

The professional development of school leaders has become a critical issue when recognizing that the principalship is the critical point of leverage in obtaining

desired improvement in schools. Buckner (1997) stated that the professional development of administrators could well dictate the success and perhaps even the survival of schools in the twenty-first century. To be successful, schools must change to meet the new and more complex needs of their students. The responsibility for leading school change is assigned to the principal with the degree of success dependent on new knowledge and skills (Daresh, 1999). In today's complex world, in schools beset with new kinds of challenges, professional development is the key to that knowledge and those skills (Lewis, 1997).

Few will dispute that creative, visionary leaders are essential to make fundamental changes in the core technology of schooling for the twenty-first century. The task facing principal professional development programs has never been more challenging. It is important that we ground our program conceptions in what Daresh (1997) calls "visions of society, education, learning, and leadership for schooling in the twenty-first century as well as in the values and evidence that define the paths to those visions" (p.6). The current preparation and professional development activities for leadership that involve dealing with managerial aspects of the role are unsatisfactory (Houston, 2000).

The consensus regarding the inadequacy of administrative training coupled with the impetus for reform legislation, as well as the development in the research of effective schools and classroom instruction, has resulted in the need to redesign professional

development for practicing principals. This research effort was based on the assumption that practitioners who are presently working through reform and restructuring school improvement activities are in the best position to identify areas of need for professional development. According to (Buckley, 1985), "It is very useful to discuss with participants not only 'what' they wish to learn during their training, but also 'how' they would wish to learn it." (p. 30). He further stated, "Such mature and experienced adults often have clear views on their leadership needs." (p. 30). Practicing principals who are charged with leading effective school improvement efforts are the group which are the most familiar with the continual and changing demands placed on them. The intent of this study was to ask high school principals in what knowledge and skill areas did they need professional development in order to effectively lead their schools through an accreditation school improvement process.

Educational reform literature abounds with articles describing the ideal school headed by a strong, visionary leader promoting an atmosphere of collegiality and participation in a learning community (Speck, 1999; Barth, 1990; Schmoker, 1996). Such studies have illustrated the dynamic nature of the principalship by delineating attributes or skills of effective principals. Most of these studies, however, have not focused on the principal as leader of a school improvement process. The emphasis of this research study was on principals' perception of their professional development needs relative to the knowledge and skills needed to lead a school through a school

improvement process. The results contribute to the limited literature now available on professional development needs for practicing principals engaged in the school improvement process.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Changes in society and the economy are placing unprecedented demands on public schools to reach higher standards and raise student achievement. Meeting these challenges requires strong leadership at the school level. The principal is the linchpin to these school reform efforts. As Dennis Sparks, Executive Director of National Staff Development Council (1998) said, “Good schools require strong and stable leadership around achievement issues” (p. 7).

One way to produce the high-quality leaders who are needed in education is to improve the training programs that prepare educational administrators (Daresh, 1999). But clearly, this is not enough. Today’s school principals need to grow and learn throughout their careers to adapt to the changing needs of students and school (Educational Research Service Report, 1999). As a result, more and more education policymakers and other experts are stressing the importance of ongoing professional development for school administrators. And, according to National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management (NIEGFPM, 1999)



quality professional development focuses on teaching and learning and school improvement.

Strengthening and improving school leadership holds tremendous potential in improving schools. The new demands on school leaders require that current principals be fresh and adaptable. They must receive professional development aimed at helping them be effective, knowledgeable and qualified to facilitate continuous school improvement. In the words of the Blue Ribbon Consortium on Renewing Education (1998): “If we could do only one thing to build school capacity, we would develop a cadre of leaders who understand the challenges of school improvement” (p. 35).

In the seven states of the Northwest Regional Accreditation Association, annual accreditation of schools now requires a comprehensive school improvement process. However, many principals are ill-prepared to lead their schools through extensive self-study and school accreditation renewal. Additionally, there has not been a needs assessment of the professional development needs of the principals regarding their perceptions of the skills needed to facilitate a school improvement accreditation process. Secondly, there has not been an examination of what state agency professional development providers perceive as the professional development needs for principals who seek the state mandated accreditation under the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC) school improvement process.

### **Purpose of the Study**

**Successful educational reform and school improvement within a high school ultimately hinges on the leadership skills of the principal. If schools are to successfully confront the complexities of a changing society and improve learning for students, then school leaders must be provided with professional development activities that improve their ability to lead schools through a school improvement process. The purpose of this study was to determine the professional development needs of high school principals in schools seeking accreditation through a school improvement process and to determine if there was a relationship between certain demographic characteristics of the principals and their perceptions of these needs. In addition, this study determined what types of professional development delivery systems that principals preferred. Finally, the study identified the perceptions of state agency professional development providers regarding principals' professional development needs and compared their perceptions to principals' perceptions.**

### **Research Questions**

- 1. What is the perception of high school principals regarding their professional development needs to facilitate the NASC school improvement accreditation process?**

2. Is there a relationship between perceptions of principals and the demographic characteristics of their schools regarding professional development needs?
3. Is there a preferred delivery system of professional development by the principals?
4. What is the perception of state agency personnel regarding the professional development needs for principals to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?
5. Is there a relationship between the perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the perception of high school principals regarding the professional development needed to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?

### **Research Design**

The following methods and procedures were followed in selecting, collecting, and analyzing the data in the study.

### **Selection of the Subjects**

The population of this study consisted of high school principals and state agency professional development providers in the states who are served by the Northwest

Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC) accreditation agency. These states are Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. These states were chosen due to their membership in the NASC, which now requires schools to conduct a school improvement process for annual accreditation. High school principals within the identified states were contacted using the NASC membership directory. State agency professional development providers were identified through their respective state departments of education.

### Collecting the Data

In order to determine what professional development learning opportunities are needed, a needs assessment was conducted. Professional development programs are enthusiastically supported when they are needs-driven (Buckley, 1985). Needs-driven projects are based on the clearly defined needs of the school and are relevant to educators and meet their personal and professional desires (Orlich, 1989). Witkin and Altschuld (1995) observed that data gathered from needs assessments illustrates the gaps or discrepancies in knowledge and skills in the respondents.

One technique to assess needs is a questionnaire. This method is most easily and widely used by school districts or universities because it is economical to conduct and interpret (Orlich, 1989). The questionnaire, as a data collection tool, is used extensively in educational research to collect information that is not directly observable. Dillman and Salant (1994) commented on the benefits of using a survey or

questionnaire, “It provides useful information when you are trying to solve a problem and need new information to solve it” (p. 25). A survey instrument (Appendix A) was developed and validated by the researcher after a review of related literature. The questionnaire entitled the Profile of Principal Professional Development Needs for Accreditation (PPPDNA) was designed to answer questions about the professional development needs of principals. The questionnaire was divided into three sections: demographic professional profile, leadership skills and knowledge, and the preferred format for professional development.

The Total Design Method (TDM) described by Dillman and Salant (1994) provided the framework for the questionnaire and survey process. This process enabled the researcher to increase the quality of information collected and the response rate by establishing guidelines for question design, questionnaire construction and follow up procedures.

The framework of this instrument was designed to obtain information concerning a principal’s self-perception of his or her need (or lack of) for professional development in the leadership skills/competencies to facilitate an accreditation school improvement process. In the first section, information about the independent variables pertaining to the participants’ demographic characteristics was elicited. The second section consisted of 25 items which asked participants to rate their perceived level of professional development need in each leadership performance domain using four-point

Likert-type scales (1=Not a Need to 4=Extremely Important Need). A higher rating indicated a greater perceived level of development need in each of the school improvement leadership areas. On the third part of the questionnaire respondents were asked to rate their preference for each of eight professional delivery methods using four-point Likert-type scales (1=Not Likely to Participate In to 4=Very Likely to Participate In). A free-response and comment section provided an opportunity for respondents to add any additional information.

A draft of the questionnaire was first distributed to a representative group of high school principals at the annual NASC Commissioner meeting in Portland, Oregon to comment on its usefulness as a survey tool to determine principal professional development needs. Revisions were made based on their feedback. Experts from both NASSP and NASC reviewed the survey instrument to establish content validity. Modifications were made based on their recommendations. A field test was conducted at the NASSP conference in Phoenix, Arizona to check for clarity, the adequacy of the content for the intended purpose of the instrument, user friendliness and other questions concerning content validity. The researcher made revisions based on the feedback from the field test. The instrument was then pilot tested for reliability with local high school principals.

### **Analyzing the Data**

This study employed quantitative methodology to determine if there was a relationship between the opinions of state agency professional development providers and the perceptions of high school principals regarding the professional development needs to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process. Borg and Gall (1996) defined quantitative research as “inquiry that is grounded in the assumption that features of the social environment constitute an objective reality that is relatively constant across time and settings” (p. 767).

Descriptive statistics was used to organize and summarize data from the survey. According to Borg and Gall (1996), descriptive research is “a type of investigation that measures the characteristics of a sample or population” (p. 757). Results were aggregated, reporting statistical measures of central tendency and variability to provide a comprehensive profile of participants’ responses. Cross-tabulation and Pearson Chi-Square was used to examine differences and similarities in principal perceptions based on demographic characteristics. Perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the high school principals were compared.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Murphy and Seashore-Lewis (1994) stated that school reform has transformed the roles of principals. Throughout popular and scholarly literature on school reform, the

leadership demands being placed on principals are becoming more complex as the call for school improvement moves to the forefront of education priority. The success of these school improvement efforts will depend upon the ability of the principal to improve the people within the school. The principal must become an organizational developer (Lambert, 1998). Theories related to organizational development are critical in providing insight into the strategies that are used to help organizations achieve greater effectiveness. These theories emphasize the human social system of an organization and the importance of the leader in carrying out organizational improvement (Schmuck & Runkle, 1985).

Hoy and Miskel (1991) described organizational development in schools as the process of changing the culture or climate of a school organization by applying knowledge from the behavioral sciences during a period of planned and sustained effort for improving organizational effectiveness (p. 401). In looking at organizations, leadership is formed and affected by the organization. Huse (1975) conceptualized organizational development as the overarching framework with individual, structural, technological, and survey feedback as being specific approaches within the overall change strategy. Hoy and Miskel (1992) contended that changing the individual has long been regarded as a major, though indirect, approach to organizational improvement. Attention to professional development must be the cornerstone of any initiative that will



result in improvements of the organization to solve problems and continuously renew itself.

The goals of OD are to make an organization more effective and to enhance the opportunity for the individual to develop his potential (Harvey & Brown, 1976).

According to Sparks and Hirsh (1997), organization development depends on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the individuals within the organization. When individual learning and organizational changes are addressed simultaneously and support one another, the organization improves. Leaders of organizational change are able to initiate, stimulate, and facilitate organizational innovation for improved effectiveness. Organizational improvement is people improvement.

To meet the educational challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, everyone who affects student learning must continually upgrade his/her skills. Individual development and organization development is dependent upon the understanding of the dynamic interaction of all of the elements within the school organization (Sparks & Hirsch, 1997). The principal as the change agent for improvement will initiate and facilitate the fundamental changes in the core technology of schooling for the twenty-first century. This view of the contemporary principal requires new skills and a new focus on the professional development activities that can deliver leaders who will improve student achievement. The question is how do we develop the capacities of individuals who are

the organization so the organization will do what is needed. The successful improvement of school leaders depends on the professional development afforded them.

### **Significance of the Study**

Much has been written about principal leadership in evolving, diverse, and democratic schools. Characteristics and behaviors of effective principals have also been explored. In addition, a plethora of research and discussion has been published on school reform and restructuring efforts. However, there is limited information regarding the necessary professional development to support the increasing role of the principal in the process of school reform and more specifically the leadership required to facilitate a comprehensive school improvement process (NPBEA, 1991). Therefore, efforts to help foster professional growth and develop principals as change agents must occur.

This study focused on the identification of the areas of focus that an effective professional development program should include for principals seeking accreditation based on principal perception. The data drawn from this study will give school districts a better perspective of the elements that constitute an effective professional development program for high school principals and assist them in developing their own programs. The investment of time and resources for the planning of an effective professional development program enhances educational leadership skills and will have a powerful impact on the ultimate quality of education in this nation (Buckner, 1997).

**This study endeavored to contribute to planning presently taking place within NASC and in school districts in the NASC region concerning the professional development of high school principals. It sought to provide information regarding professional development needs for principals who are facilitating the school improvement accreditation process to those involved in developing and implementing professional development programs in universities, state education departments, principal centers, and school districts.**

**This study sought to assist school districts to more effectively facilitate the professional development of their high school principals. It also sought to assist institutions of higher learning in developing course work and learning experiences designed to prepare school administrators to integrate these school improvement skills effectively into their leadership roles.**

### **Limitations**

- 1. This study was limited to the principals who responded to the survey, and it cannot be assumed that what one principal perceived can be applied to all principals.**
- 2. The perceptions of the principals' characteristics revealed in the data collection were limited due to the nature of the principals' training and experiences.**
- 3. Data was collected by a survey/questionnaire and was limited to responses reported by the participant rather than behaviors observed by the researcher.**

4. The questionnaire may not have been completed by the respondent it was mailed to.

### **Delimitations**

1. The research was delimited to the high school principals in the NASC region.
2. The study was delimited to the state agency personnel in the NASC region who monitor the annual accreditation of high schools within their state.
3. This study related implications from the data to the states in the NASC region and did not attempt to draw relationships or conclusions to any other part of the country.

### **Assumptions**

The following assumptions are made regarding this study:

1. Principal's perceptions reflected professional development needs that can be incorporated into professional development offerings for improved professional practice.
2. The survey/questionnaire generated reliable responses from participants in the study.

### **Definition of Terms**

The following definitions were utilized for the understanding of this study:

**Educational change:** the ability of the individual school to continuously sense and adapt to external and internal environments in such a manner as to strengthen the organization and ultimately fulfill its goal of providing quality education for children (Fullan, 1993).

**Empowerment:** the collective responsibility to make educational decisions; the participation by teachers in decisions made within schools (Glickman, 1990).

**Effective principals:** successful in matching their actions to goals with goals subsequently advanced (Sergiovanni, 1984).

**Expert leadership:** successful in developing a shared, defensible vision of a future school considered desirable by those with a stake in it; directly assisting members of the school in addressing the challenges encountered in their efforts to achieve the vision; and increasing the capacity of school members to address those and future challenges themselves more successfully (Leithwood, Begley and Cousins, 1992).

**NASC:** Northwest Accreditation of Schools and Colleges.

**Need:** A discrepancy or gap between the way things ought to be and the way they “are” (Kaufman, 1988, p. 3).

**Needs assessment:** A systematic process for determining goals, identifying discrepancies between goals and the status quo, and establishing priorities for action (Kaufman, 1988, p. 4).

**Professional development:** Denotes programs or activities that are based on identified needs; that are collaboratively planned and designed for a specific group of individuals in the school district; that have a very specific set of learning objectives and activities; and that are designed to extend, add, or improve immediate job-oriented skills, competencies, or knowledge with the employer paying the cost.

**School improvement:** The systematic efforts to improve the educational program within a school to increase student learning.

**School reform:** The movement across the nation to improve schools for the nation's students. Also referred to as educational reform, renewal, and restructuring.

**SIP:** School improvement process - the continuous improvement of the educational program. Successful improvement programs focus on the total school rather than each of the separate components within the school. Systematic analysis of data regarding student performance, coupled with an examination of the extent to which instructional and organizational practices within the school are aligned in support of student learning objectives and the mission of the school are essential when developing a comprehensive school improvement process (NASC, 2000).

**OD:** organizational development. Characteristics of organizational development in schools include: systematically planned efforts in collaboration with school participants, sustained effort at system self-study and improvement, and intended, planned change.

**The chief goal for organizational development is that the school achieves a sustained capacity for solving its own problems (Schmuck and Runkle, 1985).**

### **Summary**

**The call for restructuring of American education to ensure increased student learning requires great effort and commitment on the part of educators and policymakers. School principals, in particular, are considered a critical component for the successful implementation of school improvement strategies whereby student achievement is increased. Many principals receiving educational preparation before the advent of the current educational reform initiatives may need additional education in crucial areas.**

**In order to move into the 21st century with the necessary leadership to meet the challenges of increased public demands, something must be done to better prepare principals who are more than managers and more than administrators (Murphy, 1992). Effective instructional leaders must be developed (Daresh, 1997). Serious attention and planning is needed. America's future is at stake and school districts across the country face the critical duty of helping leaders to grow.**

**This study focused on the development of a profile of the perceived skills and knowledge that high school principals need to facilitate a comprehensive school improvement process for accreditation and their perception about how these skills and competencies should be taught in principal professional development programs. A**

**profile of the perceptions of state agency professional development providers was also provided. In addition, the principals' perceptions and state agency professional development providers' perceptions were examined.**



## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **Introduction**

Of the seemingly endless lineup of problems schools face today, the critical need for strong, responsible, and enlightened leadership is of great concern. According to the recent report from the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL, 2001), schools nationwide are grappling with serious problems ranging from record enrollment, school security, state-mandated accountability measures, the social and economic circumstances of students, staff shortfalls, chronically low academic expectations for students, and a host of other difficult challenges. To add to the severity of the problems, there is a scarcity of capable education leaders. And, without topflight leadership, schools have little chance of meeting any of the challenges (IEL, 2001).

The educational challenge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to achieve higher levels of learning for all children. This theme has become paramount and is the overarching issue on the nation's domestic policy agenda. Today, changes in society and the economy are placing unprecedented demands on public schools to reach higher

**standards and raise student achievement. Meeting these challenges requires increased efficiency and effectiveness of the educational enterprise. In a time of fast-paced and widesweeping change in schools, principals directly impact both the implementation and sustainability of reforms focused on improved student achievement (National Association of School Boards of Education, 1999).**

**In their search for ways to improve school performance, educators and policymakers have addressed a broad array of challenges confronting schools. These approaches to improvement have included raising standards, strengthening teacher professional development, refocusing schools around the primary goal of student achievement, and holding schools accountable for results. But, according to the recent report from the National Staff Development Council (2000), “only one area of policy focus – strengthening school leadership – can exert control over all of these challenges simultaneously” (p. 1). Indeed, most education researchers would agree that school reform cannot succeed without vital leadership. Unfortunately however, according to a recent report by the Education Commission of the States (ECS, 2000), “...one element has largely been ignored in the education reform movement: the competence of the people making decisions about the education of America’s students” (p. 1).**

**Inevitably, this has generated an unparalleled focus on leadership for public education. The cry on all fronts is for a redefinition of effective education leadership and a redesign of how we prepare and develop education leaders (ECS, 2000). School**

reform efforts and the increased demand for a new and different kind of leadership are generating a renewed interest in principal professional development programs and afford a unique opportunity for upgrading current professional development practices. Administrator professional development has failed to keep pace with challenging times and changing expectations of school leaders (Lumsden, 1992). As a result, many districts are trying to restructure their programs to strengthen the leadership ability of their principals. The focus is on what can be done to bolster the skills and knowledge of principals already on the job who are, on average, 48 years old and nearly a decade past their original preparation for the job (National Commission for the Principalship, 1993). The problem is intensified when you consider that the typical preparation program at that time separated educational administration from the “phenomenon known as instruction” and in fact had very little to do with education (Murphy & Forsyth, 1999, p. 20).

Policymakers are now recognizing the importance of targeting the development of strong and visionary school principals as a priority of a far-reaching agenda (NSDC, 2000). Policymakers are right. A school generally will fail to meet expectations without the energetic leadership and clear vision of a principal. The problem is long-standing. The National Association of Elementary School Principals declared in its 1990 report, Principals for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, that principal professional development must catch up to meet the demands of the accelerating pace of reform. According to the

2000 DOE report, Eliminating Barriers to Improving Teaching, most districts and state agencies still lack sufficient principal preparation and training programs. Professional development programs for principals must be designed and supported by policymakers to meet this critical challenge in public education.

### The Structure of the Review

Societal conditions, forces, and actions are constantly reshaping the work of today's principal. These changing conditions influence the performance of present day school leaders. The role of the principal in the school reform era is still emerging as teaching and learning move to the center of this new agenda. However, there are differences among researchers, educators, and policymakers on what is needed to prepare and support the individual for this role change.

The discussion of principal professional development needs for experienced principals can be forged upon our understanding of the future in education and in school leadership. A review of related research and literature on educational reform efforts and the changing role of the principal provide the foundation for this understanding. Within the school reform framework, the major challenges confronting administrators are examined and the qualities of leadership needed for leading organizational improvement efforts in tomorrow's schools is discussed. The standards for effective instructional leadership as identified by Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) are

reviewed. These identified functions, traits, or characteristics can be used to guide which job duties and responsibilities should be emphasized and further enriched during the professional development of school leaders. Next, the Northwest Accreditation of Schools and Colleges (NASC) accreditation process utilizing the National Study of School Evaluation (NSSE) self-study framework is explored as one of the emerging mandates placed on the high school principal. Finally, an overview of professional development and effective strategies for successful implementation is presented

### Schooling for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Beginning with the release of A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the 1980s witnessed an unprecedented call for educational reform (Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991). Dissatisfaction with our schools' performance mounted over the decade. Murphy (1990) noted, "Since the onslaught of reform reports in the early parts of the 1980s, a sustained effort has been undertaken to fix, restructure, and rethink the U.S. educational enterprise" (p. xi).

The initial wave of reform called for top-down mandates to raise standards and ensure accountability (Duttweiler, 1988). State agencies passed numerous statutes aimed at improving public education. However, as might be expected, there has been much resistance by school boards, administrators and teachers to reform by legislation (Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991). Many of the first wave of reform efforts fell far

short of their goals because they didn't take local dynamics into account and they failed to fully understand the complex nature of school change (Whitaker & Moses, 1994).

According to Chance (1992), "It was charged that the reform dictates were realistically unworkable with the organizational system as it currently existed" (p. 6).

As a result of this resistance, a second wave of reform followed that was designed to emanate from the local level (Murphy, 1992). This time the call was not for changing policies, but for changing the very structure of the schools themselves (Chance, 1992). These bottom-up reforms called for such changes as teacher empowerment, restructuring, professional development schools, and school-based management (Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991). If this second wave of reform is to succeed, significant changes in how our schools are organized and led must be made.

Many researchers have conveyed the need for redesign of our schools (Beck & Murphy, 1992; Petrie, 1990; Schlechty, 1990) and suggest significant changes are needed in the core technology of schooling (Murphy, 1993). The emerging vision of tomorrow's schools includes methods of organizing and managing schools that are focused on new conceptions of student learning (Evertson & Murphy, 1992). A concern for the success of school restructuring, reform and therefore, student learning will be dependent on collaborative actions of the practitioners and policymakers to develop systems for professional development of experienced principals.

Developing learning communities and organizational adaptability with a focus on the human element encompasses a basic change in our notion of schools (Clark, 1990; Barth, 1986.) In these redesigned school organizations, developing learning climates and organizational adaptability will replace the more traditional rigid authoritarian structures (Clark & Meloy, 1989). A premium will be placed on organizational flexibility with a change in management from bureaucratic control to professional empowerment (Sergiovanni, 1991). In essence, the centralized control of schools must give way to participatory management which is essential to effective change (Whitaker & Moses, 1994).

This redesigned system suggests a new paradigm for school organization and management from a “power over approach to a power to approach” (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 57). The result is a fundamental change in roles, relationships, and responsibilities. Authority flows will be less hierarchical and independence and isolation will be replaced by cooperative work (Clark & Meloy, 1989). In this new design for schools, the role of the principal changes from principal as manager to principal as facilitator (Murphy, 1992). School leaders must learn to develop the capacities of their schools by developing the capacities of the people within (Keefe & Howard, 1997). The administrator of this new organizational structure must be a leader with vision who stresses the development of human capital in the school (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

However, rhetoric alone will not move our schools in this direction. According to Starratt (1995), “The task of fundamentally reforming the structures of schooling is perhaps the most challenging opportunity that faces school leaders” (p. 3). The specific challenge for tomorrow’s leaders is to become “organizational architects” where they will replace a traditional focus on stability with a focus on change (Louis & Miles, 1990). According to Elmore (2000),

The job of administrative leaders is primarily about enhancing the skills and knowledge of the people in the organization, creating a common culture of expectations around the use of these skills and knowledge, holding the various pieces of the organization together in a productive relationship with each other, and holding individuals accountable for their contributions to collective result (p. 7).

Over the past several years, researchers have refocused their attention to discussions of organizational development and organizational management. Lashway (2000) suggested that educational leaders must enhance organizational capacity if they are to improve the school organization. “Leaders are accountable for the continuous renewal of the organization” (DuPree, 1992, p. 31). The schools of yesterday and today are not the kind of schools needed for tomorrow. New strategies, new processes, and a new mindset are required if schools are to become knowledge-based educational enterprises (Keefe & Howard, 1997). In effect, a new paradigm of instructional leadership is required. To be effective instructional leaders, school administrators must



think and act within new models (Ash & Persall, 2000). Thoughtful, planned leadership development is a vehicle to the successful growth of current principals.

### **Leadership and the Changing Role of the Principal**

Tirozzi (1999) stated that as this era of high academic standards, testing, and accountability stretches before us, the role of the principal has changed dramatically. Throughout the research on school reform, educational effectiveness and school excellence (e.g. Edmonds, 1979; Joyce, Hersh, & McKibbin, 1983; Lieberman & Miller, 1981; Rouché & Baker, 1986), the literature clearly points to the key role of educational administrators in such efforts. However, there is a shortage of people willing to become principals, and the general consensus is that the principalship must be “redefined, reinvented, and rethought” (Tirozzi, 1999, p. 2).

Schools are changing. They are transforming in response to various pressures, including parent complaints about the quality of education, labor market demands for increasingly skilled workers, rapid advances in technology, and the growing popularity of public school alternatives such as charter schools and vouchers for public education (IEL, 2000). No one can say for certain how the new schools of the century will differ from those of the last century, but there is little doubt that these schools will require different forms of leadership.

**Researchers have examined leadership skills from a variety of perspectives.**

**Early analyses of leadership, from the 1900s to the 1950s, differentiated between leader and follower characteristics (Hanson, 1996). Finding that no single trait or combination of traits fully explained leaders' abilities, researchers began to examine the influence of the situations on leaders' skill and behaviors (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). Subsequent leadership studies attempted to distinguish effective from non-effective leaders. These investigations attempted to distinguish which leadership behaviors effective leaders exemplified. To understand what contributed to making leaders effective, researchers used the contingency model in examining the connection between personal traits, situational variables, and leader effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).**

**Leadership studies of the 1970s and 1980s once again focused on the individual characteristics of leaders that influence their effectiveness and the success of their organizations (Slater & Doig, 1988). The investigations primarily contributed to understanding the impact of personal characteristics and individual behaviors of effective leaders and their role in making organizations successful. The studies emphasized the blending of managerial and supervisory skills within the climate of the organization as well as within the environmental dimensions of the community (Sergiovanni, 1984).**

**Many studies have been published on effective schools since Edmonds (1979) and Brookover and Lezotte (1979) called attention to the fact that certain schools are**

more effective than others with similar demographics. A summary of this research revealed that there are some recurring patterns in the characteristics of effective schools that are directly related to principal effectiveness (Fullan, 1982; Manasse, 1983; Robinson, 1985).

Researchers found that, when specific elements were present to an appreciable degree in a school, student achievement was above expected levels. Among these elements, a school-wide, unified effort that depended on the exercise of leadership was found to be key to promoting higher levels of student learning. In a summary by Robinson (1995), effective schools had principals who

- were assertive in their instructional role;
- were goal and task oriented (while principals in less effective schools often appeared overburdened by administrative tasks);
- were well-organized and demonstrated skill in delegating responsibility to others, achieving a balance between a strong leadership role and maximum autonomy for teachers;
- conveyed high expectations for students and staff;
- had policies that were well-defined and well-communicated;
- made frequent classroom visits;
- were highly visible and available to students and staff;
- provided strong support to the teaching staff; and

- were adept at parent and community relations.

The effective schools research had a powerful impact in the 1980s on the actions of commissions and other groups discussing school improvement efforts and school leadership.

The release of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration's (NCEE, 1987) report, Leaders for America's Schools initiated discussion on the preparation of school leaders. Following up on this discussion, the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) promoted the formation of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). In 1988 the Policy Board was established to coordinate efforts of national associations having an interest in school leadership and school improvement (Murphy & Forsythe, 1999). In an effort to continue the new focus on school leadership, the NPBEA published its first report in 1989, Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: The Reform Agenda. Two national efforts resulted from these discussions. First, the National Commission for the Principalship (1990) published a report titled Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification which asserted that the "United States cannot have excellent schools without excellent leaders" (p. 9). This was followed by the NPBEA's description of the core knowledge and skills required of principals in the document, Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base (NCP,

1993). Both of these documents set the stage for a new definition of the role of the principal as an instructional leader.

The effective schools studies differentiated between leadership and management. Murphy and Hallinger (1986) characterized effective principals as having a strong task orientation with the focus on the development of curriculum and instruction rather than on management issues. This emphasis on the instructional leader does not mean that management of the school can be left to chance. Schools have increased in size; legal and regulatory requirements have been added and have become more complex; and children need additional services to succeed academically (ERS, 2000). The context of the principal's job has changed dramatically in the last 20 years. Doing the job successfully in today's schools means not only being able to execute the components well, but also being able to recognize the balance that is needed among a wide spectrum of responsibilities (Carter & Klotz, 1990).

Stronge (1993) characterized this balanced view of educational leadership as one that "draws a rational relationship between managerial efficiency and instructionally effective schools" (p. 5). A principal who focuses primarily on management issues may have insufficient time to provide instructional leadership, while a principal who neglects tasks that might be characterized as managerial does not provide a well-organized learning environment for students and staff. The emphasis on efficiency often resulted in carrying out management and support tasks instead of focusing on the main goal of

instructional improvement (Drake & Roe, 1994). This suggests that a characteristic of the effective principal in today's school must be the capacity to make decisions about and focus on doing what makes a difference in student learning, often on a daily basis.

As studies of educational leadership began to flourish and grow, the concept of vision began to emerge. Colon (1994) proposed a new emphasis. In his view, if principals are to be effective leaders, they must engage in "reflective, purposeful, observable behavior" built on both a personal philosophy and a strong knowledge base. The principal then uses this to help students and staff develop a schoolwide vision, which "should be observable everywhere in the building and acted upon daily" (p. 87). School leaders help people think through "how to do it" as well as "what to do" (Murphy & Seashore-Louis, 1994, p. xxv). As Duttweiler and Hord (1987) stated, "The research shows that in addition to being accomplished administrators who develop and implement sound policies, procedures, and practices, effective administrators are also leaders who shape the school's culture by creating and articulating a vision, winning support for it, and inspiring others to attain it" (p. 65).

Considerable research frequently characterizes the effective leader as the vision holder, the keeper of the dream, or the person who has a vision of the organization's purpose (Murphy, 1988). In Leadership Is an Art (1989), DuPree asserted that "The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality" (p. 9). Bennis (1989) wrote that leaders "manage the dream" (p. 46). Vision is defined as the "force which molds

meaning for the people of an organization” (Manasse, 1986, p. 150). Leaders, according to Kouzes and Posner (1987), “have visions of what might be, and they believe they can make it happen” (p. 1).

Leadership requires vision. Most school improvement efforts begin with an achievable vision. The Council of Chief State School Officers (1997), defined creating and communicating a vision as an expected competency for school principals. In other words, according to Chance (1992), “a visionary administrator in a school is not afraid of stating, ‘This is what I believe; this is what the school can accomplish; and this is where we are going to be in one year, five years, and ten years.’ Vision is a powerful force that guides, cajoles, directs, and facilitates accomplishment” (p. 52). It serves as a guide for the school and helps to establish the climate for the school. A vision unifies a school and attains results (Littley & Fried, 1988). It is a force that provides meaning and purpose to the work of an organization. However, current principals have not been given any systematic professional development to facilitate these needed skills.

Leaders of change are visionary leaders and vision is the basis of their work. “To actively change an organization, leaders must make decisions about the nature of the desired state” (Manasse, 1986, p. 151). They begin with a personal vision to forge a shared vision with all of the members of the organization. With a shared vision, an organization can move forward and create change. Vail (1998) explained the genuine power that an organization can experience when a shared vision is created:

**In the short run, an organization can operate on habit and past successes. However, in the longer run, vision is indispensable: it is the basis on which an organization acquires and maintains personal meaning for all those who are associated with it. Vision arises in people who care about the situation they are involved in. The leadership role is to help people understand the caring and to express it in terms that will bring them forward in the future (p. 43).**

**The important role of vision is also evident in the literature concerning instructional leadership (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins 1992; Manasse, 1986; Mazzarella & Grundy, 1989). For principals who implement change in their school, vision is “a hunger to see improvement” (Manasse, 1986, p. 152). Leaders of educational change have a clear picture of what they want to accomplish; they have the “ability to visualize one’s goals” (Mazzarella & Gundy, 1989, p. 21). The vision of the principal provides purpose, meaning, and significance to the work of the school and enables him/her to motivate and empower the students and staff to contribute to the realization of the vision (Duke, 1986). Principals with a vision have a picture of what they want their schools to be and their students to achieve.**

**According to Manasse (1986), vision includes the “development, transmission, and implementation of an image of a desirable future” (p. 150). Effective school leaders have not only a vision but also the skills to communicate that vision to others, to develop a shared vision, and a “shared covenant” (Sergiovanni, 1994, p. 216). This “development, transmission, and implementation” of a vision is the focus of leaders of educational change and improvement. Successful principals invite and encourage**



others to participate in determining and developing a shared vision. Shared vision is the key to creating a learning organization (Keefe & Howard, 1997). From the effective schools' research, Hallinger and Heck (1996) found that when a school staff has a shared vision, there is a commitment to change. The visionary leader realizes that the involvement of others is the only way to guarantee the creation of a meaningful organizational vision. According to Chance (1992), this results in the members gaining a "feeling of empowerment and commitment" in which the visionary leader and the group members become "joint stakeholders" (p. 81). Together, the organizational vision is developed, communicated, actualized, and sustained. An understanding of organizational processes and organizational change is necessary for the implementation of needed reforms (Dolan, 1994). The restructuring of our schools is highly dependent on the abilities of principals to effect meaningful change (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Overviews of research on effective schools and leadership suggest that effective leadership in a school is critical (Dunklee, 2000). Leadership is a complex enterprise, and as recent studies assert, vision and collaboration for a shared vision are important characteristics of effective leadership. However, as the focus of schools change from teacher centered to student centered, and the role of the principal changes from manager to instructional leader in a learning community, there are special principal traits that are important to implementing successful school improvement efforts and promoting school change.

Accompanying the calls for reform in schools is an underlying assumption that somehow the leadership needed to execute these changes will emerge. As the reforms are implemented, the leadership skills of school administrators guiding these changes have generated interest from researchers. Information about the leadership skills that are needed to promote change in schools has emerged during the past decade. As the mission of the school has expanded, the ground rules for managing it have changed (Zellner & Erlandson, 1997). The thinking about what makes schools work and therefore the leadership skills that facilitate this have been refined (Lemley, 1997).

As we move into the new millennium, the tempo and the impact of change will increase. Principals will find that change is the constant reality of leadership. Schools do not exist in a static environment. The mix of students served, governance structures, and the intensity of focus on standards and accountability are all changing, sometimes rapidly (ERS, 2000). Understanding how to bring about school change is a key leadership skill (Conner, 1992). Effective leaders spur change by taking risks themselves and by encouraging people to challenge their “mental models” about how things work and what is feasible (OERI, 1999, p. 3). To be effective, a principal must be able to adapt and to encourage flexibility among staff members. School improvement is an exercise in change (Keefe & Howard, 1997).

The literature on education leadership and school change recognizes clearly the role and influence of the principal on whether or not change will occur in the school

(Murphy & Seashore-Louis, 1994; Fullan, 1991; Louis & Miles, 1990). Increasingly, research on high performing schools reveals that these schools value change as a means of realizing increased effectiveness. In their research on improving the urban high school, Louis and Miles (1990) cite “the will and the skill” for change in a collegial professional learning community as the key to school improvement (p. 38). It seems clear that transforming the school organization into a learning community is highly dependent on the leadership of the principal and on the active nurturing of the entire staff’s development as a community. The principal and the staff become partners in education.

This new relationship forged between administrators and teachers leads to a shared and collegial leadership in the school, where all grow professionally and learn to view themselves as “all playing on the same team and working toward the same goal: a better school” (Hoerr, 1996, p. 381). Kleine-Kracht (1993) suggested that administrators, along with teachers, must be learners: “questioning, investigating, and seeking solutions for school improvement” (p. 393). The traditional pattern that “teachers teach, students learn, and administrators manage is completely altered” (Kleine-Kracht, p. 393). Leithwood, Leonard, and Sharratt (1997) reinforced these ideas, finding that in learning communities, principals treat teachers with respect and as professionals, and work with them as peers and colleagues.

Louis and Kruse (1995) identified the supportive leadership of principals as one of the necessary human resources for school-based professional communities where the teachers in a school and its administrators continuously seek and share learning and act on their learning. The goal of their actions is to enhance their effectiveness as professionals for the students' benefit. Hord (1997) termed this arrangement as "communities of continuous inquiry and improvement" (p. 3). The studies of Leithwood, et. al. (1997) made clear that leadership contributes "significantly to school conditions fostering organizational learning (OL) processes" (p. 24). As Sergiovanni (1994) explained, "The sources of authority for leadership are embedded in shared ideas" (p. 214). Senge (quoted by O'Neill, 1995) added "the principal's job is to create an environment where the staff can learn continuously" (p. 21).

In 1990, Peter Senge's book The Fifth Discipline, though written for the business community, moved into the educational environment. Senge's book and its description of learning organizations that might serve to increase organizational capacity and creativity caught the attention of educators struggling to plan and implement reform in the nation's schools. The idea of a learning organization "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (p. 3) prompted new views of schools and school leadership.

**In linking the school leadership role to the development of professional community, Louis and Kruse (1995) identified six issues:**

**First, principals must lead from the center. This requires that the principal positions himself/herself in the center of the staff rather than at the top and take advantage of every opportunity to stimulate conversation about teaching and learning, to bind the faculty around issues of students and instruction.**

**Second, the principal provides teachers with classroom support. It is clear that instructional leadership is a requirement of developing a community of professionals in which “increased cognitive understanding of instruction and learning and a more sophisticated repertoire of teaching skills are goals” (pp. 212-213).**

**Third, leaders model the behaviors of a professional community, keeping the vision of such a workplace culture alive and visible**

**Fourth, the principal supports a culture of inquiry and the application of new knowledge as a high priority. Leaders champion the need for information and data so that staff can engage in discussions of “what is working and how do we know?” (p. 219). The principal supports and promotes action research by teachers as a means by which teachers consume and generate new knowledge.**

**Fifth, effective principals manage conflict by providing a safe forum for discussion, reinforcing the values of the community, and being willing to live with the uncertainty and ambiguity as the participants work through the issues involved.**

And finally, the principal must ensure that the learning community is inclusive by creating opportunities that pull the entire faculty together in pursuit of a common objective or goal. In essence, the school leader must develop the organization, a unified educational system that is committed to continuous learning for continuous improvement. In the framework of organization development, the school must maintain a heightened capacity for solving its own problems (Schmuck & Runkle, 1985). The success of organization development as a school improvement strategy is dependent on the ability of the school leader to facilitate collaborative working relations among all members of the learning community.

In all research, a key factor in effective school reform and school change is the role of the principal. The principal is the chief agent of change in improving the school (Lashway, 1999). This is not a new factor in school change efforts but it is an essential one. Louis and Kruse (1995) found that principals continue to be best positioned to help guide faculty toward new forms of effective schooling. Strong actions by the principal on behalf of organizational development are necessary to initiate school improvement, and once the initiative is under way, it is also necessary for the principal to share leadership, power, authority and decision making with the staff in a democratically participatory way (Hord, 1997).

Increased leadership demands are being placed on principals. As the call for school improvement moves to the forefront of education priority, the job of the

principal is becoming more complex. It requires new roles and new forms of leadership carried out under careful public scrutiny while simultaneously trying to keep day-to-day management on an even keel (Dunklee, 2000). This places principals at the center of the action. As such, they are in a position to have a major impact on school improvement (Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine (1991). Depending on how they choose to lead, this impact can range from highly detrimental to highly supportive. Developing and sustaining school leaders, therefore, is one of the most promising avenues available for successfully addressing the changes that will challenge future schools (Murphy & Forysth, 1999).

Considerable agreement in literature exists regarding the need to improve the leadership roles of the principal (e.g., Glickman, 1990; Leithwood, 1994). However, a recent report from NCES (1997) showed that principal professional development programs are not effectively preparing principals to lead schools through school improvement efforts. In short, the demands placed on principals have changed, but the profession has not changed to meet those demands. This is a major disadvantage, as current principals find very little in their professional preparation or ongoing professional development to equip them for this new role (Berney, M. & Ayers, 1990). School leaders are critical to the success of these initiatives and must be given the support to take the lead in these efforts.

Beginning with the publication of Leaders for America's Schools (Griffiths, Stout, & Forysth, 1987), and continuing through the work of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in 1991, several efforts were launched to examine the preparation and professional development of principals. Many current administrators do not have the training to fulfill the new definitions of learning (OERI, 1999). Continuous learning by experienced principals is critical if they are to ensure sustained and effective school improvement for quality schools. According to Jacobson and Conway (1990), this new attention to administrative preparation generated the beginning of the third wave of reform.

There is a great need for additional information on professional development programs for experienced practicing principals for instructional leadership. It is evident that principals need additional information about the knowledge and skills required for their positions. The report, Effective Leaders for Today's Schools (OERI, 1999), stressed that the professional development for administrators should "be based on a few core standards for which leaders should know and be able to do, with the chief standard being a deep understanding of teaching, learning, and school improvement" (p. 7). New approaches to helping administrators grow and acquire new skills will require changes in content and delivery. Many formal professional development options for principals do not address the skills that leaders really need or they neglect recent research on effective teaching and schooling (OERI, 1999). The reality is that all schools must



improve student learning. Professional development providers should offer school administrators the necessary tools to lead the schools of the future in order to ensure high levels of learning for all students.

Most administrators were not taught how to inspire and empower others, work collaboratively, listen and communicate effectively, or transform the school into a learning community (Ramsey, 1999). Existing professional development for principals tends to be focused on managerial tasks such as finance or legal issues, rather than focusing on instructional leadership and exploring better ways to use leadership to raise student performance. As a result, there are many principals out there floundering as they try to learn these skills all by themselves. According to Bess Keller of Education Week (2000), “The professional development of principals as leaders must put student learning as job one for principals” (p. 3).

In 1996, the document, Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution, sponsored by NASSP in partnership with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was released. The report came along as the spotlight across the nation was being focused on identifying more effective approaches to preparing school principals. This report contained recommendations for school improvement efforts and the importance of strong leadership to guide these efforts. As studies show the crucial role principals can play in improving teaching and learning, it is clear that principals today

also must serve as leaders for student learning (IEL, 2000). In other words, learning does not happen without leadership.

Given the importance of their role, the critical nature of professional development cannot be overemphasized. However, Muse and Thomas (1991) summed up the theme expressed in much of the literature about principal preparation.

“Regardless of the year appointed, principals have been trained and certified administrators through programs largely irrelevant and grossly inadequate for the work responsibilities found in the school principalship” (p. 29). Daresh (1997) also noted, “There are too many complex demands placed on school principals to assume that, once certified, they are set for life. Ongoing inservice education for all administrators must be (and in many cases is) required and seen as part of effective professional life” (p. 8). In recent years there has been an appreciation of the fact that little effort has been directed at improving the ways in which people are supported in this critical educational role. As a result, there has been some movement in a positive direction.

In 1994, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers, developed a set of standards for instructional leadership (CCSSO, 1996). The standards present a core of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that will help link leadership more forcefully to productive schools and enhanced educational outcomes (Murphy, 1994). According to NSDC (2000), many more leaders will become effective if these skills and knowledge

are explicitly taught. To meet these worthy goals for what school leaders should know and do, policymakers must provide them with better professional development.

The standards are grouped into six areas: creating and implementing a vision for learning; sustaining the school culture and instructional program; ensuring good management; collaborating with families and the community; acting with integrity, fairness and ethics; and understanding and influencing the larger political, social economic, legal, and cultural context (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). These standards can help administrators identify the knowledge and skills they need in order to become more effective. It is up to professional development providers to create opportunities in order to help principals meet such standards.

According to the ISLLC report, Proposition for Quality Professional Development of School Leaders (CCSSO, 2000), quality professional development must validate teaching and learning as the central activities of the school. Additionally, the professional development must engage all school leaders in well-planned, integrated, career-long learning to improve student achievement, promote collaboration to achieve organizational goals while meeting individual needs, model effective learning processes, and incorporate measures of accountability that direct attention to valued learning outcomes (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000). The Education Research Service's Informed Educator Series (1999) publication "Professional Development of School Principals," declared that effective professional

development of principals must focus on student achievement and provide principals with substantive research on teaching and learning. All principals must be provided with professional development opportunities to learn the leadership skills needed to use their knowledge of student achievement and instructional methods to shape their school improvement efforts (NSDC, 2000). Clearly, educators and policymakers have recognized that principals need support to confront the challenges of our changing schools.

The critical variable of successful school restructuring is the leadership behavior of the school principal. This is consistent with the administrative preparation reform proposals. These reform proposals make it clear that the traditions of the school principal serving almost exclusively as a building manager are not consistent with newly identified demands for more direct involvement in the quality of teaching, learning, and the needs of students. As Paul Houston of the American Association of School Administrators observed, "Today's leaders must shift their focus from the B's (budgets, books, buses, bonds, and buildings), to the C's (communication, collaboration, and community building)" (NPBE, 1992, p. 4) for continuous school improvement. The ISLLC standards and those set by state policymakers and national associations provide useful input on what is needed in professional development for school administrators (Murphy & Shipman, 1999). The focus must be on what can be done to restructure professional development programs to strengthen the leadership

ability of principals as they lead schools through continuous improvement and seek validation of the efforts through annual accreditation.

### **Accreditation and School Improvement**

Effective principals are strong educators, anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and continuous school improvement. On-going school accountability and evaluation are central to these efforts. School self-assessment, evaluation, and renewal ensure that educational standards for student achievement are maintained. Accreditation organizations monitor the self-assessment and document the efforts of schools to ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn and master a challenging common core of knowledge and skills. The accreditation bodies represent a self-regulation process that focuses primarily on judging educational quality where institutional self-study is at the heart of the process (Young, Chambers, & Kells, 1983).

According to the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC, 2000):

The mission of the Northwest Accreditation Commission is to ensure excellence in education by holding member schools accountable to rigorous standards and a process of continual improvement.

NASC is a non-profit organization, accrediting over 6000 schools spread out over seven states including Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. The purpose of the accreditation is to encourage improvement of schools

through continuous self-study and planning. Accreditation is the affirmation that a school provides the quality of education expected by the community and endorsed by the education world. The essential elements in the accreditation process are (1) a clear statement by the school of its educational intentions, (2) the conduct of a directed self-study focused on the achievement of these intentions, (3) an on-site evaluation by a visitation team of peers, and (4) a decision by the accreditation commission that if the school meets its standards, it therefore receives accreditation (Young, Chambers, & Kells, 1983).

Accreditation is a means of showing confidence in a school's performance. When NASC accredits a school, it certifies that the school has met the prescribed qualitative standards of the Northwest Accreditation Association within the terms of the school's own stated philosophy and objectives.

The chief purpose of the whole accreditation process is the improvement of education for youth by evaluating the degree to which a school has attained worthwhile outcomes set by its own staff and community (Duke, 1986). This is accomplished by periodically conducting a comprehensive self-evaluation of the total school. Through the accreditation process, the school seeks the validation of its self-evaluation by obtaining professional judgment from impartial outsiders on the effectiveness of the total school operation. The intent throughout the process is more than identifying

shortcomings; the chief goal is to seek remedies for inadequacies and to identify and nurture good practices (NSSE, 1998).

The purpose of NASC membership is to protect the public's trust. The Northwest Standards for Accreditation provides an assurance of quality that schools maintain a satisfactory program of education substantiated by research, experience, or judgment of educators. It is comprised on two components: (1) an annual report showing progress toward school improvement and adherence to ten standards and (2) periodic self-evaluation with review and validation by a visiting team of educators.

To become a member of NASC, a school must meet NASC's standards, conduct a self-study, and adopt a model of continuous school improvement (also known as seeking an endorsement) that focuses on improving student performance (NASC, 1999). NASC utilizes standards and their application to enhance learning. These standards require schools to focus on improving student performance and increasing the effectiveness of the school improvement process (Young, Chambers, & Kells, 1983). Schools that are NASC members are examined by an outside team made up of their peers, and have their school improvement plan reviewed by experts. A school becomes accredited through NASC by:

- (1) Meeting NASC standards and criteria; the school and district verify that the necessary preconditions for equity and quality of schooling are in place.

**(2) Undertaking an improvement process, which begins with the development of a mission statement and a student profile. This is followed by an appraisal of the school's organization and instructional effectiveness. Through the self-study, the school discovers if it has what is needed to fulfill its mission statement. It also acquires the self-knowledge needed to plan with confidence. Students benefit from being in a school that knows itself thoroughly.**

**(3) Developing an improvement plan that addresses and identifies needs.**

**Students benefit from a school that constantly strives for improvement.**

**(4) Being evaluated by a peer review team of recognized evaluators trained by the NASC. The evaluators, who have no prior relationship with the school or its sponsoring authority, verify the appropriateness of the school improvement plan during an on-site visit.**

**All schools accredited through NASC must enter into a School Improvement Plan (SIP) in order to meet accreditation requirements. Member schools initiating their self-study during school year 1999-2000 and schools seeking initial accreditation must utilize the NASC School Improvement Process to fulfill the responsibilities of required self-study and peer review in fulfillment of the Standards for Accreditation. Beginning with the school year 2003 –2004, all schools must be utilizing an approved State Accreditation Committee School Improvement Process (SIP) to fulfill the responsibilities of self-study and peer review (NASC, 2000).**



School improvement plan models focus on the total school program rather than on separate components within that program. These models explore the alignment of instructional and organizational practices, as well as the mission of the school. The use of this uniform accreditation self-study instrument facilitates a school's examination of its entire program in light of the school's statement of philosophy and objectives and provides a platform for school improvement. In essence, the imperative of the school improvement model is the development of a learning organization with the focus on improving student achievement.

The planning framework based on The National Study of School Evaluation (NSSE) series on School Improvement provides the steps for developing each part of the plan and serves as a catalyst for change with the goal of improving student performance (NSSE, 1999). The National Study of School Evaluation (NSSE) series on School Improvement helps guide a school staff and community in the development of school improvement initiatives designed to make an enduring difference in the quality of student learning (NSSE, 1998). It focuses on a data-driven and research-based framework for improving student learning and strengthening the instructional and organizational effectiveness of schools. According to the NSSE (1999) guidebook, the planning framework includes the following components:

- (1) Development of the Student/Community Profile: This section provides a process for gathering and analyzing information in a variety of critical areas that

leads to the development of a comprehensive profile of the students and community served by the school.

**(2) Formulation of Beliefs and Development of the School's Mission Statement:**

This section assists a school in articulating its beliefs and helps guide the development of a mission statement, which reflects a collective vision for student learning.

**(3) Identification of Desired Results for Student Learning:** This section guides in the identification of desired results for student learning aligned with the school's beliefs and mission statement.

**(4) Analysis of Instructional and Organizational Effectiveness:** This section helps the school assess the quality of their work in behalf of student learning by analyzing the effectiveness of their instructional and organizational practices.

Schools are encouraged to review research-based indicators of high performing systems of teaching and learning to determine the extent to which these practices are currently evident in the work of the school. This section also challenges the school to determine the extent of alignment of instructional practices and organizational conditions with the school's beliefs, mission and desired results for student learning.

**(5) Development of a School Improvement Plan:** This section provides a process for determining the target area goals, the design of action steps to achieve the

goals, and the implementation and monitoring of the school improvement process.

**(6) Implementing the Plan and Documenting Results:** This section helps the school monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan, collect evidence of the achievement of the target goals for improvement, and sustain the commitment to continuous improvement.

Developing and implementing a comprehensive plan for school improvement in order to be accredited by NASC is a demanding responsibility of school leaders.

This new focus on purposeful improvement requires a new kind of leadership; and, an essential requirement of this leadership is vision. Vision permits the school leader to see beyond the managerial routines and compels the principal to focus on what is truly important. The effective principal who leads successful school improvement efforts is able to identify the goals related to meeting the learning needs of all students and has the skill to build a learning organization that supports the necessary growth of all staff members in order to accomplish these goals (Duke, 1986).

Critical to the success of the school improvement process is consensus and agreement before moving ahead with the activities of the next section. The principal must be capable of building a collaborative effort for shared decision making among all staff in order to achieve this. The process of school improvement planning also incorporates active participation from all of the community—faculty, staff, parents, and

students—throughout the entire process. Staff are encouraged to identify a variety of comprehensive measures to describe student performance. Questions are raised that explore the alignment of instructional and organizational practices with the achievement of desired learner outcomes and the mission of the school. As the staff becomes aware of areas in which there is a need for better alignment, they discover ways in which the program may be improved and develop ownership in the identification and resolution of such problem areas. This results in the identification of a School Improvement Plan that is specifically targeted at needs identified within an individual school and addressed the gap of what is and what it could be and should be. Since experts in systems change say it usually takes five years for change to occur at all levels of an organization, the plan guides the school improvement efforts of the staff and community for the following three to five years (NASC, 2000). A successful school improvement process is dependent on a principal who can facilitate the necessary growth in the organization to accomplish these activities.

Almost every reform effort requires principals to refocus their responsibilities, concepts, strategies, and roles. As a result of these efforts, principals must acquire new knowledge and skills. New designs in professional development are productive approaches to addressing this need. Professional development providers can provide principals with the opportunity to learn the necessary skills and knowledge needed to create organizations that are continually improving. Guskey and Huberman (1995)

stress, “Never before in education has there been greater recognition of the need for ongoing professional development” (p. 1).

The principal is the school leader and the primary catalyst for the school’s progress and direction. As such, the principal’s leadership is integral to the implementation of all reform strategies (Consemaius, 1999). Effective administrators lead by example and empower others with the knowledge, skills, and responsibility they contribute to school improvement (Cross and Rice, 2000). They become instructional leaders and create an atmosphere of learning for students and teachers. Effective school leaders are involved in improvement initiatives within their schools and have demonstrated commitment to change (George, 2001).

Reforms in teaching and learning in our high schools do not come about by accident. They happen only when members of the school community combine thoughtful program development with a clear sense and purpose for improvement in student performance. According to Schmoker (1997) in his book Results: the Key to Continuous School Improvement, the combination of three concepts constitutes the foundation for positive improvement results: meaningful teamwork; clear, measurable goals; and the regular collection and analysis of performance data.

Principals must lead their school through the goal-setting process in which student achievement data is analyzed, improvement areas are identified and actions for change are initiated. This process involves working collaboratively with staff and

school community to identify discrepancies between current and desired outcomes, to set and prioritize goals to help close the gap, to develop improvement and monitoring strategies aimed at accomplishing the goals, and to communicate goals and change efforts to the entire school community (Duke, 1986). In addition, principals must ensure that staff development needs are identified in alignment with school improvement priorities and that these needs are addressed with appropriate professional learning opportunities. Clearly, there are new skills required of school leaders as they lead their organization in school improvement efforts. Skills that are centered more on development of the organization, on aspects of relationships, on situational analysis and on shared leadership will form a firm basis for defining new objectives and new content for the training of principals.

School improvement is a required component for the accreditation of schools. This program of accreditation is fundamentally different than in the past where instead of checking on the quality of student achievement, the criteria required a check on “the quality of the assembly line, that is, curricula, faculty, resources, and so on” (Young, Chambers, & Kells, 1983, p. 227). That accreditation program assumed a direct relationship existed between the quality of the assembly line and the quality of the product. However, research suggests that educational outcomes are much more complex and requires a more comprehensive process to ensure increased levels of student performance. Accreditation requires a systematic approach to the planning and

implementation of school improvement. The challenge is how to prepare principals to successfully implement this process and then sustain the continual improvement that is needed for increased student achievement. Professional development is the critical element for meeting this challenge.

### **Effective Professional Development**

Effective professional development addresses the issue of developing organizational problem-solving capacities and leadership skills of the people within the organization. Orlich (1989) suggests that the “totality of building human and institutional resources in the organization becomes the goal of staff development” (p. 6). The nature of professional development has to do with “helping people grow, learn, improve, enjoy, think, and do” (Harris, 1989, p.1). A quality professional development program is well planned. Planning helps ensure that professional development leads directly to achievement of state, district, school, and professional development outcome goals. Planning also ensures that professional development takes advantage of the best information via needs assessments, ongoing evaluation, and current research. Sparks (1994) contended that “successful school reform results when individual and organizational goals are aligned and coherent” (p.16).

Professional development is an organized effort to improve the performance of people in already assigned positions and is rooted in the belief that all personnel can

improve their performance, that people make organizations effective, and that planned programs are most efficient. Professional development enhances human potential and therefore enhances the school organization. Quality professional development as suggested by Harris (1989), is a planned program of learning opportunities provided to educational staff members based on their needs for the purpose of improving their performance in already assigned positions. Building principals who are directly impacted by current performance demand and role expectations for school improvement are the most knowledgeable group to describe professional development needs to perform their job responsibilities effectively (Daresh and LaPlant, 1985).

An effective professional development program is focused on “emerging trends, needs, or changes in the social milieu” (Orlich, 1989, p. 7). It implies training for the future and suggests that no one ever masters the totality of the profession. Everyone enters the profession with skills and knowledge that will continuously expand with experience both inside and outside of the school. According to Kouzes and Posner (1987), this “growth approach” recognizes that every educator is a continuous learner who wants to solve organizational and instructional problems and recognizes that professional development is an on-going process. In recent years, educational researchers have focused renewed attention on professional development (Sparks, 1994). The new models of professional development are derived from several different theoretical bases, including adult learning theory and theories of teaching effectiveness.



Understanding of adult growth, theories of teaching and learning, and principles of quality professional development can all be applied to the planning and design of administrator professional development activities. This section briefly reviews these perspectives.

The uniqueness of principals as learners must be considered when designing professional development. Adult learning theory holds that factors associated with adult growth are somewhat different than those reported for nonadults (Robbins, 1991). The teaching of adults (andragogy) is different from the teaching of children (pedagogy). Andragogical theory is based on four assumptions: adults are self-directed, have a reservoir of experiences to draw upon, learn what is necessary to perform their evolving social roles, and are problem-centered in their orientation to learning (Pitner, 1987). Daresh and Playko (1992) asserted that adult development can be encouraged by significant role-taking experiences, careful matching of role-taking experiences with level of ability, careful and continuous guided reflection, guided integration of role-taking experience and reflection, and provision for personal support as well as personal challenge (p. 163). Moore (1988) suggested professional development providers must use knowledge about adults and stress self-directed, collaborative, reflective and empowering and growth activities if the program is to be successful. Moyle and Andrews (1987) noted that when planning for professional development programs, the

principles of adult learning should be systematically incorporated in order to strengthen the learning outcomes of the principal.

The teacher effects literature is a second perspective to be acknowledged when planning effective professional development. According to Murphy and Hallinger (1987), the variety of approaches by which principals learn should be increased and although lecture and discussion can be useful, they must be supplemented with an array of other instructional strategies. Duke (1986) proposed discussion or discovery methods, observational learning and modeling, and self-regulation as strategies that have been found effective when teaching adult learners. Joyce and Showers (1980) identified five major training components that are essential for maximum professional development effectiveness: the presentation of theory or a description of skill or strategy; the modeling or demonstration of skills or models; practice in simulated settings; structured and open-ended feedback; and coaching for the transfer of skills and strategies to the workplace. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) contended that effective professional development must involve learning that is centered on the participant and not the instructor.

Research on quality professional development programs serves as the foundation for designing and planning effective professional development for school administrators.

**NASBE (1999) defined quality professional development for principals as “ongoing professional development that is targeted to the individual needs of principals and tailored to the correspond with principal standards” (p. 27). The NASBE Study Group asserted that effective professional development for school administrators is:**

- A. Standards-based and systemic;**
- B. Flexible and adaptable to new and evolving needs of principals and utilizes new technologies to improve efficiency and effectiveness and cut costs;**
- C. Focused upon effective practice or application that is based upon rigorous theory;**
- D. Evaluated according to outcomes;**
- E. Held accountable for bringing principals to high standards;**
- F. Sufficiently flexible to address the individual learning needs of principals; and**
- G. Focused upon three interrelated goals: principals’ personal improvement, meeting school goals, and fostering principals’ career growth (p. 28).**

**Pitner (1987) proposed the following themes be taken into account when designing and implementing quality professional development programs for administrators:**

- Provide opportunities for administrators to be away from the workplace;**
- Allow administrators to personalize their training;**
- Include opportunities for administrators to reflect on their actions;**
- Build on the experiential base of administrators to foster cumulative learning;**

- **Incorporate modeling, feedback, and practice opportunities for the development of skills;**
- **Include a training component for trainers;**
- **Provide professional development for both personal growth and for the development of the organization;**
- **Design professional development that is cumulative and based on the continuous assessment of skills;**
- **Emphasize outcomes over sentiments in the evaluation of training effectiveness; and**
- **Keep the purpose of the training in mind.**

**The National Staff Development Council (1995) recommended the following strategies for designing and planning effective professional development:**

- A. Effective professional development needs commitment from all parties;**
- B. All improvement needs to be continuous, not a one-shot effort;**
- C. Structures must be aligned with professional development goals;**
- D. Planning must be participatory;**
- E. Professional development should be student focused, data driven, and results oriented;**
- F. The content of the professional development program must have proven value;**
- G. Professional development needs to be localized; and**
- H. A variety of approaches must be used.**

Herman and Herman (1995) noted when planning for professional development, the first role is to understand that adults participating in professional development activities have different learning needs which require different delivery approaches. Lashway and Anderson (1991) stated new kinds of delivery systems and innovative programs are replacing the traditional lecture format with such practices as in-depth weekend seminars and mentorships with master principals. Numerous recommendations regarding delivery of professional development for principals have been advanced. All approaches merit attention when planning and designing professional development programs.

NSDC (2000) supports professional development activities that include networks of principals established in study groups, and formal, sustained mentoring arrangements. They recommend that some of this networking can take place online as principals discuss problems and work together on solutions to improvement issues. They also encourage coaches for principals as a means to enable them to stay focused on their instructional goals. Evans and Mohr (1999) discovered in their work with the Annenberg Principals Program the importance of principal study groups as a means for principals to be supported once the formal workshop ends. They found that special attention must be given to methods of learning that they can use on the job such as reflective thinking.

NASBE (1999) proposed leadership academies operating in a retreat format as a professional development approaches that provides highly targeted and intensive assistance to resolve particular leadership issues faced by participants. Peterson (1987) asserted that more and better use of clinically-based field experiences, school improvement projects, simulations, management games, and assessment centers is needed for a greater emphasis on reality-oriented instructional situations geared more toward translating theory into practice.

Smith and Pourchot (1998) found that adult learning is more effective when it is experiential or in response to real needs and problems. According to Murphy and Hallinger (1992), problem-based learning (PBL) is an approach that can make professional development more relevant. The identified three major goals emphasized in problem-simulated learning, one form of PBL: the development of administrative skills, the development of problem solving skills, and the acquisition of the knowledge base that underlies administrative practice.

According to Silver (1987), the strategy of conducting inservice sessions for administration within a district has the advantage of focusing on district issues and common concerns of participants. Inservice presentations such as conferences, workshops, and panel discussions can cover broad topics of interests. While off-site workshops and inservices are often appropriate, Lewis (1997) warned that they should be accompanied by a variety of ongoing, job-embedded learning activities, such as

study groups, action research, peer coaching, curriculum development, and case discussions. Herman and Herman (1995) proposed computer networking and interactive telecommunications as an effective approach for ongoing professional development.

McCay (1999) reported from his research with elementary principals that effective professional development activities include opportunities to network with principal colleagues, peer coaching, translation of theory to practice, opportunities for hands-on applications of the concepts being presented, and access to research and resources from local colleges and universities. Hopkins-Thompson (2000) advocated principal professional development through mentoring and coaching. She surveyed principals representing urban and rural districts in North Carolina and Mississippi and found that learning can be accelerated and made more meaningful through these processes.

Ricciardi (1999) found in her study of middle school principals concerning professional development that content should be matched to their individual needs. She also found that they placed a high value on time spent networking with other principals and asked that better and more intensive follow-up training and support activities be provided to them while they worked on implementing new programs in their schools.

Current understanding about effective professional development for principals suggests that any one of these approaches has great potential for developing the kinds of

leaders needed for today's schools. Effective school leaders need to continually develop their skills and knowledge through many activities – maintaining membership in professional associations, attending conferences and workshops, reading professional journals, and maintaining a professional library (Robbins and Alvy, 1995). But the most promising means of engaging education leaders in continued growth and renewal is through effective professional development activities (Sparks, 2000).

Over the past few years, the spotlight has been on the principal as chief player in either making changes or implementing effective school practices and innovations. Even among well-prepared and high-performing principals, expertise does not last forever. A profession is never mastered (Anderson, 1991). Professionals face different circumstances as clients change and new research and technology appear. Social and political priorities are reordered. Particularly in the current era of rapid reform, failure to provide targeted, on-going professional development to help principals adapt to their changing work environment stymies innovation (Murphy and Forsyth, 1999).

Building capacity to assume new leadership roles requires intensive, on-going professional development that is targeted to the individual needs of principals and tailored to correspond to the standards of effective school leadership. It will be necessary to create an overall system of professional development that extends beyond simple principal remediation and instead positively impacts their school and their



personal career growth. In effect, effective professional development must be results-oriented.

Changing roles of principals and demands by policymakers are forcing professional development providers to reexamine their practices. The most successful professional development programs involve the people who are affected by the professional development (Murphy and Seashore-Louis, 1994). In spite of the difficulties faced by professional development providers when attempting to meet the professional development needs of principals — needs which are recognized as changing as the schools change and as the role of the principal changes in consequence —the fact remains that it is necessary to seek input from the principals regarding what they want and how they want it delivered. The principal must help plan and design activities intended for their own job-related growth. According to Evans and Mohr (1999), “good professional development for leadership scrutinizes its own belief system, content, and process” (p. 532). High quality professional development resources must be made available to principals if reform efforts are to succeed (Tirrozzi, 2000).

### Summary

Effective leadership is the forgotten imperative of education reform. Effective leaders can create vision and a climate that encourages everyone in the school to reach

higher and accomplish more. The role of the principal has changed dramatically with reforms in education and changes in society. According to the report, Learning to Lead. Leading to Learn: Improving School Quality through Principal Professional Development (National Staff Development Council, 2000), strengthening the skills and knowledge of the nation's principals is likely to have more immediate payoff in raising student performance than any other area of school improvement because it is central to raising standards, improving teacher quality, and hold schools accountable with results.

The role of the principal in the 21st century will be to create schools that are characterized by continuous improvement (Bolman & Deal, 1997). School systems will have to be much more dynamic, data-driven organizations that allow for learning at all levels for all students. The continual improvement of the educational program is essential in providing quality results. Today's schools demand new skills and knowledge from education leaders, including skills that many current principals have not mastered. Chief among these is organization development – the ability to facilitate school improvement for improved student learning through the creation of a learning community. In today's complex school environments and diverse communities this means greater skills in communication, collaboration, and community building are needed. Principals must learn to develop the capacities of their schools and the people within their school. Shifting to this model of instructional leadership will not be easy for schools or school leaders (NSDC, 2000).

**Organized professional development programs are not adequately preparing leaders to meet their new job demands. Substantial changes in the current practices of principal training must occur. If education reform is going to succeed, better support for professional growth of current and future principals must be developed. There must be a concentrated effort to prepare enlightened administrators who are committed to the continuous development of their schools and provide them with the skills and ability to do great things in improved student learning.**

**Although the background information developed through this literature review provides additional context in which to study the issue of professional development needs of principals facilitating school improvement efforts, it does not adequately answer the questions posed by this paper. This study builds upon existing information and provides additional information relative to the professional development needs of practicing principals who are faced with leading schools in continuous improvement. Over the next few years, there will be continued efforts to identify focuses for leadership development for experienced principals so that they can “make a difference” in their schools. This is the vision that prompted this research study.**

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

Successful educational reform and school improvement within a high school ultimately hinges on the leadership skills of the principal. If schools are to successfully confront the complexities of a changing society and improve learning for students, then school leaders must be provided with professional development activities that improve their ability to lead schools through a school improvement process. The role of the principal is of increasing importance in relation to educational change and school improvement.

The challenge is to design professional development activities for principals in these emergent roles. School improvement and the skills needed to facilitate a comprehensive self-study emphasize the importance of the principal as an agent of change. Organizational change can only be effected by helping the individual change. Organizations do not change: the individuals (people) within the organization are the driving forces – they have to change. Change requires learning (Senge, 1990).

Professional development providers will have to give increasing attention to the learning needs of school leaders to address the school reform demands of continuous school improvement.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the professional development needs of high school principals seeking accreditation through a school improvement process and to determine if there was a relationship between the perceptions of the state agency professional development providers regarding these needs. In addition, this study determined what type of professional development delivery system was preferred by the principals. Information about professional development needs and preferred professional development delivery systems was obtained from two sources: a questionnaire given to high school principals in the NASC region and a questionnaire given to state agency professional development providers.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the perception of high school principals regarding their professional development needs to facilitate the NASC school improvement accreditation process?

2. Is there a relationship between perceptions of principals and the demographic characteristics of their schools regarding professional development needs?
3. Is there a preferred delivery system of professional development by the principals?
4. What is the perception of state agency personnel regarding the professional development needs for principals to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?
5. Is there a relationship between the perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the perception of high school principals regarding the professional development needed to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?

#### **Selection of the Subjects**

The population of this study consisted of high school principals and state agency professional development providers in the states seeking accreditation from the Northwest Accreditation Association. These states are Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. These states were chosen due to their membership in the NASC, which requires schools to conduct a school improvement

process for annual accreditation. High school principals within the identified states were contacted using the NASC membership directory. State agency professional development providers were identified through their respective state departments of education.

Principals in the Clark County School District were not a part of this survey due to the interaction of this researcher as a professional development provider for the school improvement process for the Clark County School District and because they also participated in the reliability testing of the survey instrument. The entire group of high school principals in the NASC region was surveyed with exception to the previously stated delimitations (n=623).

### **Instrumentation Design**

In order to determine the professional development needs of high school principals seeking accreditation, a needs assessment was conducted utilizing a survey. Orlich (1989) studied effective staff development programs and concluded that the first prerequisite for success (being effective) was a comprehensive assessment of needs. Kaufman (1985) concurred, “needs assessments involve identifying and justifying gaps in results, and placing the gaps in prioritized order for attention” (p. 21). Alreck and Settle (1985) described the survey as an instrument which can be used to obtain information that is unavailable from other sources or would be more difficult and

expensive to obtain otherwise. They further acknowledged that surveys provide information that helps the producer of the survey better understand their respondents and therefore able to serve them more effectively. Reviere, Berkowitz, Carter, and Graves-Ferguson (1996) suggested the survey is the most frequently used method in needs assessment research.

The questionnaire is a basic survey instrument containing instructions, questions or items, response alternatives where appropriate, and specific means for recording responses (Alreck and Settle, 1985). In order to obtain information regarding professional development needs of principals, the researcher developed and validated a questionnaire entitled the Profile of Principal Professional Development Needs for Accreditation (PPPDNA).

The design of the instrument was based on the needs assessment model. A need is defined as a quantifiable gap in attitude, achievement, performance, or skills and concepts between the real and ideal or between the actual and desired (Wiersma, 1986; Orlich, 1989). The framework of this instrument was designed to obtain information concerning a principal's self-perception of his or her need (or lack of) for professional development in the leadership skills/competencies to facilitate an accreditation school improvement process.

The researcher took steps to strengthen the validity of the evidence collected in the questionnaire. By using the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium



(ISLLC) Standards and the competencies described in the 21 job performance domains developed by the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (1990), the researcher used current research about domains which are viewed as critical for success in the principalship. These domains include the skills and knowledge areas needed for organizational development and improvement such as building team commitment, creating a learning organization, building community and involvement, sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement and facilitating the change process.

Additional items were added and designed from information taken from the “Analysis of Developmental Needs” and the “21<sup>st</sup> Century School Administrator Skills Self-Assessment for Instructional Leaders” published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1986, 2000), the “Metropolitan Principal Preparation Survey” from Minneapolis Public Schools (1998), and the “Identifying the Needs of Middle School Principals Survey” by Ricciardi (1997). The questionnaire items were categorized within the context of leadership activities to facilitate the school improvement process.

The PPPDNA contained three sections: a demographic professional profile, leadership skills and knowledge, and the preferred format for professional development. In the first section, information about the independent variables pertaining to the participants’ demographic characteristics was elicited. The second section consists of 25 items which asked participants to rate their perceived level of professional

development need in each leadership performance domain using four-point Likert-type scales (1=Not a Need to 4=Extremely Important Need). A higher rating indicated a greater perceived level of development need in each of the school improvement leadership areas. On the third part of the questionnaire respondents were asked to rate their preference for each of eight professional delivery methods using four-point Likert-type scales (1=Not Likely to Participate In to 4=Very Likely to Participate In). A higher rating indicated a greater preference for the professional development delivery method. A free-response and comment section provided an opportunity for respondents to add any additional information.

In order for the researcher to have confidence in the results of the study, it was necessary to ensure the quality of the survey instrument (McMillan and Schumacher, 1989). There are two technical concepts of measurement, validity and reliability that affect the quality of the measure.

### Validity

A valid instrument measures appropriately and dependably what it is intended to measure. An instrument can be judged and validated by a panel of experts and field tested for the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences made from data collected by the instrument (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996, p. 262; Jones, 1973, p. 146).

McMillan and Schumacher (1989) suggested two steps in getting feedback about the questionnaire before it is used in a study: an informal critique of individual items as they are prepared, and a pretest of the full questionnaire (p. 265). The draft of PPPDNA was first distributed to a representative group of approximately twenty-five high school principals at the annual NASC Commissioner meeting in Portland, Oregon (December 6-8, 2000) to comment on its usefulness as a survey tool to determine principal professional development needs. Revisions were made based on their feedback.

Educational experts in both the Northwest Accreditation school improvement process and principal professional development provided input on possible items for inclusion in the survey. The panel of experts from both NASSP (Dick Flanery , Executive Director of Professional Development and Kermit Buckner, former Assistant Director of Professional Development) and NASC (Len Paul, Past President, Jim Whitford and Joe Pope, Commissioners) reviewed the instrument and commented on the instrument in terms of the adequacy of the content for the intended purpose of the instrument, user friendliness and other questions concerning content validity. Modifications were made based on their recommendations.

A field test was conducted at the NASSP conference in Phoenix, Arizona (March 9-13, 2001) to check for format, clarity, the adequacy of the content for the intended purpose of the instrument, user friendliness and other questions concerning

face validity. This enabled the researcher to revise and refine the questionnaire. The participants were asked to review the questionnaire and respond to the following:

- Are the questions stated clearly?
- Are the questions relevant to the subject?
- Is it written with sufficient appeal to ensure response?
- Are the questions too restrictive or too broad?
- Are the questions phrased in the appropriate language for school administrators?
- Are there questions which should be eliminated and others included?
- Will principals be able to respond to all of the questions?

The researcher made revisions based on the feedback from the field test.

### **Reliability**

The next step was to ensure reliability which refers to the consistency of measurement. The questionnaire was pilot tested for reliability with the Clark County School District high school principals [n=27]. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1989), it is best to locate a sample of subjects with characteristics similar to those that will be used in the study and the size of the pretest sample should be greater than twenty (p. 265). Alreck and Settle (1985) suggested a “preliminary pilot survey, using a small, convenience sample, conducted to test the survey instrument” (p. 416). Lester and Bishop (1994) in the Handbook of Tests and Measurement in Education and the Social Sciences stated, “25-40 subjects should be sufficient for a pilot study where reliability

estimates can be obtained” (p. 12). Cronbach alpha was used to measure internal consistency. It is used for items that are not scored right or wrong. McMillan and Schumacher (1989) stated that the Cronbach Alpha is “generally the most appropriate type of reliability for survey research and other questionnaires in which there is a range of possible answers for each item” (p. 248). Reliability coefficients in the range of .50 to .60 were considered acceptable in this study as the measurement results are to be used for producing results about the group (in this case, principals) and not individuals (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996, p. 287). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated for part two of the instrument and found to be .84.

### Data Collection Procedures

The researcher utilized the Total Design Method (TDM) described by Dillman and Salant (1994) as the framework for the questionnaire and survey process. The TDM steps consist of (a) determine the study objective and prepare a study design, (b) construct the questionnaire and pretest, (c) collect the data and (d) systematically follow-up on data collection (Dillman & Salant, 1994). This process enabled the researcher to increase the quality of information collected and the response rate by following specific procedural steps in the collection of the data for this study:

First, the final version of the instrument, “Profile of Principal Professional Development Needs for Accreditation,” was mailed to the high school principals in the

seven states of the Northwest Accreditation region [n=623]. A cover letter (Appendix B) and a self-addressed envelope for the return of the completed questionnaire were included in the mailing. The researcher asked that the surveys be returned within two weeks and took several steps to decrease the likelihood of nonresponse to the survey. The researcher explained the process for the survey in the accompanying letter. The letter guaranteed confidentiality and offered to share results of the study with interested respondents. Directions were included on each section of the questionnaire. In addition, the respondents were given the option to respond to the questionnaire online at [www.ccsd.net/schools/basic/nwsurvey](http://www.ccsd.net/schools/basic/nwsurvey).

Surveys were coded to maintain confidentiality of participants and to allow for follow-up mailing to non-respondents. Follow-up mailings were conducted two weeks after the initial mailing to prompt a final response (Appendix B). Surveys were also sent to the seven state agency professional development providers as identified by their respective state departments of education.

### Data Analysis

After questionnaires were returned, the researcher reviewed each one for clarity and legibility of responses. The surveys were collected and coded for data entry. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to organize and summarize the data. The statistics program, SPSS 6.1 was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics

including frequencies and percentages were used to examine the professional development needs of principals in the specific leadership performance areas. Results were aggregated by state, size of district, size of school, years as an educator, and years as an administrator, reporting statistical measures of central tendency and variability to provide a comprehensive profile of principals' responses. In addition, a profile of the state agency professional development providers' responses was summarized utilizing descriptive statistics. Cross-tabulation and Pearson Chi-Square were used to examine differences and similarities in principal perceptions based on demographic characteristics. Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) is the most widely used statistic whenever data are frequency counts, such as the number of individuals falling into a particular category (Slavin, 1984). Perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the high school principals were compared.

### Summary

This descriptive study design enabled the researcher to identify areas of need with regard to professional development of high school principals who are seeking accreditation through the NASC school improvement process. The data collected from the formal survey was aggregated to make comparisons and generalizations regarding relationships between demographic variables and principals' development needs in the five school improvement leadership performance categories. Preferences about how

**these skills and competencies should be taught in principal professional development programs were identified and perceptions of professional development needs by principals and state agency professional development providers were compared.**



## **CHAPTER 4**

### **FINDINGS**

#### **Introduction**

**This chapter presents an analysis of the data which pertain to the professional development training needs of experienced high school principals in the NASC region.**

**This chapter is organized into three primary sections. The first section provides a demographic profile of the respondents including personal, professional and school characteristics. These responses offer a portrait of the leaders in high schools in the NASC region. The next section reports on the data which was used to answer the five research questions. A final section summarizes the findings.**

**The purpose of this study was to determine the professional development needs of high school principals in schools seeking accreditation through a school improvement process and to determine if there was a relationship between certain demographic characteristics of the principals and their perceptions of these needs. In addition, this study determined what type of professional development delivery systems were preferred by principals. Finally, the study identified the perceptions of state**

agency professional development providers regarding principals' professional development needs and compared their perceptions to principals' perceptions.

In order to determine what professional development learning opportunities were needed, a needs assessment was conducted using a researcher-designed questionnaire. All 623 principals in the NASC region were mailed the Profile of Principal Professional Development Needs for Accreditation (PPPDNA) survey. Two weeks later, follow-up postcards were sent to 408 individuals who had not returned the survey. A minimum of 50% return rate (312 responses) was established to ensure the validity of the study. Of the 623 questionnaires mailed, 316 were returned (51%). According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample size of 240 would be required to be representative of a population this size. The response rate of this study exceeded the minimums set by National Education Association (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). Out of the 316 returned surveys, 17 principals responded online to the website and the remaining 299 principals returned the survey by mail. All seven state agency personnel responded.

The data collected from the surveys was coded numerically and entered in the computer and analyzed using SPSS 6.1 statistical package. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to report the profiles of the respondents and to provide a comparative representation of the findings in this study of principals for professional development and state agency

professional development providers. Inferential statistics was also used, including a Cross-tabulation and Pearson Chi-Square process to examine differences and similarities in principal perceptions based on demographic characteristics. Perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the high school principals regarding professional development needs for the accreditation process were compared.

### **Characteristics of the Participants**

Principals who participated in the study responded to a number of questions on Part I of the questionnaire regarding demographic information about themselves and the schools in which they worked. Information was collected in the following areas: (a) school size, (b) school locations, (c) school socioeconomic level, (d) school minority population, (e) state performance goal requirements, (f) state reconstitution regulations, (g) school improvement plan, (h) Northwest Accreditation Process school improvement process, (i) date of Northwest Accreditation visitation, (j) size of school district, (k) formal level of education, (l) gender, (m) ethnicity, (n) age, (o) years working in education, (p) years working as an administrator, (q) years principal at current school, (r) Northwest Accreditation SIP workshop attendance, and (s) educational journal subscription(s).

During June of 2001, 623 high school principals were listed in the NASC directory for the seven states of the Northwest Accreditation region. All high school

principals listed were mailed a PPPDNA survey. Of the 623 principals in the NASC region who were surveyed, 316 principals returned the questionnaire, representing an overall return rate of 50.7%.

The following represents the return rates by states (Table1).

**Table 1**

**Numbers and percent of returns by States**

<b>STATE</b>	<b>Number Sent</b>	<b>Number Returned</b>	<b>% Returned</b>	<b>% of Total Returned</b>
Alaska	28	12	42.8	3.8
Idaho	76	32	42.1	10.1
Montana	55	46	83.6	14.6
Nevada	34	18	52.9	5.7
Oregon	160	82	51.3	25.9
Utah	79	42	53.2	13.3
Washington	191	84	44.0	26.6

Montana had the highest return rate with 83.6% of the Montana high school principals returning their questionnaires. Idaho had the lowest return rate with only 42.1% of the Idaho high school principals returning their questionnaires.

The following presents the personal and professional characteristics of the respondents who participated in this study. Table 2 provides comparison about the gender, ethnicity, and age of the participants.

Table 2

Personal Characteristics

ITEM	NUMBER	PERCENT
<b>GENDER</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	222	70.3
Female	94	29.7
Totals	316	100.0
<b>AGE</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Under 30	6	1.9
50 - 59	176	55.7
60 +	12	3.8
Totals	316	100.0
<b>ETHNICITY</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	10	3.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	1.3
African American	14	4.4
Caucasian	282	89.2
Hispanic	6	1.9
Totals	316	100.0

Gender, Age and Ethnicity

The principals are predominantly male (70.3%). Over 90% are forty years or older with nearly 60% over fifty years of age. In addition, nearly 90% of the principals are Caucasian followed by 4.4% African American and 3.2% American Indian/Alaska Native. These values are slightly above the national percentages with males representing approximately 65% of all principals, average age is approximately 47.8 years, and approximately 85% of all principals are Caucasian (NCES, 1997).

Principal professional characteristics of experience, educational levels, professional development, and journal subscriptions are found in Table 3.

Table 3

**Professional Characteristics**

ITEM	NUMBER	PERCENT
<b>HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters degree	224	70.9
Ed Specialist	52	16.5
Doctorate	38	12.0
<b>YEARS AS ADMINISTRATOR</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 – 10 years	136	43.0
11 – 20 years	134	42.4
20 + years	46	14.6
<b>YEARS IN EDUCATION</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 – 10 years	14	4.4
11 – 20 years	66	20.9
21 - 30 years	154	48.7
31 - 35 years	70	22.2
35 + years	12	3.8
<b>AT CURRENT SCHOOL</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 - 10 years	290	91.8
11 – 20 years	26	8.2
20 + years	0	0
<b>ATTENDED INSERVICE ON NW ACCREDITATION</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
YES	166	52.5
NO	150	47.5
<b>JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
NASSP	266	88.7
KAPPAN	134	44.7
ED LEADERSHIP	152	50.7
ED WEEK	82	27.3
NO SUBSCRIPTION MARKED	16	3.3

NOTE: Total number of subscriptions exceeds 316 due to many principals subscribing to more than one journal.

### **Formal Education**

Participants reported the highest level of formal training that they had earned in preparation for the principalship (Table 3). Approximately 70.9% of the principals had earned a Masters degree, which is generally the minimum state requirement for administrative certification. Approximately 16.5% of the principals held an educational specialist degree and 12.0% held a doctorate degree.

### **Experience as an Educator**

Data collected about years of experience as an administrator revealed that principals participating in the study ranged from being brand new principals to having more than twenty years of experience (Table 3). Approximately 43.0% of the principals had less than ten years of experience in administration. Another 42.4% had between ten and twenty years of experience in administration, and 14.6% of the principals reported that they had over twenty years of experience in administration.

### **Total Years of Experience in Education**

Participating principals also reported the number of years that they had worked as a public school educator prior to the 2001-2002 school year (Table 3). Principals reported that they had between one to more than thirty-five years of experience working as a public educator. Nearly 48.7% of the principals reported having between twenty and thirty years of experience in public education. Approximately 22.2% of the principals reported having between thirty and thirty-five years experience and 3.8%

reported having over thirty-five years of experience as a public educator.

Approximately 74.7% of the principals in this study were within ten years of retirement.

Approximately 26% of the participants have thirty or more years in public education and were already eligible for retirement under the standard thirty year retirement standard.

#### **Years at Current School as Principal**

Principals also reported the number of years as principal of their current school (Table 3). Approximately 91.8% of the principals had been at their current school as principal for ten years or less. Only 8.2% of the principals had been at their current assignment as principal for more than ten years.

#### **Professional Development Participation**

Participants reported on their participation in professional development for the Northwest Accreditation process (Table 3). Approximately 52.5% of the principals had participated in inservice activities for Northwest Accreditation School Improvement Process; however, 47.5% of the principals had not participated in any professional development activities for the Northwest Accreditation School Improvement Process.

#### **Professional Journal Subscriptions**

Principals also reported on their professional journal subscriptions (Table 3). NASSP journals were the most widely subscribed to with 88.7% of the respondents stating that they subscribed to NASSP. ASCD's Educational Leadership was the



second most subscribed-to journal with 50.7% subscriptions. Approximately 44.7% of the principals indicated a subscription to Phi Delta's Kappan journal. Approximately 27.3% of the principals listed Education Week as a professional journal that they subscribed to. Only 3.3% of the principals did not indicate any professional journal subscriptions. Many of the principals subscribe to more than one professional journal with 36.7% subscribing to both NASSP and Educational Leadership and 22.2% subscribing to NASSP, Kappan, and Education Week.

### School Characteristics

School characteristics of district size, school size, school location, socioeconomic, minority students, formal SIP in place, Northwest Accreditation visitation date, and status of Northwest Accreditation SIP are found in Table 4.

### Size of District

Principals responded to questions about the school districts in which they worked (Table 4). Nearly 43.7% of the principals worked in school districts with fewer than 5000 students. Principals who worked in school districts which had between 5000 and 19,999 students represented 25.9% of the participants. Approximately 13.9% of the principals worked in school districts which had between 20,000 and 49,999 students. Approximately 4.4% of the principals worked in schools which had between 50,000 and 99,999 students. The remaining 9.5% of the participants reported that they worked in school districts with more than 100,000 students.

Table 4

**School Characteristics**

ITEM	NUMBER	PERCENT
<b>SIZE OF DISTRICT</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 - 4999	138	43.7
5000 - 19999	82	25.9
20000 - 49999	44	13.9
50000 - 99999	14	4.4
100000 +	30	9.5
<b>SCHOOL ENROLLMENT</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 - 199	28	8.9
200 - 499	58	18.4
1000 - 1999	116	36.7
2000 - 2999	36	11.4
3000 +	8	2.5
<b>SCHOOL LOCATION</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Urban	122	38.6
Rural	192	60.7
<b>FREE LUNCH RECIPIENTS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 - 25%	172	54.4
26 - 50%	112	35.4
51 - 75%	26	8.2
76 - 100%	6	1.9
<b>MINORITY STUDENTS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0 - 25%	246	77.8
26 - 50%	56	17.7
51 - 75%	8	2.5
76 - 100%	6	1.9
<b>FORMAL SIP</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	292	92.4
No	24	7.6
<b>NW VISITATION DATE</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
2001	44	13.9
2002	72	22.8
2003	46	14.6
2004	48	15.2
2005	40	12.7
No year selected	40	12.7
<b>STARTED NW SIP</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	256	81.0
No	58	18.3

### **School Enrollment**

Principals also responded to questions about the schools in which they worked (Table 4). Principals who worked in schools with fewer than 200 students represented 8.9% of the participants. Approximately 18.4% of the principals worked in schools which had between 200 and 499 students. Approximately 19.6% of the principals worked in schools which had between 500 and 999 students. Most of the principals, 36.7%, worked in schools that had between 1000 and 1999 students. Approximately 11.4% of the principals worked in schools which had between 2000 and 2999 students. Few principals, only 2.5%, worked in schools which had more than 3000 students.

### **Location of School**

Participating principals indicated that they worked in different types of locations throughout the seven states (Table 4). Approximately 38.6% of the principals reported that they worked in urban schools. Approximately 60.7% of the principals reported that they worked in rural schools.

### **Socioeconomics of the Schools**

Principals indicated the socioeconomic levels of the students within their schools (Table 4). To collect this data, the researcher asked participants to provide information about the number of Free Lunch Recipients, a Federal Department of Education standard for socioeconomic level. Approximately 54.4% of the schools reflected fewer than 25% of their students receiving Federal assistance through the Free

**Lunch program.** Approximately 35.4% of the schools had between 26 and 50% of their students identified as Free Lunch Recipients. Approximately 10.1% of the schools had more than 50% low income students, with 8.2% having 51 – 75% of their students receiving Free Lunch benefits and 1.9% of the schools having the highest percentage of low income students with more than 75% of their students identified as Free Lunch Recipients.

#### **Formal School Improvement Plan in Place**

Participating principals provided information regarding the status of a formal school improvement plan (Table 4). Approximately 92.4% of the principals indicated that they had a formal school improvement plan in place. Approximately 7.6% of the principals indicated that there was no formal school improvement plan in place.

#### **Northwest Accreditation School Improvement Process Started**

Participants also responded to questions regarding the Northwest Accreditation School Improvement Process (Table 4). Approximately 81% of the principals reported that they had started the Northwest School Improvement Process while 18.3% reported that they had not yet begun.

#### **Northwest Accreditation Visitation Date**

Participating principals provided information regarding the scheduled visitation date for Northwest Accreditation (Table 4). Approximately 13.9% of the principals had their visitations in 2001. Approximately 22.8% of the principals indicated a scheduled

visitation in 2002, followed by 14.6% who reported a visitation scheduled in 2003, 15.2% reported a visitation scheduled in 2004 and 12.7% reported a visitation scheduled in 2005. Approximately 12.7% of the principals did not indicate a year for the scheduled Northwest Accreditation visitation.

### **Presentation and Analysis of Data**

This section presents the analysis of the data used to answer the five research questions. Methods of analysis and tables displaying the data are also presented.

#### **Research Question One:**

*What is the perception of high school principals regarding their professional development needs to facilitate the NASC school improvement accreditation process?*

Table 5 presents a rank ordering of the extremely important needs identified by principals.

The researcher next examined the means which were calculated from the principals' level of need in each of the twenty-five training areas. The training area of Building a Team Commitment was identified as the highest need, with a mean score of 3.60. Other priorities with the highest means were (a) Creating a Learning Organization (3.51), (b) Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement (3.50), (c) Facilitating the Change Process (3.49), (d) Using Research and "Best Practices" (3.44),

Table 5

**Rank Order Distribution of Professional Development Needs as Identified as Extremely Important**

<b>Area of Focus for Professional Development</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Building team commitment	216	68.4
Creating a learning organization	194	61.4
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	192	60.8
Communicating effectively	186	58.9
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	184	58.2
Facilitating the change process	174	55.1
Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	174	55.1
Using research and “best practice”	174	55.1
Understanding student development and learning	170	53.8
Facilitating professional development/Development of others	168	53.2
Solving problems and making decisions	164	51.9
Building community and involvement	160	50.6
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	158	50.0
Resolving complex problems	158	50.0
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	148	46.8
Setting goals and determining outcomes	148	46.8
Developing the vision and the mission	146	46.2
Analyzing data	144	45.6
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	142	44.9
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	138	43.7
Developing information and data collection strategies	136	43.0
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	134	42.4
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	120	38.0
Managing the organization and operational procedures	118	37.3
Organizing resources	114	36.1

**(e) Communicating Effectively (3.41), and (f) Facilitating Professional Development/Development of Others (3.42). The lowest mean rankings fell in the training areas of (a) Developing the School Organization Using Systems Thinking (3.15), (b) Developing Information and Data Collection Strategies (3.15), (c) Managing the Organization and Operational Procedures (3.08), and (d) Organizing Resources (3.08).**

**Table 6 presents a rank ordering distribution of means and standard deviations. After grouping data by two different methods for analysis, the critical areas of need which were common were identified. The professional development areas which were identified by principals as critical needs were (a) Building a Team Commitment, (b) Creating a Learning Organization, and (c) Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement. Overall, 90% of the principals rated Building Team Commitment and Creating a Learning Organization as either a three (3) or a four (4) on the needs assessment scale for professional development topics.**

**The researcher also examined the training areas that were rated most frequently by principals as an extremely important need. The training area of Building a Team Commitment was rated the highest since 216 principals, which represented 68.4% of the participants, ranked this training area as one of extremely important need. Other areas which received a high percentage of ratings in this category of an extremely important training need were (a) Creating a Learning Organization (61.4%), (b) Sustaining and**

Table 6

**Rank Order of Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by the Means and Standard Deviations of Principal Perceptions of their Professional Development Needs**

<b>Area of Focus for Professional Development</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Building team commitment	3.60	.66
Creating a learning organization	3.51	.70
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	3.50	.72
Facilitating the change process	3.49	.63
Using research and "best practice"	3.44	.71
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	3.43	.79
Facilitating professional development/Development of others	3.42	.70
Communicating effectively	3.41	.80
Understanding student development and learning	3.37	.78
Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	3.35	.84
Resolving complex problems	3.35	.77
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	3.35	.74
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	3.34	.73
Building community and involvement	3.32	.79
Setting goals and determining outcomes	3.32	.75
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	3.31	.70
Solving problems and making decisions	3.30	.87
Analyzing data	3.24	.85
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	3.23	.83
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	3.23	.78
Developing the vision and the mission	3.17	.94
Developing information and data collection strategies	3.15	.92
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	3.15	.92
Managing the organization and operational procedures	3.08	.88
Organizing resources	3.08	.83



Motivating for Continuous Improvement (60.8%), (c) Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation (58.2%), (d) Communicating Effectively (58.9%), (e) Facilitating the Change Process (55.1%), (e) Building Shared Decision Making, Collegiality and Peer Support (55.1%), and (f) Using Research and “Best Practices” (55.1%). The training areas which received the lowest percentage of ratings as an extremely important need were (a) Developing the School Organization Using Systems Thinking (38.0%), (b) Managing the Organization and Operational Procedures (37.3%), and (c) Organizing Resources (36.1%).

A summary of the frequencies, mean, and standard deviation of each of the twenty-five professional development areas as reported by the principals is presented in Appendix A Table 1: Principals’ Perceptions of Professional Development Needs.

#### Research Question Two:

*Is there a relationship between perceptions of principals and the demographic characteristics of their schools regarding professional development needs?*

#### Principals’ Perceptions of Professional Development by State

The researcher examined the training areas that were rated most frequently as an extremely important need by principals within each state. In both Alaska and Idaho, the training area of Communicating Effectively was rated the highest with 83.3% of the principals in those states ranking this professional development area as one of extremely important need. In Montana, Oregon, Utah, and Washington the professional

development area of Building Team Commitment was rated the highest with 73.9%, 78%, 71.4%, and 68.3% respectively of the principals within the four states ranking this training area as one of extremely important need. In Nevada, the professional development area of Solving Complex Problems was rated the highest with 66.7% of the principals ranking this training area as one of extremely important need.

The cross tabulation results of the twenty-five professional development areas by state of the respondent are presented in Appendix A Table 2: Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by States.

Chi square analysis showed significant differences in the perceptions of participating principals by state in 18 areas regarding their professional development needs (Table 7).

#### Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development by Size of District

The researcher examined the training areas that were rated most frequently as an extremely important need by principals based on the size of their school district. In districts with less than 5000 students, the training area of Building Team Commitment was rated the highest with 66.7% of the principals in those districts ranking this professional development area as one of extremely important need. In districts with 5000 – 19,999 students and districts with 49,999 – 99,999 students, the professional development area of Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation was rated the

Table 7

**Significant Differences in Perceptions by States and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level)**

<b>Area of Professional Development</b>	<b>Chi Square</b>	<b>Significance</b>
Analyzing data	29.49	.042
Communicating Effectively	42.97	.0008
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	49.03	.0001
Creating a learning organization	66.98	.0001
Building a shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	33.6	.014
Building team commitment	75.23	.0001
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	69.73	.0001
Using research and “best practices”	46.46	.0003
Understanding student development and learning	34.11	.012
Setting goals and determining outcomes	36.44	.0062
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	47.4	.0002
Organizing resources	31.22	.0272
Facilitating professional development/Development of others	34.76	.0101
Facilitating the change process	53.06	.0001
Resolving complex problems	30.20	.0355
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	64.19	.0001
Solving problems and making decisions	54.47	.0002
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	48.20	.0001

highest with 71.4% and 72.5% respectively, of the principals within those districts

ranking this training area as one of extremely important need. In districts with 20,000 –

49,999 students, the professional development area of **Building Team Commitment** was

rated the highest with 81.8% of the principals within those districts ranking this training

area as one of extremely important need. In districts with more than 100,000 students, the professional development area of Understanding Measurement, Evaluation and Assessment was rated the highest with 73.3% of the principals within those districts ranking this training area as one of extremely important need.

The cross tabulation results of the twenty-five professional development areas by size of district of the respondent are presented in Appendix A Table 3: Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of District.

Chi square analysis showed significant differences in the perceptions of participating principals by size of district in 13 areas regarding their professional development needs (Table 8).

#### **Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of School**

The researcher examined the training areas that were rated most frequently as an extremely important need by principals based on the size of their school. In schools with less than 200 students, the training areas Communicating Effectively, Creating a Learning Organization, Building Team Commitment, Using Research and "Best Practices," and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement were rated the highest with 57.1 % of the principals in those schools ranking these professional development areas as one of extremely important need. In all other school sizes, the professional development area of Building Team Commitment was rated the highest

Table 8

**Significant Differences in Perceptions by Size of School District and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level)**

Area of Professional Development	Chi Square	Significance
Analyzing data	23.53	.0236
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	23.38	.0451
Creating a learning organization	24.98	.0149
Building a shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	21.08	.0492
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	38.97	.0001
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	27.42	.0067
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	46.96	.0001
Setting goals and determining outcomes	25.63	.0121
Facilitating professional development/Development of others	23.81	.0216
Facilitating the change process	53.06	.0001
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	35.92	.0003
Solving problems and making decisions	54.47	.0002
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	27.01	.0077

with 58.6%, 61.3%, 75.4%, and 100% respectively, of the principals within those schools ranking this training area as one of extremely important need.

The cross tabulation results of the twenty-five professional development areas by size of school of the respondent are presented in Appendix A Table 4: Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of School.

Chi square analysis showed significant differences in the perceptions of participating principals by size of school in 20 areas regarding their professional development needs (Table 9).

Table 9

**Significant Differences in Perceptions by Size of School and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at  $P=.05$  level)**

Area of Professional Development	Chi Square	Significance
Building community and involvement	27.15	.0276
Analyzing data	24.99	.0499
Communicating effectively	33.77	.0037
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	39.92	.0005
Creating a learning organization	39.08	.0006
Developing the vision and the mission	40.63	.0004
Building a shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	51.51	.0001
Building team commitment	28.09	.0209
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	36.41	.0015
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	26.37	.0343
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	28.67	.0178
Understanding student development and learning	29.87	.0124
Setting goals and determining outcomes	32.04	.0064
Managing the organization and operational procedures	37.55	.0011
Organizing resources	27.57	.0244
Facilitating professional development/Development of others	30.42	.0105
Facilitating the change process	39.92	.0005
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	37.56	.0011
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	42.99	.0002
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	27.09	.0281

### **Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Years in Administration**

The researcher examined the training areas that were rated most frequently as an extremely important need by principals based on the principal's years in administration. Principals in all categories reported the training area of Building Team Commitment, as the area of most need for professional development with 64.2%, 71.5% and 73.9% respectively, of the principals in that category choosing it as an extremely important need.

The cross tabulation results of the twenty-five professional development areas by years in administration of the respondent are presented in Appendix 1 Table 5:.

### **Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Years in Administration.**

Chi square analysis showed significant differences in the perceptions of participating principals by years in administration in 14 areas regarding their professional development needs (Table 10).

### **Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Degree Earned**

The researcher examined the training areas that were rated most frequently as an extremely important need by principals based on the degree earned by the principal. Principals with a Masters degree reported the training area of Building Team Commitment, as the area of most need for professional development with 68.5% of the principals in that category choosing it as an extremely important need. Principals with an Educational Specialist degree reported the training areas of Analyzing Data,

Table 10

**Significant Differences in Perceptions by Years in Administration and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level)**

Area of Professional Development	Chi Square	Significance
Developing information and data collection strategies	16.65	.0107
Building community and involvement	15.51	.0166
Analyzing data	20.3	.0025
Communicating effectively	19.24	.0038
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	17.20	.0086
Developing the vision and the mission	15.50	.0167
Building a shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	20.57	.0022
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	24.65	.0004
Using research and “best practices”	25.28	.0003
Understanding student development and learning	20.91	.0019
Setting goals and determining outcomes	14.13	.0176
Resolving complex problems	15.74	.0152
Solving problems and making decisions	20.19	.0026
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	18.34	.0054

**Building Team Commitment, and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous**

**Improvement, as the areas of most need for professional development with 73.1% of the principals in that category choosing all three of these areas as an extremely important need. Principals with a Doctorate reported the training area of Understanding Student Development and Learning, as the area of most need for professional development with 68.4% of the principals in that category choosing it as an extremely important need.**



The cross tabulation results of the twenty-five professional development areas by degree earned of the respondent are presented in Appendix A Table 6: Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Degree Earned.

Chi square analysis showed significant differences in the perceptions of participating principals by years in administration in nine areas regarding their professional development needs (Table 11).

Table 11

**Significant Differences in Perceptions by Level of Education and Areas for Professional Development (Significance at P=.05 level)**

Area of Professional Development	Chi Square	Significance
Building community and involvement	13.65	.0338
Analyzing data	28.62	.0001
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	15.63	.0156
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	20.82	.0019
Managing the organization and operational procedures	33.38	.0001
Organizing resources	22.51	.0009
Facilitating professional development/Development of others	36.28	.0000
Facilitating the change process	31.60	.0000
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	19.07	.0041

**Research Question Three:**

*Is there a preferred delivery system of professional development by the principals?*

The following presents the preferred delivery of professional development as reported by the 316 principals. Table 12 provides the percentages of the frequencies of their selections.

Table 12

**Professional Development Delivery Method**

Method	Not likely to participate in %	May participate in %	Likely to participate in %	Very Likely to participate in %
Workshop	1.3	12	47.5	38
Online/Self-paced	26.6	34.8	29.1	8.9
Mentoring/Internship/ Coaching	12	25.3	41.1	21.5
University Coursework	18.4	40.5	31	9.5
Problem-based projects	13.3	38	37.3	10.8
Small study group	10.8	28.5	41.8	19
Hands-on/Field-based	5.1	18.4	41.1	34.8
Seminar/Conference	1.9	10.8	38.6	46.8

Almost half of the principals (46.8%) reported the seminar/conference professional delivery method as the primary type of professional development in which

they would be very likely to participate. Approximately 38% of the respondents preferred the workshop as the preferred professional delivery system. This was closely followed by 34.8% of the principals preferring the professional delivery method of Hands-on/Field-based. Only 8.9% of the principals preferred the Online/Self-paced professional development method.

Table 13 presents a rank ordering distribution of means and standard deviations for principals' preferred delivery of professional development.

**Table 13**

**Rank Order of Principals' Preferred Delivery of Professional Development by Means and Standard Deviations**

<b>Area of Focus for Professional Development</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Seminar/Conference	3.33	.75
Workshop	3.24	.71
Hands-on/Field-based	3.06	.86
Mentoring/Internship/Coaching	2.72	.94
Small study groups	2.69	.90
Problem-based projects	2.46	.86
University coursework	2.32	.88
On-line/Self-paced	2.20	.94

The researcher next examined the means which were calculated from the principals' preferred methods of professional development delivery. The delivery

method of Conference/Seminar was identified as the most preferred, with a mean score of 3.33. Other preferred delivery methods with the highest means were Workshop (3.24), and Hands-on/Field-based (3.06). The lowest mean rankings fell in the professional development delivery areas of Online/Self-paced (2.20) and University coursework (2.32).

**Research Question Four:**

*What is the perception of state agency personnel regarding the professional development needs for principals to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?*

The researcher first examined the training areas that were rated most frequently by state agency personnel as an extremely important need. The training areas of Setting Goals and Determining Outcomes, Facilitating the Change Process, Developing and Implementing Strategic Action Plans, Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation, Solving Problems and Making Decisions and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement were rated the highest since all seven (100%) state agency professional development providers ranked these training areas as ones of extremely important need. Other areas which received a high percentage of ratings in this category of an extremely important training need were Building Consensus and Negotiating Effectively, Creating a Learning Organization, Developing the Vision and the Mission, Building Shared Decision Making, Collegiality and Peer Support, and

**Building Team Commitment with six out of seven (85.7%) state agency personnel ranked these training areas as ones of extremely important professional development need. The training areas which received the lowest percentage of ratings as an extremely important need were Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating Curriculum and Facilitating Professional Development/Development of Others with only two of the seven (28.6%) state agency personnel ranking these training areas of extremely important need. A summary of the frequencies, mean, and standard deviation of each of the twenty-five professional development areas as reported by the state agency professional development providers is presented in Appendix A Table 7: State Agency Professional Development Needs.**

**Table 14 presents a rank ordering of the extremely important professional development needs identified by state agency personnel.**

**Research Question Five:**

**Is there a relationship between the perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the perception of high school principals regarding the professional development needed to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?**

**Mean and rank comparisons of principals and state agency professional development providers showed differences with regards to the professional development needs of principals. (Table 15)**

Table 14

**Rank Order of State Agency Personnels' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Means and Standard Deviations**

<b>Area of Focus for Professional Development</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	4.00	.00
Solving problems and making decisions	4.00	.00
Facilitating the change process	4.00	.00
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	4.00	.00
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	4.00	.00
Setting goals and determining outcomes	4.00	.00
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	3.86	.68
Creating a learning organization	3.86	.68
Facilitating professional development/Development	3.86	.68
Developing the vision and the mission	3.86	.68
Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer	3.86	.68
Resolving complex problems	3.71	.49
Building team commitment	3.71	.76
Using research and “best practice”	3.71	.76
Communicating effectively	3.57	.54
Analyzing data	3.43	.98
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	3.43	.98
Managing the organization and operational procedures	3.43	.98
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	3.43	.98
Building community and involvement	3.29	.49
Organizing resources	3.29	.49
Developing information and data collection strategies	3.14	.90
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	3.14	.90
Understanding student development and learning	3.14	.90
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	3.00	.82

**Table 15: Mean and Rank Comparisons of Principals and State Agency Professional Development Providers**

<b>Area of Professional Development</b>	<b>Principals' Mean</b>	<b>Principals' Rank</b>	<b>State Agency Personnel Mean</b>	<b>State Agency Personnel Rank</b>
Developing information and data collection strategies	3.15	22	3.14	22
Building community and involvement	3.32	14	3.29	20
Analyzing data	3.24	18	3.43	16
Communicating effectively	3.41	8	3.57	15
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	3.35	12	3.86	7
Creating a learning organization	3.51	2	3.86	8
Developing the vision and the mission	3.17	21	3.86	10
Building a shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	3.35	10	3.86	11
Building team commitment	3.60	1	3.71	13
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	3.23	19	3.43	17
Using research and "best practices"	3.44	5	3.71	14
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	3.31	16	3.00	25
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	3.34	13	3.43	19
Understanding student development and learning	3.37	9	3.14	24
Setting goals and determining outcomes	3.32	15	4.00	6
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	3.15	23	3.14	23
Managing the organization and operational procedures	3.08	24	3.43	18
Organizing resources	3.08	25	3.29	21
Facilitating professional				

development/Development of others	3.42	7	3.86	9
Facilitating the change process	3.49	4	4.00	3
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	3.23	20	4.00	4
Resolving complex problems	3.35	11	3.71	12
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	3.43	6	4.00	5
Solving problems and making decisions	3.30	17	4.00	2
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	3.50	3	4.00	1

The researcher examined the differences in the ranking of the professional development areas by the principals and the professional development providers. Both groups placed Facilitating the Change Process and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement in the top five areas to be addressed. Both groups placed Organizing Resources, Developing the School Organization Using Systems Thinking and Developing Information and Data Collection Strategies in the bottom five areas to be addressed. In eleven of the twenty-five areas of professional development topics, the difference in rankings was less than four. Principals ranked Building a Team Commitment, Creating a Learning Organization and Sustaining, Motivating for Continuous Improvement and Facilitating the Change Process as their top four areas of need for professional development. The seven state agency professional development providers ranked Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement, Solving



**Problems and Making Decisions, Facilitating the Change Process and Developing and Implementing Strategic Action Plans as the top four professional development areas of need for principals.**

### **SUMMARY**

**The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings related to each of the research questions. The data collected for this study were subjected to treatment by descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. Descriptive analysis of the data included the use of frequency distributions and cross-tabulations.**

**From the responses of the participating high school principals, the results clearly indicated that they view the topics of Building Team Commitment and Creating a Learning Organization as the most important topics for future professional development activities. They also prefer that these topics of professional development be delivered through Seminars/Conferences and Workshops. State agency professional development providers view Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement and Solving Problems and Making Decisions as the most important topics for professional development for principals.**

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Introduction**

**Good leadership is not innate (Fullan, 2001). The main leadership forces facing principals today are organizational. Leaders must be able to establish expectations on the norms of teaching and learning for all members of the learning community while building organizational systems to support them and maintaining a professional climate that encourages practitioners to continue to learn. Leadership today requires the ability to mobilize constituents to do important but difficult work under conditions of constant change, overload, and fragmentation. Principals must become organization developers if they are going to be able to facilitate successful school improvement processes. This requires ongoing professional development opportunities to help principals update their leadership knowledge and skills on a continuing basis. Regular opportunities for self-assessment of learning needs must be provided. These needs must be addressed by sustained, meaningful professional development.**

The purpose of this study was to examine the professional development needs of high school principals regarding their needs to lead a school through the Northwest Accreditation School Improvement Process. The study examined principals' perceived professional development needs and their preferred delivery method of the professional development. The research also analyzed the relationship of principals' professional development needs and several demographic characteristics, including state of residence, size of school district, size of school, years in administration, and formal education. Finally, the study identified the perceptions of state agency professional development providers regarding principals' professional development needs and compared their perceptions to principals' perceptions.

For the purpose of data collection, the researcher asked all of the 623 high school principals in the Northwest Accreditation region to respond to a questionnaire. Data was collected from 316 (50.7%) principals who were working in the public schools in the seven states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington during the 2000-2001 school year. The quantitative data from principals' responses were processed statistically by SPSS 6.1. Frequencies and percentages were compiled to provide information about the demographic characteristics of principals and to answer questions about their perceived professional development needs and their preferred delivery methods for their training. Cross-tabulation and Pearson Chi-Square were used to identify significance differences in perceptions of participating principals

based on several demographic characteristics. Data was also collected from seven state agency representatives who were decision-makers for NASC professional development within their respective states. Responses of state agency professional development providers were compared to responses of the high school principals.

### **Findings of the Study**

The findings of the study were based on the research questions analyzed below:

- 1. What is the perception of high school principals regarding their professional development needs to facilitate the NASC school improvement accreditation process?*

Principals identified their most important professional development needs in the areas of Building a Team Commitment, Creating a Learning Organization, Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement, Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation, Communicating Effectively and Facilitating the Change Process. Data suggested that principals recognized the importance of their own professional knowledge and skills in these areas and that they understood their own responsibilities for addressing issues related to facilitating a school improvement process for Northwest Accreditation. The data suggested that principals recognized professional development in these domains would help them perform their primary duties as instructional leaders and organization developers for continuous school improvement. The areas of Managing the Organization and Operational Procedures and Organizing Resources were

identified by principals as areas of least need for professional development. The data suggested that principals are concerned with the skills of leadership as compared to the skills of management. Principals clearly recognized the collaborative nature of school leadership and ranked areas of need for professional development in those areas that would assist them in developing a collaborative learning community.

*2. Is there a relationship between perceptions of principals and the demographic characteristics of their schools regarding professional development needs?*

There was a significant relationship identified between several demographic characteristics of the participating principals and areas of professional development needs. These characteristics were: (1) state in which the principal resided (2) size of school district (3) school enrollment (4) administrative experience and (5) level of education.

The researcher examined the professional development areas that were rated most frequently as an extremely important need by principals within each state. In both Alaska and Idaho, the training area of Communicating Effectively was rated the highest. In Montana, Oregon, Utah, and Washington the professional development area of Building Team Commitment was rated the highest. In Nevada, the professional development area of Solving Complex Problems was rated the highest. These data suggested that states differ in their needs based on any number of factors, including state accountability requirements, district mandates, current professional development

opportunities, and situational needs. In Nevada, for example, Legislative mandates of annual accountability reports require principals to collect data in several areas including student achievement, standardized tests, attendance rates, and annual drop-out rates and respond with a comprehensive action plan to address the deficiencies. The complexity of the variables that affect these outcomes such as transiency, parents with minimal education, high teen-age pregnancy rate, increasing growth, and an increasing influx of students with limited English speaking skills are critically evidenced when principals report the need for professional development in Solving Complex Problems.

In districts with less than 5000 students and districts with 20,000 – 49,999 students, the training area of Building Team Commitment was rated the highest. In districts with 5000 – 19,999 students and districts with 49,999 – 99,999 students, the professional development area of Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation was rated the highest need. In districts with more than 100,000 students, the professional development area of Understanding Measurement, Evaluation and Assessment was rated the highest need. These data suggested that in large districts there are more accountability issues and demands for demonstrated results. There is no clear consensus in districts smaller than 100,000 students; however, it is apparent that results orientation and accountability are factors in all school districts.

In schools with less than 200 students, the professional development areas of Communicating Effectively, Creating a Learning Organization, Building Team

**Commitment, Using Research and “Best Practices,” and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement were rated the highest need. In all other school sizes, the professional development area of Building Team Commitment was rated the highest. Principals in all categories of years in administration reported the training area of Building Team Commitment as the area of most need for professional development.**

**Principals with a Master’s degree reported the training area of Building Team Commitment as the area of most need. Principals with an Educational Specialist degree reported the training areas of Analyzing Data, Building Team Commitment, and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement as the areas of most need for professional development. Principals with a Doctorate reported the training area of Understanding Student Development and Learning as the area of most need for professional development. Principals who had completed degrees beyond the Master’s level have been challenged to examine research through the requirements of their respective programs. Their selection of such topics as Analyzing Data and Understanding Student Development and Learning suggested their recognition of research-based, data-driven decision-making as critical to effective school improvement.**

***3. Is there a preferred delivery system of professional development by the principals?***

**Principals identified the delivery method of Conference/Seminar as the most preferred. Other preferred delivery methods identified were Workshop and Hands-**

on/Field-based. The least preferred professional development delivery areas were identified as Online/Self-paced and University coursework. These data suggested that principals are concerned with the amount of time away from the demanding responsibilities of their job and when participating in professional development, they want to (1) be held captive, i.e. attend a workshop or a conference for a short period of time and (2) get the information so that they can get back to their schools. The concern with time and the ongoing priorities of leading a school may also have been the reason few principals selected self-paced online professional development. This requires a self-modulated, self-paced time commitment. Unlike being held captive in a workshop, this is easy to postpone to some later date that may never happen when more pressing issues arise. Another factor that may have impacted the lack of interest in online professional development was the fact that the majority of the principals (55.7%) were over 50 years of age. Having not grown up in the midst of the technology era they may not be comfortable with this option. The lack of technology interest was also evidenced by the small percentage of principals who responded to the questionnaire via the website.

*4. What is the perception of state agency personnel regarding the professional development needs for principals to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?*



The researcher first examined the training areas that were rated most frequently by state agency personnel as an extremely important need. The training areas of Setting Goals and Determining Outcomes, Facilitating the Change Process, Developing and Implementing Strategic Action Plans, Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation, Solving Problems and Making Decisions and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement were rated the highest areas of need by the state agency professional development providers. The training areas which were rated the lowest were Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating Curriculum and Facilitating Professional Development/Development of Others. These data suggested that state agency personnel are concerned with issues related to school progress and accountability. The state agency personnel are often responsible for rating schools based on student achievement and the resulting school improvement plans that are developed. The professional development topics selected as important by the state agency personnel focus on areas such as goal setting, developing strategic plans, decision making, and setting direction which all suggest the development of action plans and the monitoring of those plans. These activities are consistent with the standard tasks assigned to state agency personnel.

*5. Is there a relationship between the perceptions of state agency professional development providers and the perception of high school principals regarding the*

*professional development needed to successfully complete the NASC school improvement accreditation process?*

Both groups placed Facilitating the Change Process and Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement in the top five areas to be addressed. Both groups placed Organizing Resources, Developing the School Organization Using Systems Thinking and Developing Information and Data Collection Strategies in the bottom five areas to be addressed. In eleven of the twenty-five areas of professional development topics, the difference in rankings was less than four. These data suggested that both groups recognize the importance of continuous improvement as the critical effort for improved student achievement and the creation of powerful learning communities. Both groups also recognized that understanding the change process is essential to motivating and sustaining this improvement process. Where they differed had to do primarily with their respective vantagepoint. School leaders selected first those topics that enhanced their ability to create a learning community necessary to sustaining school improvement thus satisfying accreditation requirements. State agency personnel selected first those areas they were most likely responsible for monitoring. For example, if they reviewed accreditation SIPs and saw deficiencies in setting goals and determining outcomes, they would consider this an area of need for professional development.

### **Conclusion**

The results of this research study on the professional development needs of high school principals to facilitate the school improvement process for Northwest Accreditation suggested that principals have strong preferences for activities that will help them develop their schools into learning organizations. Principals identified the need for high-quality professional development opportunities in the areas of Building a Team Commitment, Creating a Learning Organization, Sustaining and Motivating for Continuous Improvement, Setting Instructional Direction – Results Orientation, Communicating Effectively and Facilitating the Change Process. These areas are viewed by principals as the most important leadership domains to the primary function of school improvement. Principals recognized that for effective organizational development and continuous improvement, they must build team commitment in order to create a learning organization. They realized that effective communication is essential to determining instructional direction and motivating for defined results. And, they noted that understanding the change process is essential to sustaining continuous growth.

Another conclusion that can be drawn is that the importance of professional development needs depends on your vantagepoint. Principals selected areas that they believed would help them facilitate school improvement efforts and as a result satisfy

accreditation requirements. State agency personnel selected areas that they believed were necessary to satisfy accreditation requirements thus facilitating school improvement. And finally, because there were significant differences across demographic characteristics, professional development must be idiosyncratic and based on the individual needs of the schools, districts, and states. One size does not fit all when designing professional development programs. The uniqueness of the situational factors of schools must be considered.

The data drawn from this study provide school districts and state agency professional development providers with a better perspective of the elements that are needed for an effective professional development program for high school principals who are leading school improvement efforts within their schools. The topics identified for future professional development support the increasing role of the principal in the process of school reform and more specifically the leadership required to facilitate comprehensive school improvement. As knowledge and theory grows in the areas of creating learning organizations, principals need continuous opportunities to upgrade their knowledge and skills. Professional development opportunities should be tailored to the needs of the participants and geared to actual leadership roles.

Formal leadership in schools is a complex, multi-faceted task that has evolved over the last decade in response to the demands of educational reform and renewal.

Professional development programs are springing up in school systems across the nation as part of a concerted effort to enhance the skills of school leaders. Millions of dollars are being spend to ensure principals are trained to effectively lead schools.

When districts invest in professional development of principals, they emerge with the ability to bring about changes to create productive schools and enhanced educational outcomes. Building leadership capacity can become synonymous with school improvement. Principals must become knowledgeable about the skills needed for facilitating successful school improvement and developing the capacities of the school members to function as a learning organization. Today more than ever, strong education leaders must engage in continued growth and renewal.

These findings provide direction for the development of professional development activities that will enhance the leadership skills that principals need to guide school reform and reach higher standards of student achievement. The investment of time and resources for the planning of an effective professional development program to enhance the educational leadership skills of high school principals to lead schools which are focused on continual improvement will greatly impact the ultimate quality of education for our students.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

- **Further studies should be conducted to identify the situational factors of schools that may affect professional development needs of individual principals.**
- **Further studies should be conducted to identify the relationship between perceived professional development needs and participation in previous professional development activities.**
- **Further studies on the effectiveness of various professional development delivery methods and the feedback received from principals in the context of successful school improvement data should be explored.**
- **Further studies should be conducted to design professional development programs that are results-oriented and job-embedded. Follow-up training and networking opportunities should be a part of the design so that principals have the support that they need to implement their newly learned leadership skills.**
- **Further studies should be conducted to identify the relationship between successful school improvement efforts and the professional development afforded school leaders.**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alreck, P. and Settle, R. (1985). The survey research handbook. Homewood, IL: Irwin Press.

Anderson, M. (1991). How to train, recruit, select, induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337 843).

Ary, D., Jacobs L., and Razavieh, A. (1996). Introduction to research in education. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ash, R. and Persall, M. (2000). The principal as chief learning officer: The new work of formative leadership. Birmingham, AL: Samford University School of Education.

Barth, R. (1986, December). On sheep and goats and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan. 293-96.

Barth, R. (1990). Changing schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make a difference. San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Beck, L. and Murphy, J. (1992). Understanding the principalship: A metaphorical analysis from 1920 to 1990. NY: Teachers College Press.

Bennis, W. (1989). Why leaders can't lead. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Berlin, B., Kavanaugh, J., and Jensen, K. (1988). The principal as curriculum leader: Expectations vs. performance. NASSP Bulletin. 72(509), 43-49.

Blue Ribbon Consortium of Renewing Education (1998). 20/20 vision: A strategy for doubling America's academic achievement by the year 20/20. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.

Berney, M. and Ayers, J. (1990). Evaluating prep programs for school leaders. Boston, MA: Kliever Academic Publishers.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L.G. and Deal, T.E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Borg, W. and Gall, M. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6<sup>th</sup> edition). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

Brookover, W. and Lezotte, L. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research on Testing.

Buckley, J. (1985). The training of secondary school heads in western Europe. Windsor, Berkshire, England: Nfer-Nelson Publishing Co.

Buckner, K. (1997, January). Introduction to administrative training, NASSP Bulletin, 81(585).

Carter, C. and Klotz, J. (1990, April). What principals must know before assuming the role of instructional leader. NASSP Bulletin.

Chance, E. (1992). Visionary leadership. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Checkley, K. (2000). The contemporary principal: New skills for a new age. ASCD Education Update, 42(3), 1-8.

Clark, D. (1990, September). Reinventing school leadership. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership. 25-29.

Clark, D. and Meloy, J. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools. In T. Sergiovanni and J. Moore (Eds.) Schooling for Tomorrow: Directing to Issues that Count. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.



Colon, R. (1994, October). Rethinking and retooling for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: A must of administrators. NASSP Bulletin. 84-88.

Conner, D. (1992). Managing at the speed of change. NY: Villard Books Publishers.

Conzemius, A. (1999, Fall). Ally in the office: A skillful principal can make sure the pieces are in place, allowing teachers the autonomy to lead. Journal of Staff Development 20 (4), 31-34.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1997). Using ISLLC standards to strengthen preparation programs in school administration. Washington, D.C.: CCSSO.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2000). Collaborative professional development process for school leaders. Washington, D.C.: CCSSO.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2000). Proposition for quality professional development of school leaders. Washington, D.C.: CCSSO.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). The interstate school leaders licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders (ISLLC). Washington, DC: CCSSO.

Cross, C. and Rice, R. (2000, December). The role of the principal as instructional leader in a standards-driven system. NASSP Bulletin 84(620). 61-65.

Daresh, J. (1997, January). Improving principal preparation: A review of common strategies. NASSP Bulletin 81(585). 3-8.

Daresh, J. (1999, May). Preparing school leaders to “break ranks”. Connections: NASSP Journal of Secondary Education, 2.

Daresh, J. and Capasso, R. (2001). The school administrator internship handbook: Leading, mentoring, and participating in the internship program. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Daresh, J. and LaPlant, J. (1985). Developing a research agenda for administrator inservice. Journal of Research and Development in Education 18(2), 39-43.

Daresh, J. and Playko, M. (1992). The professional development of school administrators: Preservice, induction, and inservice applications. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Darling-Hammond, L. and McLaughlin, M. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(8), 597-604.

Deal, T. and Peterson, K. (2000). The leadership paradox. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Dillman, D. and Salant, P. (1994). How to conduct your own survey. NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Dolan, W. (1994). Restructuring our schools: A primer on systemic change. Kansas City, MO: Systems and Organization.

Drake, T. and Roe, W. (1994). The Principalship (4<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: Macmillan College Publishing Co.

Dunklee, D. (2000). If you want to lead, not just manage. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Duke, D. (1986). School leadership and instructional improvement. NY: Random House.

Dupree, M. (1989). Leadership is an art. NY: Dell Publishing.

Dupree, M. (1992). Leadership jazz. NY: Dell Publishing.

Duttweiler, P. and Hord, S. (1987). Dimensions of effective leadership. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Duttweiler, P. (1988). Dimension of effective leadership. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37(1), 15-27.

Education Commission of the States (2000). Leadership for Results. ECS Education agenda for 2000 and beyond. Denver, CO: ECS.

Educational Research Service (1999). Professional development for school principals. The Informed Educator series (WS-0350). Arlington, VA: Author.

Educational Research Service (2000). The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need. Arlington, VA: Author.

Elmore, R. (2000). Leadership for effective middle school practice. Kappan 82 (4). 291-292.

Evans, P. and Mohr, N. (1999). Professional development for principals: Seven core beliefs. Kappan 80 (7), 530-532.

Evertson, C. and Murphy, J. (1992). Beginning with classrooms: Implications for restructuring schools. In H. Marshall (Ed.), Redefining Student Learning. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Findley, D. and Findley, B. (1992). Effective schools: The role of the principal. Contemporary Education 63(2), 102-104.

Flath, B. (1989). The principal as instructional leader. ATA Magazines, 69(3), 19-22, 47-49.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1992, February). Visions that blind. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 19-22.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. New York: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). Leading in a culture of change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- George, P. (2001, Jan.). Breaking ranks in action. Principal leadership 1(5), 60-65.
- Glickman, C. (1990). Open accountability for the '90s: Between pillars. Educational Leadership. 47(7), 38-42.
- Griffiths, D., Stout, R., and Forsyth, P. (1987). Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishers.
- Guskey, T. and Huberman, M. (1995). Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hanson, M. (1996). Educational administration and organizational behavior. NY: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (1996, February). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. Education Administration Quarterly. 5-44.
- Harris, B. (1989). Inservice education for staff development. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hart, A. (1993). The social and organizational influence of principals: Evaluating principals in context. Peabody Journal of Education. 68. 37-57.
- Harvey, D. and Brown, D. (1976). An experiential approach to organization development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hausman, C., Crow, G. and Speery, D. (2000). Portrait of the "Ideal principal: Context and self". NASSP Bulletin. 84(617), 5-14.
- Herman, J.L. and Herman, J. (1995, March). Tri-dimensional needs assessment and staff development model. People and Education. 3(1), 122-129.
- Hoerr, T. (1996). Collegiality: A new way to define instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan. 77(5), 380-381.
- Hopkins – Thompson, P. (2000). Colleagues helping colleagues: Mentoring and coaching. NASSP Bulletin. 84(617). 29-37.

Hord, S. (1997). Professional learning communities. Southern Education Development Lab.

Houston, P. (2000). Not a great job but a wonderful calling. AASA Online. June 11.

Hoy, W. and Miskel, C. (1991). Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). NY: McGraw Hill.

Hoy, W. and Miskel, C. (1996). Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). NY: McGraw Hill.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., and Steffy, B. E. (1998). Skills for successful 21<sup>st</sup> century school leaders: Standards for peak performers. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Huse, E. (1975). Organizational development and change. NY: West Publishers.

Institute for Educational Leadership (2000). Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship. Washington, D.C.: IEL.

Institute for Educational Leadership (2001). Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership. Washington, D.C.: IEL.

Jacobson, S. and Conway, J. (Eds.) (1990). Educational leadership in an age of reform. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

Jones, R. (1973). Methods and Techniques of Educational Research. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1980, February). Improving inservice training: The message of research, Educational Leadership, 37(2), 379-385.

Joyce, B., Hersh, R. and McKibbin, M. (1983). The structure of school improvement. NY: Longman.

Kaufman, R. (1985, July/August). Needs assessment, needs analysis, objectives and evaluation. Performance and Instruction 24, 21.

Kaufman, R. (1988). Planning educational systems: A results-based approach. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Keefe, J. and Howard, E. (1997). Redesigning schools for the new century: A systems approach. Reston, VA: NASSP.

Keller, B. (2000). Building on experience. Education Week, May 3.

Kleine-Kracht, P. (1993, July). The principal in a community of learning. Journal of School Leadership 3 (4), 391-399.

Kouzes, J. and Posner, B. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krejcie, R. and Morgan, D. (1970). Determining sample size. Educational and Psychological Measurement 30(3), 607-609.

Lambert, L. (1998). How to build leadership capacity. Educational Leadership 55(7), 17-19.

Lashway, L. (1999). Preparing school leaders. Research Roundup. Spring: 1-4.

Lashway, L. (2000). Trends and issues: Training of school administrators. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Lashway, L. and Anderson, M. (1991). School leadership: Handbook for excellence. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly. November: 498-518.

Leithwood, K., Begley, P., and Cousins, J. B. (1992). Developing expert leadership for future schools. Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Leithwood, K., Leonard, L., and Sharratt, L. (1997). Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. Memphis, TN: International Congress on School Effectiveness and Improvement.

Lemley, R. (1997, January). Thoughts on a richer view of principals' development. NASSP. 33-37.

Lester, P. and Bishop, L. (1994). The handbook of tests and measurement in education and the social science.

Lewis, A. (1997). A new consensus emerges on the characteristics of good professional development. The Harvard Education Letter. 13(4).

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1981). Synthesis of research on improving schools. Educational Leadership. 38 (7). 583-586.

Littley, D. and Fried, R. (1988, January). The challenge to make good schools great. NEA Today, 4-8.

Louis, K. and Miles, M. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. NY: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K. and Kruse, S. (1995). Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lumsden, L. (1992). Prospects in principal preparation (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 350 726).

Manasse, A. (1983). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research on effective principals. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Manasse, A. (1986). Vision and leadership: Paying attention to intention. Peabody Journal of Education 63 (1), 150-173.

Mazzarella, J. and Grundy, T. (1989). Portrait of a leader. In S.C. Smith and P.K. Piele (Eds.), School leadership: Handbook for excellence 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Washington, DC: OERI.

McCay, E. (1999). Influences on change: Supporting ongoing developing for midcareer principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Ontario, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).

McMillan, J. and Schumacher, S. (1989). Research in education: A conceptual introduction (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman Co.

Miklos, E. (1992). Administrator preparation, educational. In M.C. Alkin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). NY: Macmillan. 22-29.

Milstein, M. (1993). Changing the way we prepare educational leaders. NY: Teachers College Press.

Milstein, M., Bobroff, B. and Restine, L. (1991). Internship programs in educational administration: A guide to preparing educational leaders. NY: Teachers college Press.

Minneapolis Public Schools (1998). Metropolitan principal preparation survey. MN: Minneapolis Public School System.

Moore, J. (1988). Guidelines concerning adult learning. Journal of Staff Development 9(3), 2-5.

Moyle, C. and Andrews, K. (1987). The institute of educational administration in Australia. In Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) Approaches to Administrative Training in Education. NY: SUNY Press.

Murphy, J. (1988, Summer). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of administrator instructional leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 10(2), 117-139.

Murphy, J. (ed.) (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Murphy, J. (1992) The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1993). Preparing tomorrow's school leaders. University Park, PA: UCEA, Inc.

Murphy, J. (1994). Redefining the principalship in restructuring schools. NASSP Bulletin, 78(560).



Murphy, J. and Forsyth, P. (Eds.) (1999). Educational administration: A decade of reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (1986). Some encouraging signs in staff development for school administrators, Journal of Staff Development, 7(2), p. 15.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (1987). Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. Journal of Educational Administration 30(3). 77-88.

Murphy, J. and Seashore-Lewis, K. (1994). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. and Shipman, N. (1999). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: A standards-based approach to strengthening educational leadership. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13(3), 205-224.

Muse, I. and Thomas, G. (1991). The rural principal: Select the best. Journal of Rural and Small Schools (Winter), 32-37.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (1990). Principals for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Alexandria, VA: NAESP.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (1997). Proficiencies for principals. Alexandria, VA: NAESP.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1986). Analysis of developmental needs. Reston, VA: NASSP.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1992). Developing school leaders: A call for collaboration. Reston, VA: NASSP.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1996). Breaking ranks: Changing an American institution. Reston: VA: NASSP.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (2000). 21<sup>st</sup> Century school administrator skills self-assessment for instructional leader. Reston, VA: NASSP.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (2001). Annual Principals Conference, Phoenix, AZ (March 9-13).

National Association of State Boards of Education (1999). Principals of change: What education leaders need to guide schools to excellence. Charlottesville, VA: NASBE.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, D. C. United States Department of Education. NCEE.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for America's schools. Tempe, AZ: UCEA.

National Commission for the Principalship (1993). Principals for our changing schools: Knowledge and skill base. Fairfax, VA: NCP.

National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management (1999). Effective leaders for today's schools: Synthesis of a policy forum on educational leadership. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. U. S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: NIEGFPM.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989). Improving the preparation of principals: An agenda for reform. Charlottesville, VA: NPBEA.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990). Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1991). The preparation of school administrators: A statement of purposes. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1992). Performance domains. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.

National Staff Development Council (2000). Learning to lead, learning to learn. Oxford, OH: NSDC.

National Staff Development Council (1995). Standards for staff development. Oxford, OH: NSDC.

National Study of School Evaluation (1999). School Improvement: Focusing on Student Performance. Schaumburg, IL: NSSE.

National Study of School Evaluation (1996). Evaluative Criteria, Sixth Edition, National Study of School Evaluation. Schaumburg, IL: NSSE.

National Study of School Evaluation (1998). Indicators of School Quality Vol. 1: Schoolwide Indicators of Quality. Schaumburg, IL: NSSE.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (2000). Annual Commissioners Meeting, Portland, OR. (December 6-8).

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (1999). Handbook for School Improvement Process. Boise, ID: NASC.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (2000). Handbook for School Improvement Process. Boise, ID: NASC.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (2000). Preparing to lead: Beyond isolated skills. Northwest Education Magazine. 5(3) 1-5.

Office of Educational Leadership (1999). Effective leaders for today's schools: Synthesis of a policy forum on educational leadership. Washington, D.C.: OERI.

O'Neil, J. (1995, April). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. Educational Leadership 52(7). 20-23.

Orlich, D. (1989). Staff development: Enhancing human potential. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Peterson, K. (1987). Research, practice, and conceptual models: Underpinnings of a principals' institute. In Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) Approaches to Administrative Training in Education. NY: SUNY Press.

Petrie, H. (1990). Reflecting on the second wave of reform: Restructuring the teaching profession. In S. Jacobson and J. Conway (Eds.) Educational leadership in an age of reform. NY: Longman. 14-29.

Phay, D. (1997). Learning to be effective CEO's: The principals' executive program. NASSP Bulletin, 81(585). 51-57.

Pitner, N. (1987). Principals of quality staff development: lessons for administrator training. In Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) Approaches to Administrative Training in Education. NY: SUNY Press.

Ramsey, R. (1999). Lead, follow, or get out of the way: How to be a more effective leader in today's schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Reviere, R., Berkowitz, S., Cartier, C. and Graves-Ferguson, C. (1996). Needs assessment: A creative and practical guide for social scientists. Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis.

Ricciardi, D. (1999). Professional training of middle school principals: Impact of selected variables. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Ontario, Canada, April 19-23.)

Ricciardi, D. (1997). Sharpening experienced principals' skills for changing schools. NASSP Bulletin, 81(585), 65-69.

Robbins, P. (1991). How to plan and implement a peer coaching program. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Robbins, P. and Alvy (1995). The principal's companion: Strategies and hints to make the job easier. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Robinson, G. (1985). Effective schools research: A guide to school improvement. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Rouche, J. and Baker, G. (1986). Profiling excellence in America's schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Sava, S. and Koerner, T. (1998). Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship? An exploratory study. In ERS Report. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Schlechty, P.C. (1990). Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Leadership impetus for education reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Schlechty, P.C. (1997). Inventing better schools: An action plan for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmoker, M. (1996). Results: The key to continuous school improvement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Schmuck and Runkle (1985). The handbook of organizational development in schools. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Senge, P. (et al). (1994). The fifth discipline fieldbook. NY: Doubleday Publishers.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. NY: Doubleday Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (1984, February). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Educational leadership. 9.

Sergiovanni, T. (1991). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Silver, P. (1987). The center for advancing principalship excellence (APEX): An approach to professionalizing educational administration. In Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) Approaches to Administrative Training in Education. NY: SUNY Press.

Slater, R. and Doig, J. (1988). Leadership in education: Issues of entrepreneurship and environment. Education and Urban Society, 20(3), 294-301.

Slavin, R. (1984). Research methods in education: A practical guide. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Smith, M. and Pourchot, T. (1998). Adult learning and development: Perspectives from educational psychology. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Sparks, D. (1994). A paradigm shift in staff development. Journal of Staff Development 15(4), 26-29.

Sparks, D. (1998, December). High standards for principals bolster school performance. National Staff Development Council: Results.

Sparks, D. (2000, December). High Powered Professional development for high-poverty schools. Principal leadership 1(4), 26-29.

Sparks, D. and Hirsh, S. (1997). A new vision for staff development. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Speck, M. (1999). The principalship: Building a learning community. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Starratt, R. (1995). Leaders with vision: The quest for school renewal. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Stronge, J. (1993, May). Defining the principalship: Instructional leader as middle manager. NASSP Bulletin. 1-7.

Tirozzi, G. (2000). Our time has come: Principals may get a share of the federal pie. Education Week (February 23).

Tirozzi, G. (1999). School reform in the principalship. NASSP Press Release. [www.nassp.org/press\\_release/schl\\_rfrm.tir.html](http://www.nassp.org/press_release/schl_rfrm.tir.html).

Tirozzi, G. and Ferrandino, V. (1997). How do you reinvent a principal. Education Week, (January 31).

U.S. Department of Education (1997) National center for educational statistics: Schools and staffing survey: 1993-94 (Principal questionnaire). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education (2000) Eliminating barriers to improve teaching. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vail, P. (1989). Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Vail, P. (1998). Spirited leading and learning: Process wisdom for a new age. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Van Meter, E., and McMinn, C. (2001). Measuring a leader. Journal of Staff Development, 22 (1), 32-35.

Wiersma, W. (1986). Research methods in education: An introduction (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Whitaker, K. and Moses, M. (1994). The restructuring handbook: A guide to school revitalization. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Witkin, B. and Altschuld, J. (1995). Planning and Conducting Needs Assessment: A practical guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wohlstetter, P., Van Kirk, A., Robertson, P., and Mohrman, S. (1997) Organizing for school-based management. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. 35 – 40.

Young, K., Chambers, C., and Kells, H. (1983). Understanding Accrediation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Zellner, L. and Erlandson, D. (1997, January). Leadership laboratories: Professional development for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. NASSP. 45-50.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **SUMMARY TABLES OF PRINCIPALS' AND STATE AGENCY PERSONNEL'S PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS' PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS**



Table 1

**Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs**

<b>Area of Focus for Professional Development</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b><u>Profile</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Developing information and data collection strategies	24/7.6	40/12.7	116/36.7	136/43	3.15	.92
Building community and involvement	6/1.9	46/14.6	104/32.9	160/50.6	3.32	.79
Analyzing data	16/5.1	36/11.4	120/38	144/45.6	3.24	.85
Communicating Effectively	6/1.9	44/13.9	80/25.3	186/58.9	3.41	.80
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	4/1.3	38/12.0	116/36.7	158/50	3.35	.74
<b><u>Vision, Beliefs and Mission</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Creating a learning organization	4/1.3	26/8.2	92/29.1	194/61.4	3.51	.70
Developing the vision and the mission	26/8.2	40/12.7	104/32.9	146/46.2	3.17	.94
Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	12/3.8	40/12.7	88/27.8	174/55.1	3.35	.84
Building team commitment	2/6	24/7.6	72/22.8	216/68.4	3.60	.66
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	12/3.8	44/13.9	118/37.3	142/44.9	3.23	.83

---

<b><u>Desired Results for Student Learning</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Using research and “best practices”	6/1.9	22/7.0	114/36.1	174/55.1	3.44	.71
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	4/1.3	32/10.1	142/44.9	138/43.7	3.31	.70
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	6/1.9	30/9.5	132/41.8	148/46.8	3.34	.73
Understanding student development and learning	4/1.3	46/14.6	96/30.4	170/53.8	3.37	.78
Setting goals and determining outcomes	6/1.9	36/11.4	124/39.2	148/46.8	3.32	.75
<b><u>Organizational and Instructional Effectiveness</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	8/2.5	58/18.4	130/41.1	120/38.0	3.15	.92
Managing the organization and operational procedures	16/5.1	60/19.0	120/38.0	118/37.3	3.08	.88
Organizing resources	8/2.5	74/23.4	120/38	114/36.1	3.08	.83
Facilitating professional development/ Development of others	2/6	32/10.1	114/36.1	168/53.2	3.42	.70
Facilitating the change process	2/6	16/5.1	120/38.0	174/55.1	3.49	.63

---

<b>School Action Plans/ Continuous School Improvement</b>	<b>N/%</b>	<b>N/%</b>	<b>N/%</b>	<b>N/%</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	8/2.5	44/13.9	130/41.1	134/42.4	3.23	.78
Resolving complex problems	8/2.5	32/10.1	116/36.7	158/50.0	3.35	.77
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	10/3.2	30/9.5	90/28.5	184/58.2	3.43	.79
Solving problems and making decisions	14/4.4	42/13.3	92/29.1	164/51.9	3.30	.87
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	6/1.9	24/7.6	92/29.1	192/60.8	3.50	.72

Table 2

**Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by States****1. Developing information and data collection strategies**

<b>STATE</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Alaska	0	0	50	50
Idaho	0	6.3	43.8	50
Montana	17.4	13	34.8	34.8
Nevada	11.1	22.2	44.4	22.2
Oregon	7.3	12.2	36.6	43.9
Utah	9.5	4.8	38.1	47.6
Washington	4.8	19.0	31	45.2

**2. Building community and involvement**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	33.3	50
Idaho	0	6.3	31.3	62.5
Montana	4.3	17.4	34.8	43.5
Nevada	0	44.4	33.3	22.2
Oregon	2.4	9.8	39	48.8
Utah	0	14.3	33.3	52.4
Washington	2.4	14.3	26.2	52.1

**3. Analyzing Data**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	0	33.3	66.7
Idaho	0	0	43.8	56.3
Montana	13	17.4	30.4	39.1
Nevada	11.1	0	55.6	33.3
Oregon	4.9	9.8	39	46.3
Utah	4.8	9.5	38.1	47.6
Washington	2.4	19	35.7	42.9

**4. Communicating Effectively**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	0	83.3
Idaho	0	0	25	75
Montana	4.3	13	30.4	52.2
Nevada	0	22.2	66.7	11.1
Oregon	0	17.1	19.5	63.4
Utah	4.8	9.5	33.3	52.4
Washington	2.4	7.3	36.6	53.7

**5. Building consensus and negotiating effectively**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	16.7	66.7
Idaho	0	0	56.3	43.8
Montana	4.3	13	21.7	60.9
Nevada	0	44.4	44.4	11.1
Oregon	0	9.8	31.7	58.5
Utah	4.8	9.5	42.9	42.9
Washington	0	11.9	40.5	47.6

**6. Creating a learning organization**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	16.7	0	33.3	50
Idaho	0	6.3	31.3	62.5
Montana	0	4.3	26.1	69.6
Nevada	0	33.3	44.4	22.2
Oregon	0	0	36.6	63.4
Utah	0	19	14.3	66.7
Washington	4.8	19	31	45.2

**7. Developing the vision and the mission**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	16.7	16.7	16.7	50
Idaho	0	6.7	33.3	60
Montana	0	17.4	30.4	52.2
Nevada	11.1	22.2	33.3	33.3
Oregon	2.4	9.8	24.4	63.4
Utah	0	19	23.8	57.1
Washington	7.1	7.1	31	54.8

**8. Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	16.7	0	50	33.3
Idaho	6.3	6.3	31.3	56.3
Montana	13	13	39.1	34.8
Nevada	22.2	22.2	33.3	22.2
Oregon	4.9	9.8	39	46.3
Utah	9.5	14.3	14.3	61.9
Washington	4.8	16.7	31	47.6

**9. Building team commitment**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	33.3	16.7	50
Idaho	0	0	37.5	62.5
Montana	0	13	13	73.9
Nevada	11.1	22.2	33.3	33.3
Oregon	0	2.4	19.5	78
Utah	0	14.3	14.3	57.1
Washington	0	2.14	29.3	68.3

**10. Defining the core values and beliefs of education**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	33.3	50
Idaho	0	6.3	31.3	62.5
Montana	133	57.1	34.8	43.5
Nevada	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1
Oregon	0	12.2	48.8	39
Utah	4.8	23.8	14.	47.6
Washington	2.4	7.1	42.9	47.9

**11. Using research and "best practices"**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	33.3	50
Idaho	0	0	50	50
Montana	4.3	13	13	69.6
Nevada	11.1	0	77.8	11.1
Oregon	0	7.3	34.1	58.5
Utah	0	4.3	38.1	57.1
Washington	2.4	7.1	35.7	54.8

**12. Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	0	50	50
Idaho	0	6.3	43.8	50
Montana	0	21.7	39.1	39.1
Nevada	0	22.2	33.3	44.4
Oregon	4.9	9.8	41.5	43.9
Utah	4.8	4.8	38.1	2.4
Washington	0	4.8	47.6	47.6

**13. Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Idaho	0	6.3	43.8	50
Montana	4.3	17.4	30.4	47.8
Nevada	0	11.1	66.7	22.2
Oregon	2.4	12.2	46.3	39
Utah	0	9.5	42.9	47.6
Washington	0	7.1	47.6	45.2

**14. Understanding student development and learning**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	16.7	66.7
Idaho	0	6.3	25	68.8
Montana	0	21.7	26.1	52.2
Nevada	0	22.2	66.7	11.1
Oregon	4.9	9.8	31.7	53.7
Utah	0	14.3	28.6	57.1
Washington	0	16.7	28.6	54.8

**15. Setting goals and determining outcomes**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	0	33.3	66.7
Idaho	0	13.0	47.8	39.1
Montana	0	13	47.8	39.1
Nevada	0	22.2	44.4	33.3
Oregon	4.9	4.9	43.9	46.3
Utah	4.9	4.9	43.9	46.3
Washington	2.4	12.2	36.6	48.8

**16. Developing the school organization using systems thinking**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	16.7	66.7
Idaho	0	12.5	25	62.5
Montana	0	21.7	43.5	26.1
Nevada	11.1	44.4	33.3	11.1
Oregon	4.9	9.8	48.8	36.6
Utah	0	19	61.9	19
Washington	2.4	21.4	38.1	38.1

**17. Managing the organization and operational procedures**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Idaho	0	12.5	31.3	56.3
Montana	8.7	21.7	43.5	26.1
Nevada	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2
Oregon	2.5	20	37.5	40
Utah	4.8	19	42.9	33.3
Washington	7.1	14.3	38.1	40.5

**18. Organizing resources**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	50	16.7	33.3
Idaho	0	18.8	18.8	62.5
Montana	4.3	17.4	47.8	30.4
Nevada	0	33.3	55.6	11.1
Oregon	2.4	17.1	41.5	34
Utah	0	25.6	42.9	28.6
Washington	4.8	26.2	33.3	35.9

**19. Facilitating professional development/Development of others**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	66.7	34.76
Idaho	0	6.3	31.3	62.5
Montana	0	4.3	47.8	47.8
Nevada	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Oregon	2.4	12.2	22	63.4
Utah	0	4.8	42.9	52.4
Washington	0	9.5	45.2	45.2

**20. Facilitating the change process**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	33.3	50
Idaho	0	0	37.5	62.5
Montana	0	0	52.2	47.8
Nevada	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Oregon	2.4	7.3	29.3	61
Utah	0	0	47.6	52.4
Washington	0	2.5	37.5	60

**21. Developing and implementing strategic action plans**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	16.7	33.3	50
Idaho	0	6.3	31.3	62.5
Montana	4.3	17.4	34.8	43.5
Nevada	0	22.2	33.3	44.4
Oregon	4.9	7.3	53.7	34.1
Utah	0	14.3	38.1	47.6
Washington	2.4	19	40.5	38.1



**22. Resolving complex problems**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Idaho	0	18.8	25	56.3
Montana	4.3	17.4	43.5	34.8
Nevada	0	11.1	22.2	66.7
Oregon	2.4	4.9	39	53.7
Utah	0	9.5	47.6	42.9
Washington	4.9	4.9	34.1	56.1

**23. Setting instructional direction – results orientation**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	0	33.3	0	66.7
Idaho	0	6.3	18.8	75
Montana	4.3	17.4	43.5	34.8
Nevada	0	44.4	0	55.6
Oregon	2.4	7.3	43.9	46.3
Utah	0	4.8	38.1	57.1
Washington	7.3	4.9	24.4	63.4

**24. Solving problems and making decisions**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	16.7	16.7	16.7	50
Idaho	0	0	50	50
Montana	4.3	17.4	34.8	43.5
Nevada	22.2	33.3	11.1	33.3
Utah	0	23.8	23.8	52.4
Washington	4.9	14.6	19.5	61

**25. Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement**

STATE	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Alaska	16.7	0	33.3	50
Idaho	0	0	31.3	68.8
Montana	0	13	13	73.9
Nevada	0	33.3	22.2	44.4
Oregon	2.4	4.9	29.3	63.4
Utah	0	4.8	33.3	61.9
Washington	2.4	7.3	36.6	53.7

Table 3

**Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of District****1. Developing information and data collection strategies**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	10.1	14.5	39.1	36.2
5000-19999	7.3	12.2	36.6	43.9
20000-49999	9.1	9.1	40.9	40.9
50000-99999	0	0	42.9	57.1
100000+	0	20	26.7	53.3

**2. Building community and involvement**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	13	40.6	43.5
5000-19999	2.4	17.1	26.8	53.7
20000-49999	0	9.1	31.8	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	28.6	57.1
100000+	0	20	13.3	66.7

**3. Analyzing Data**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	7.2	17.4	39.1	36.2
5000-19999	7.3	7.3	36.6	48.8
20000-49999	0	4.5	50	45.5
50000-99999	0	14.3	28.6	57.1
100000+	0	6.7	26.7	66.7

**4. Communicating Effectively**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	0	18.8	27.5	53.6
5000-19999	4.9	9.8	24.4	61
20000-49999	4.5	9.1	27.3	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	14.3	71.4
100000+	0	13.3	20	66.7

**5. Building consensus and negotiating effectively**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	0	15.9	39.1	44.9
5000-19999	2.4	7.3	39	51.2
20000-49999	4.5	9.1	31.8	54.5
50000-99999	0	0	42.9	57.1
100000+	0	20	13.3	66.7

**6. Creating a learning organization**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	4.3	34.8	58
5000-19999	0	14.6	29.3	56.1
20000-49999	0	4.5	18.2	77.3
50000-99999	0	0	28.6	71.4
100000+	0	20	20	60

**7. Developing the vision and the mission**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	11.6	11.6	37.7	39.1
5000-19999	7.3	17.1	34.1	41.5
20000-49999	4.5	4.5	31.8	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	14.3	71.4
100000+	6.7	20	20	53.3

**8. Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	11.8	35.3	50
5000-19999	7.3	17.1	22	53.7
20000-49999	0	9.1	22.7	68.2
50000-99999	14.3	0	28.6	57.1
100000+	0	20	20	60

**9. Building team commitment**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	1.4	4.3	27.5	66.7
5000-19999	0	10	25	65
20000-49999	0	4.5	13.6	81.8
50000-99999	0	14.3	0	85.7
100000+	0	20	20	60

**10. Defining the core values and beliefs of education**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-49999	5.8	11.6	42	40.6
5000-19999	4.9	4.9	46.3	43.9
20000-49999	0	18.2	22.7	59.1
50000-99999	0	42.9	14.3	42.9
100000+	0	33.3	20	46.7

**11. Using research and "best practices"**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	11.6	33.3	52.2
5000-19999	2.4	4.9	29.3	63.4
20000-49999	0	0	40.9	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	42.9	42.9
100000+	0	0	53.3	46.7

**12. Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	1.4	8.7	50.7	39.1
5000-19999	2.4	12.2	39	46.3
20000-49999	0	4.5	63.6	31.8
50000-99999	0	28.6	14.3	57.1
100000+	0	13.3	20	66.7

**13. Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	7.2	49.3	40.6
5000-19999	0	14.6	39	46.3
20000-49999	0	0	50	50
50000-99999	0	42.9	14.3	42.9
100000+	6.7	6.7	13.3	73.3

**14. Understanding student development and learning**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	15.9	33.3	47.8
5000-19999	0	17.1	31.7	51.2
20000-49999	0	9.1	27.3	63.6
50000-99999	0	28.6	14.3	57.1
100000+	0	6.7	26.7	66.7

**15. Setting goals and determining outcomes**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	10.1	50.7	36.2
5000-19999	2.5	12.5	35	50
20000-49999	0	4.5	27.3	68.2
50000-99999	0	28.6	14.3	57.1
100000+	0	13.3	33.3	53.3

**16. Developing the school organization using systems thinking**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	13	44.9	39.1
5000-19999	2.4	24.4	36.6	36.6
20000-49999	0	13.6	45.5	40.9
50000-99999	0	42.9	14.3	42.9
100000+	6.7	20	40	33.3

**17. Managing the organization and operational procedures**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	4.3	18.8	43.5	33.3
5000-19999	4.9	17.1	36.6	41.5
20000-49999	9.1	13.6	31.8	45.5
50000-99999	0	28.6	28.6	42.9
100000+	7.1	28.6	28.6	35.7

**18. Organizing resources**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	0	26.1	42	31.9
5000-19999	4.9	19.5	36.6	39
20000-49999	4.5	13.6	31.8	50
50000-99999	0	28.6	42.9	28.6
100000+	6.7	33.3	26.7	33.3

**19. Facilitating professional development/Development of others**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	0	8.7	39.1	52.2
5000-19999	0	14.6	36.6	48.8
20000-49999	4.5	0	36.4	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	14.3	71.4
100000+	0	13.3	7.3	10.8

**20. Facilitating the change process**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	0	4.4	41.2	54.4
5000-19999	0	5	35	60
20000-49999	4.5	0	40.9	54.5
50000-99999	0	14.3	14.3	71.4
100000+	0	6.7	40	53.3

**21. Developing and implementing strategic action plans**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	1.4	13	49.3	36.2
5000-19999	4.9	17.1	36.6	41.5
20000-49999	4.5	13.6	31.8	50
50000-99999	0	14.3	28.6	57.1
100000+	0	13.3	26.7	60

**22. Resolving complex problems**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	1.4	8.7	39.1	50.7
5000-19999	5.0	15	27.5	52.5
20000-49999	4.5	4.5	36.4	54.5
50000-99999	0	28.6	42.9	28.6
100000+	0	6.7	40	53.3

**23. Setting instructional direction – results orientation**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	2.9	7.2	42	47.8
5000-19999	5	15	7.5	72.5
20000-49999	4.5	4.5	31.8	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	14.3	71.4
100000+	0	6.7	26.7	66.7

**24. Solving problems and making decisions**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	4.4	10.3	36.8	48.5
5000-19999	7.5	17.5	22.5	52.5
20000-49999	4.5	13.6	22.7	59.1
50000-99999	0	14.3	42.9	42.9
100000+	0	13.3	20	66.7

**25. Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement**

SIZE OF DISTRICT	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-4999	0	5.8	30.4	63.8
5000-19999	5	12.5	20	62.5
20000-49999	4.5	4.5	27.3	63.6
50000-99999	0	28.6	28.6	42.9
100000+	0	0	40	60

**Table 4****Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Size of School****1. Developing information and data collection strategies**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6
200-499	10.3	17.2	37.9	34.5
500-999	9.7	16.1	38.7	35.5
1000-1999	6.9	8.6	37.9	46.6
2000-2999	0	16.7	33.3	50
3000+	0	0	1.7	4.7

**2. Building community and involvement**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	17.4	6	9
200-499	3.4	13.8	37.9	44.8
500-999	3.2	9.7	51.6	35.5
1000-1999	1.7	17.2	25.9	55.2
2000-2999	0	11.1	22.2	66.7
3000+	0	0	25	75

**3. Analyzing data**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	14.3	50	28.6
200-499	6.9	17.2	41.4	34.5
500-999	6.5	16.1	41.9	35.5
1000-1999	5.2	8.6	39.7	46.6
2000-2999	0	5.6	22.2	72.2

3000+	0	0	25	75
<b>4. Communicating effectively</b>				
<b>SIZE OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
0-199	0	21.4	21.4	57.1
200-499	0	20.7	27.6	51.7
500-999	0	19.4	38.7	41.9
1000-1999	5.2	10.3	24.1	60.3
2000-2999	0	5.6	16.7	77.8
3000+	0	0	0	100
<b>5. Building consensus and negotiating effectively</b>				
<b>SIZE OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
0-199	0	21.4	35.7	42.9
200-499	0	10.3	44.8	44.8
500-999	0	12.9	58.1	29
1000-1999	3.4	10.3	31	55.2
2000-2999	0	16.7	16.7	66.7
3000+	0	0	0	100
<b>6. Creating a learning organization</b>				
<b>SIZE OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
0-199	7.1	7.1	28.6	57.1
200-499	0	3.4	48.3	48.3
500-999	3.2	6.5	38.7	51.6
1000-1999	0	12.1	20.7	67.2
2000-2999	0	11.1	16.7	72.2
3000+	0	0	0	100
<b>7. Developing the vision and the mission</b>				
<b>SIZE OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
0-199	14.3	21.4	21.4	42.9
200-499	17.2	6.9	44.8	31
500-999	6.5	16.1	45.2	32.3
1000-1999	6.9	13.8	24.1	55.2
2000-2999	0	11.1	38.9	50
3000+	0	0	0	100



**8. Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	30.8	15.4	53.8
200-499	3.4	13.8	34.5	48.3
500-999	3.2	6.5	54.8	35.5
1000-1999	6.9	13.8	15.5	63.8
2000-2999	0	11.1	27.8	61.1
3000+	0	0	0	100

**9. Building team commitment**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	14.3	28.6	57.1
200-499	0	6.9	34.5	58.6
500-999	0	3.2	35.5	61.3
1000-1999	1.8	8.8	14	75.4
2000-2999	0	11.1	11.1	77.8
3000+	0	0	0	100

**10. Defining the core values and beliefs of education**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	21.4	28.6	50
200-499	6.9	17.2	51.7	24.1
500-999	6.5	9.7	45.2	38.7
1000-1999	3.4	10.3	34.5	51.7
2000-2999	0	27.8	27.8	44.4
3000+	0	0	0	100

**11. Using research and "best practices"**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	7.1	35.7	57.1
200-499	3.4	17.2	34.5	44.8
500-999	3.2	9.7	38.7	48.4
1000-1999	1.7	3.4	31	63.8
2000-2999	0	0	44.4	55.6
3000+	0	0	50	50

**12. Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	21.4	42.9	35.7
200-499	3.4	6.9	58.6	31
500-999	0	9.7	48.4	41.9
1000-1999	1.7	12.1	41.4	44.8
2000-2999	0	5.6	38.9	55.6
3000+	0	0	0	100

**13. Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	7.1	64.3	28.6
200-499	3.4	13.8	41.4	41.4
500-999	3.2	3.2	54.8	38.7
1000-1999	1.7	12.1	34.5	51.7
2000-2999	0	11.1	33.3	55.6
3000+	0	0	0	100

**14. Understanding student development and learning**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	21.4	28.6	42.9
200-499	3.4	17.2	44.8	34.5
500-999	0	16.1	32.3	51.6
1000-1999	0	15.5	24.1	60.3
2000-2999	0	5.6	27.8	66.7
3000+	0	0	25	75

**15. Setting goals and determining outcomes**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	7.1	42.9	50
200-499	3.4	20.7	51.7	24.1
500-999	3.2	9.7	48.4	38.7
1000-1999	1.8	12.3	31.6	54.5
2000-2999	0	5.6	38.9	55.6
3000+	0	0	0	100

**16. Developing the school organization using systems thinking**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	7.1	50	35.7
200-499	0	24.1	44.8	31
500-999	3.2	19.4	41.9	35.5
1000-1999	3.4	22.4	39.7	34.5
2000-2999	0	11.1	33.3	55.6
3000+	0	0	50	50

**17. Managing the organization and operational procedures**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	14.3	21.4	50	14.3
200-499	10.3	17.2	41.4	31
500-999	0	19.4	54.8	25.8
1000-1999	5.3	19.3	33.3	42.1
2000-2999	0	22.2	22.2	55.6
3000+	0	0	25	75

**18. Organizing resources**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	21.4	57.1	21.4
200-499	0	20.7	44.8	34.5
500-999	0	35.5	35.5	29
1000-1999	6.9	20.7	32.8	39.7
2000-2999	0	22.2	38.9	38.9
3000+	0	0	50	50

**19. Facilitating professional development/Development of others**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	7.1	50	35.7
200-499	0	17.2	31	51.7
500-999	0	9.7	38.7	51.6
1000-1999	0	6.9	36.2	56.9
2000-2999	0	11.1	33.3	55.6
3000+	0	0	25	75

**20. Facilitating the change process**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	7.1	50	35.7
200-499	0	13.8	34.5	51.7
500-999	0	0	43.4	56.7
1000-1999	0	3.5	33.3	63.2
2000-2999	0	5.6	44.4	50
3000+	0	0	50	50

**21. Developing and implementing strategic action plans**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	21.4	35.7	35.7
200-499	3.4	6.9	51.7	37.9
500-999	0	16.1	58.1	25.8
1000-1999	3.4	15.5	36.2	44.8
2000-2999	0	16.7	22.2	61.1
3000+	0	0	0	100

**22. Resolving complex problems**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	14.3	35.7	50
200-499	3.4	6.9	41.4	48.3
500-999	0	9.7	48.4	41.9
1000-1999	5.3	12.3	31.6	50.9
2000-2999	0	5.6	44.4	50
3000+	0	0	0	100

**23. Setting instructional direction – results orientation**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	0	28.6	35.7	35.7
200-499	3.4	6.9	31	58.6
500-999	3.2	9.7	48.4	38.7
1000-1999	5.3	8.8	17.5	68.4
2000-2999	0	5.6	33.3	61.1
3000+	0	0	0	100

**24. Solving problems and making decisions**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	21.4	28.6	42.9
200-499	6.9	13.8	34.5	44.8
500-999	3.2	6.5	38.7	51.6
1000-1999	5.4	16.1	25	53.6
2000-2999	0	16.7	27.8	55.6
3000+	0	0	0	100

**25. Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement**

SIZE OF SCHOOL	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-199	7.1	14.3	21.4	57.1
200-499	0	6.9	34.5	58.6
500-999	3.2	3.2	35.5	58.1
1000-1999	1.8	12.3	22.8	63.2
2000-2999	0	0	44.4	55.6
3000+	0	0	0	100

Table 5

**Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Years in Administration****1. Developing information and data collection strategies**

YEARS IN ADMINIS-TRATION	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-10	11.8	14.7	39.7	33.8
11-20	3	9	34.3	53.7
20+	8.7	17.4	34.8	39.1

**2. Building community and involvement**

YEARS IN ADMINIS-TRATION	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
0-10	4.4	13.2	32.4	50
11-20	0	11.9	37.3	50.7
20+	0	26.1	21.7	52.2

**3. Analyzing data**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	8.8	16.2	35.3	39.7
11-20	1.5	4.5	41.8	52.2
20+	4.3	17.4	34.8	43.5

**4. Communicating effectively**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	4.4	19.1	27.9	48.5
11-20	0	11.9	22.4	65.7
20+	0	4.3	26.1	69.6

**5. Building consensus and negotiating effectively**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	2.9	11.8	44.1	41.2
11-20	0	10.4	28.4	61.2
20+	0	17.4	39.1	43.5

**6. Creating a learning organization**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	2.9	10.3	30.9	55.9
11-20	0	7.5	26.9	65.7
20+	0	4.3	30.4	65.2

**7. Developing the vision and the mission**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	13.2	16.2	27.9	42.6
11-20	6.0	9	38.8	46.3
20+	0	13	30.4	56.5

**8. Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	3	17.9	34.3	44.8
11-20	6	10.4	19.4	64.2
20+	0	4.3	34.8	60.9

**9. Building team commitment**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	0	10.4	25.4	64.2
11-20	1.5	7.5	19.4	71.6
20+	0	0	26.1	73.9

**10. Defining the core values and beliefs of education**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	7.4	20.6	27.9	44.1
11-20	1.5	9	47.8	41.8
20+	0	8.7	34.8	56.5

**11. Using research and "best practices"**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	4.4	13.2	29.4	52.9
11-20	0	3	41.8	55.2
20+	0	0	39.1	60.9

**12. Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	2.9	10.3	47.1	39.7
11-20	0	10.4	46.3	43.3
20+	0	8.7	34.8	56.5

**13. Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	2.9	11.8	45.6	39.7
11-20	1.5	7.5	37.3	53.7
20+	0	8.7	43.5	47.8

**14. Understanding student development and learning**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	2.9	22.1	30.9	44.1
11-20	0	9	32.8	58.2
20+	0	8.7	21.7	69.6

**15. Setting goals and determining outcomes**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	3	17.9	38.8	40.3
11-20	1.5	7.5	37.3	53.7
20+	0	4.3	47.8	47.8

**16. Developing the school organization using systems thinking**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	1.5	22.1	36.8	39.7
11-20	4.5	10.4	46.3	38.8
20+	0	30.4	39.1	30.4

**17. Managing the organization and operational procedures**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	4.4	22.1	44.1	29.4
11-20	6.1	18.2	31.8	43.9
20+	4.3	13	39.1	43.5

**18. Organizing resources**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	1.5	27.9	41.2	29.4
11-20	3	19.4	37.3	40.3
20+	4.3	21.7	30.4	43.5

**19. Facilitating professional development/Development of others**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	0	10.3	42.6	47.1
11-20	1.5	10.4	29.9	58.2
20+	0	8.7	34.8	56.5

**20. Facilitating the change process**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	0	4.5	46.3	35.7
11-20	1.5	6	28.4	64.2
20+	0	4.5	45.5	50



**21. Developing and implementing strategic action plans**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	2.9	17.6	36.8	42.6
11-20	3	11.9	40.3	44.8
20+	0	8.7	56.5	34.8

**22. Resolving complex problems**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	3.0	14.9	41.8	40.3
11-20	1.5	6.0	37.3	55.2
20+	4.3	8.7	21.7	65.2

**23. Setting instructional direction – results orientation**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	4.5	13.4	29.9	52.2
11-20	1.5	7.5	28.4	62.7
20+	4.3	4.3	26.1	65.2

**24. Solving problems and making decisions**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	6	17.9	35.8	40.3
11-20	3	13.6	22.7	60.6
20+	4.3	0	30.4	65.2

**25. Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement**

YEARS IN ADMINIS- TRATION	Not a Need %	Somewhat a Need %	Somewhat Important Need %	Extremely Important Need %
0-10	1.5	13.4	31.3	53.7
11-20	3.0	3.0	23.9	70.1
20+	0	4.3	39.1	56.5

Table 6

**Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs by Degree Earned**

<b>1. Developing information and data collection strategies</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	8	15.2	36.6	40.2
Ed Specialist	3.8	7.7	34.6	53.8
Doctorate	10.5	5.3	36.8	47.4
<b>2. Building community and involvement</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	2.7	12.5	36.6	48.2
Ed Specialist	0	15.4	19.2	65.4
Doctorate	0	26.3	26.3	47.4
<b>3. Analyzing data</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	6.3	14.3	42	37.5
Ed Specialist	0	7.7	19.2	73.1
Doctorate	5.3	0	36.8	57.9
<b>4. Communicating effectively</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	1.8	14.3	27.7	56.3
Ed Specialist	0	11.5	19.2	69.2
Doctorate	5.3	15.8	15.8	63.2
<b>5. Building consensus and negotiating effectively</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	.9	12.5	39.3	47.3
Ed Specialist	0	7.7	30.8	61.5
Doctorate	5.3	15.8	31.6	47.4

**6. Creating a learning organization**

DEGREE EARNED	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Masters	1.8	8	30.4	59.8
Ed Specialist	0	7.7	26.9	65.4
Doctorate	0	10.5	26.3	63.2

**7. Developing the vision and the mission**

DEGREE EARNED	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Masters	8	12.5	35.7	43.8
Ed Specialist	11.5	15.4	23.1	50
Doctorate	5.3	10.5	31.6	52.6

**8. Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support**

DEGREE EARNED	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Masters	3.6	14.4	27	55
Ed Specialist	7.7	3.8	26.9	61.5
Doctorate	0	15.8	36.8	47.4

**9. Building team commitment**

DEGREE EARNED	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Masters	0	8.1	23.4	68.5
Ed Specialist	3.8	3.8	19.2	73.1
Doctorate	0	10.5	26.3	63.2

**10. Defining the core values and beliefs of education**

DEGREE EARNED	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Masters	4.5	13.4	41.1	41.1
Ed Specialist	3.8	19.2	15.4	61.5
Doctorate	0	10.5	47.4	42.1

**11. Using research and "best practices"**

DEGREE EARNED	Not a Need	Somewhat a Need	Somewhat Important Need	Extremely Important Need
	%	%	%	%
Masters	2.7	8.9	35.7	52.7
Ed Specialist	0	3.8	30.8	65.4
Doctorate	0	0	47.4	52.6

**12. Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	1.8	9.8	47.3	41.1
Ed Specialist	0	11.5	34.6	53.8
Doctorate	0	10.5	42.1	47.4

**13. Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	1.8	10.7	40.2	47.3
Ed Specialist	0	11.5	34.6	53.8
Doctorate	5.3	0	57.9	36.8

**14. Understanding student development and learning**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	1.8	16.1	33	49.1
Ed Specialist	0	11.5	23.1	65.4
Doctorate	0	10.5	21.1	68.4

**15. Setting goals and determining outcomes**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	2.7	11.7	40.5	45
Ed Specialist	0	7.7	26.9	65.4
Doctorate	0	15.8	47.4	36.8

**16. Developing the school organization using systems thinking**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	2.7	21.4	41.1	34.8
Ed Specialist	0	11.5	26.9	61.5
Doctorate	5.3	10.5	57.9	26.3

**17. Managing the organization and operational procedures**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Masters	6.3	19.6	44.6	29.5
Ed Specialist	0	19.2	11.5	69.2
Doctorate	5.6	16.7	38.9	38.9

**18. Organizing resources**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	2.7	27.7	40.2	29.5
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	11.5	26.9	61.5
<b>Doctorate</b>	5.3	15.8	42.1	36.8

**19. Facilitating professional development/Development of others**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	0	8.0	43.8	48.2
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	15.4	11.5	73.1
<b>Doctorate</b>	5.3	15.8	26.3	52.6

**20. Facilitating the change process**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	0	3.6	45.5	50.9
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	11.5	19.2	69.2
<b>Doctorate</b>	5.3	5.3	26.3	63.2

**21. Developing and implementing strategic action plans**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	2.7	11.6	42.9	42.9
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	23.1	23.1	53.8
<b>Doctorate</b>	5.3	15.8	57.9	21.1

**22. Resolving complex problems**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	3.0	14.9	41.8	40.3
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	1.5	6.0	37.3	55.2
<b>Doctorate</b>	4.3	8.7	21.7	65.2

**23. Setting instructional direction – results orientation**

<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	3.6	11.7	37.8	46.8
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	11.5	30.8	57.7
<b>Doctorate</b>	0	0	42.1	57.9

<b>24. Solving problems and making decisions</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	6.3	13.5	30.6	49.5
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	12	24	64
<b>Doctorate</b>	0	15.8	26.3	57.9
<b>25. Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement</b>				
<b>DEGREE EARNED</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Masters</b>	1.8	9	30.6	58.6
<b>Ed Specialist</b>	0	7.7	19.2	73.1
<b>Doctorate</b>	5.3	0	36.8	57.9

Table 7

**State Agency Professional Development Providers' Perceptions of Professional Development Needs**

<b>Area of Focus for Professional Development</b>	<b>Not a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat a Need</b>	<b>Somewhat Important Need</b>	<b>Extremely Important Need</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>Profile</b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Developing information and data collection strategies	0/0	2/28.6	2/28.6	3/42.9	3.14	.90
Building community and involvement	0/0	0/0	5/71.4	2/28.6	3.29	.49
Analyzing data	0/0	0/0	2/28.6	5/71.4	3.43	.98
Communicating Effectively	0/0	0/0	3/42.9	4/57.1	3.57	.54
Building consensus and negotiating effectively	0/0	0/0	1/14.3	6/40	3.86	.68

<b><u>Vision, Beliefs and Mission</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Creating a learning organization	0/0	0/0	1/14.3	6/85.7	3.86	.68
Developing the vision and the mission	0/0	0/0	1/14.3	6/85.7	3.86	.68
Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	0/0	0/0	1/14.3	6/85.7	3.86	.68
Building team commitment	0/0	0/0	1/14.3	6/85.7	3.86	.68
Defining the core values and beliefs of education	0/0	1/14.3	2/28.6	4/57.1	3.43	.79
<b><u>Desired Results for Student Learning</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Using research and "best practices"	0/0	0/0	2/28.6	5/71.4	3.71	.73
Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	0/0	2/28.6	3/42.9	2/28.6	3.00	.81
Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	0/0	0/0	4/57.1	3/42.9	3.43	.54
Understanding student development and learning	0/0	2/28.6	2/28.6	4/42.9	3.43	.90
Setting goals and determining outcomes	0/0	0/0	0/0	7/100	4.00	.00

<b><u>Organizational and Instructional Effectiveness</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Developing the school organization using systems thinking	0/0	0/0	3/42.9	4/57.1	3.14	.92
Managing the organization and operational procedures	0/0	0/0	3/42.9	4/57.1	3.14	.92
Organizing resources	0/0	1/14.3	2/28.6	4/57.1	3.43	.79
Facilitating professional development/ Development of others	0/0	0/0	5/71.4	2/28.6	3.29	.49
Facilitating the change process	0/0	0/0	0/0	7/100	4.00	.00
<b><u>School Action Plans/ Continuous School Improvement</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>N/%</u></b>	<b><u>M</u></b>	<b><u>SD</u></b>
Developing and implementing strategic action plans	0/0	0/0	0/0	7/100	4.00	.00
Resolving complex problems	0/0	0/0	2/28.6	5/71.4	3.71	.49
Setting instructional direction – results orientation	0/0	0/0	0/0	7/100	4.00	.00
Solving problems and making decisions	0/0	0/0	0/0	7/100	4.00	.00
Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	7/100	4.00	.00



## **APPENDIX 2**

### **SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

## Profile of Principal Professional Development

### Needs for Accreditation Survey (PPPDNA)

**Please complete the following survey. Upon completion, please return to Pamela Salazar, 7145 W. LeBaron Avenue, Las Vegas, NV. 89124.**

**The purpose of this study is to learn more about the professional development needs of principals who are seeking accreditation through the Northwest Accreditation School Improvement Process. Please fill in the box completely.**

#### PART I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. **Student Enrollment of your school:** ☐ 0-199 ☐ 200-499 ☐ 500-999 ☐ 1000-1999 ☐ 2000-2999 ☐ 3000+
2. **Type of School:** ☐ Public ☐ Private
3. **Location of School:** ☐ Urban ☐ Rural
4. **Percentage of Students Receiving Free Lunch:** ☐ 0-25% ☐ 26-50% ☐ 51%-75% ☐ 76%-100%
5. **Percentage of Minority Students:** ☐ 0-25% ☐ 26-50% ☐ 51%-75% ☐ 76%-100%
6. **Is your school required to meet state performance goals?** ☐ yes ☐ no
7. **Is your school subject to state reconstitution or takeover regulations?** ☐ yes ☐ no
8. **Does your school have a formal improvement plan?** ☐ yes ☐ no
9. **Has your school begun the Northwest Accreditation SIP?** ☐ yes ☐ no
10. **When are you scheduled for your NW visitation?** ☐ 2001 ☐ 2002 ☐ 2003 ☐ 2004 ☐ 2005 ☐ 2006
11. **What is the size of your school district?** ☐ 0-4999 ☐ 5000-19,999 ☐ 20,000-49,999 ☐ 50,000-99,999 ☐ 100,000
12. **What is the highest degree you have earned?** ☐ Master's degree ☐ Ed. Specialist ☐ Doctorate
13. **Are you male or female?** ☐ Male ☐ Female
14. **What is your race?** ☐ American Indian/Alaska Native ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ African American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Hispanic

---

Please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by July 1, 2001. You may also fax the survey back to 702 799-8966 or complete online at <http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey/>. Thank you.

15. What is your age? ☐ under 30 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60+
16. How many years do you have in education? ☐ 0-10 ☐ 11-20 ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31-35  
☐ 35+
17. How many years do you have as an administrator? ☐ 0-10 ☐ 11-20 ☐ 20+
18. How many years do you have as principal of your current school? ☐ 0-10  
☐ 11-20 ☐ 20+
19. Have you attended inservice education on the NW School Improvement Process? ☐ yes ☐ no
20. Do you subscribe to any of the following journals?  
NASSP ☐ yes Kappan ☐ yes Educational Leadership ☐ yes  
Other? \_\_\_\_\_

## **PART II: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

The items below represent areas of knowledge that are reflected in the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders and are correlated to the school improvement process. Please rate the importance of these topics as subjects for future professional development activities. Indicate the level of importance that this knowledge has on your ability to effectively lead your school through a school improvement process.

<b>1</b>	<b>Not a need</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Somewhat a need</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Somewhat important need</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Extremely important need</b>

---

Please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by July 1, 2001. You may also fax the survey back to 702 799-8966 or complete online at <http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey/>. Thank you.

Area of Focus for Professional Development	Scale			
<b>Profile</b>				
1. Developing information and data collection strategies	1	2	3	4
2. Building community and involvement	1	2	3	4
3. Analyzing data	1	2	3	4
4. Communicating effectively	1	2	3	4
5. Building consensus and negotiating effectively	1	2	3	4
<b>Vision, Beliefs and Mission</b>				
6. Creating a learning organization	1	2	3	4
7. Developing the vision and the mission	1	2	3	4
8. Building shared decision making, collegiality and peer support	1	2	3	4
9. Building team commitment	1	2	3	4
10. Defining the core values and beliefs of education	1	2	3	4
<b>Desired Results for Student Learning</b>				
11. Using research and "best practices"	1	2	3	4
12. Designing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum	1	2	3	4
13. Understanding measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies	1	2	3	4
14. Understanding student development and learning	1	2	3	4
15. Setting goals and determining outcomes	1	2	3	4
<b>Organizational and Instructional Effectiveness</b>				
16. Developing the school organization using systems thinking	1	2	3	4

Please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by July 1, 2001. You may also fax the survey back to 702 799-8966 or complete online at <http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey/>. Thank you.

<b>17. Managing the organization and operational procedures</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>18. Organizing resources</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>19. Facilitating professional development/ Development of others</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>20. Facilitating the change process</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b><i>School Action Plans/ Continuous School Improvement</i></b>				
<b>21. Developing and implementing strategic action plans</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>22. Resolving complex problems</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>23. Setting instructional direction - results orientation</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>24. Solving problems and making decisions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>25. Sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

☐ **Other Needs?** ☐

---

<b>PART III: PREFERRED DELIVERY FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>
--

The items below represent different approaches to the delivery of professional development. Please rate your preference for each of the delivery methods for your professional development.

<b>1</b>	<b>Not likely to participate in</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>May participate in</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Likely to participate in</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Very likely to participate in</b>

Please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by July 1, 2001. You may also fax the survey back to 702 799-8966 or complete online at <http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey/>. Thank you.

For each topic below, circle the number to the right that best fits your opinion on the different approaches to professional development delivery. Use the scale above to match your opinion. (Choose only one)

Professional Development Delivery Method	Scale			
workshop	1	2	3	4
on-line/self-paced	1	2	3	4
mentoring/internship/coaching	1	2	3	4
university coursework	1	2	3	4
problem-based projects	1	2	3	4
small study group	1	2	3	4
hands-on/field-based	1	2	3	4
seminar/conference	1	2	3	4

🍏 Thank you 🍏 Comments? 🍏  
🍏 Suggestions? 🍏

Please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by July 1, 2001.  
You may also fax the survey back to 702 799-8966 or complete online at  
<http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey/>. Thank you.

## **Response Form – Principal Professional Development Needs Survey**

Your cooperation and assistance in critiquing the enclosed survey instrument are deeply appreciated. Please respond to each of the following:

- Indicate the directions or questions, if any, that are unclear or need revision for any reason and provide suggestions for revision.
  - Indicate the requests for information or the questions, if any, that may be of limited use either because the information requested is not available or will be difficult to use for analysis.
  - Suggest any questions, if any, that may be trivial, or inappropriate in the survey, and therefore, may need to be deleted. Please provide a brief explanation as to why.
  - Suggest additional questions, if any, that should be included in the survey and provide a brief explanation as to why.
- 

Please return this comment form and the attached survey by March 20, 2001. You may also email comments to me at [rexdog@hotmail.com](mailto:rexdog@hotmail.com). Thank you.

- Provide suggestions for improving any aspect of the format of the survey.
- Indicate how long it took you to take the survey.

**🍏 Thank you 🍏 Comments? 🍏  
🍏Suggestions? 🍏**

***Thank you in advance for your assistance. Please return this  
comment form and the attached survey by March 20.  
You may fax it to (702) 799-8966 or mail to  
Pam Salazar, Basic High School, 400 N. Palo Verde,  
Henderson, NV 89015, or call at (702) 799-8000 ext. 311.***

---

**Please return this comment form and the attached survey by March 20, 2001. You  
may also email comments to me at [rexdog@hotmail.com](mailto:rexdog@hotmail.com). Thank you.**



## **APPENDIX 3**

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Department of Educational Leadership  
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 453005  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-3005**

June 12, 2001

Dear Fellow High School Principal,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at University of Nevada, Las Vegas studying the professional development needs of practicing principals who are seeking accreditation through the school improvement process. I am respectfully requesting your participation in a research project, by asking you to complete a brief Profile of Principal Professional Development Needs for Accreditation Survey. This questionnaire should take no longer than 10-12 minutes to complete. After completing the questionnaire, please return in provided self-addressed envelope or complete online at <http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey/>.

Professional development for practicing principals is a growing need in our country. School reform efforts and the increased demands being placed on school leaders are generating a renewed interest in principal professional development programs and afford a unique opportunity for upgrading current professional development practices. In an effort to provide the most effective professional development experiences for principals, additional information is needed. Using the data collected from this study, it is my intent to share this information with professional development providers at the state level and district level, as well as the Northwest Accreditation Commission to assist them with their planning efforts on professional development for high school principals.

If you would like additional information before completing the survey, please email me at [rexdog@hotmail.com](mailto:rexdog@hotmail.com) or call me (702) 799-8000 ext. 311 or (702) 896-7106. I will gladly answer any questions that you may have. Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary and you will not be compensated for this participation. In addition, assurances are given that your responses will be held in strictest confidence. All documentation associated with this study will be stored and secured at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for three years. If you desire a summary of the research results, please indicate on the final page of the questionnaire.

This is an excellent opportunity to help establish some directions for future professional development activities that can be used to enhance the skills of principals in the school improvement process. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Pamela Salazar  
Principal of Basic High School  
Doctoral Candidate

# **UNLV**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Department of Educational Leadership  
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453005 • Las Vegas, NV 89154-3005**

## **CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**

**Project Title:** The Professional Development Needs of High School Principals to Lead a School through the School Improvement Process of Northwest Accreditation

**Researcher:** Pamela Salazar  
Doctoral Candidate  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Department of Educational Leadership

### **Purpose:**

You are being asked to participate in a research study to ascertain your professional development needs to lead a school improvement accreditation process.

### **Procedure**

This study will examine the professional development needs of high school principals seeking accreditation through a school improvement process and determine what type of professional development delivery system is preferred by the principals.

### **Benefits**

This research project will contribute to the planning presently taking place within NASC and in school districts in the NASC region concerning the professional development of high school principals. In addition it will provide information regarding professional development needs for principals to those involved in developing and implementing professional development programs in universities, state education departments, principal centers, and school districts.

### **Conditions**

All responses will be kept completely confidential. Your name will not be used anywhere in this study. Length of involvement is approximately twelve minutes to complete the survey. Records will be maintained in the College of Education, Department of Curriculum & Instruction at UNLV.

Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent at anytime. If you have any questions regarding the research, and your participation before or after the completion of the study, please contact Pamela Salazar, researcher, at 896-7106 or email [rexdog@hotmail.com](mailto:rexdog@hotmail.com). For questions about the rights of research subjects, contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) is 895-2794.

Your signature below indicates that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant and you have read the information provided above. You will be given a copy of this form.

---

Signature of Participant

---

Date

---

Signature of Researcher

---

Date

July 1, 2001

***Dear Principal [ID ]***

This is a brief reminder regarding the Profile of Principal Professional Development Needs for Accreditation (PPDNA) survey that was mailed to you on June 15, 2001. I know that this is transition time of the year, but your expertise is valued. Your input will provide me with information that I can share with the Northwest Accreditation Commission to assist them with their planning efforts on professional development for high school principals.

Please take a few minutes, if you have not already done so and complete and return the survey. If you have misplaced your copy of the survey, please email me at [rexdog@hotmail.com](mailto:rexdog@hotmail.com) or call me (702) 799-8000 ext. 311 or (702) 896-7106. The survey can also be completed online at <http://www.ccsd.net/schools/Basic/nwsurvey>.

This is an excellent opportunity to help establish some directions for future professional development activities that can be used to enhance the skills of principals in the school improvement process. Thank you for your cooperation. I really appreciate your help with this and know you are very busy so I thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,  
Pamela Salazar,  
Principal Basic High School

**Basic High School  
400 N. Palo Verde  
Henderson, NV 89015**

***Home of the Wolves***

July 1, 2001

Dear Fellow Educator.

I am the principal of Basic High School as well as a NASC commissioner in Southern Nevada. I am also doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The purpose of my study is to determine the professional development needs of practicing principals who are seeking accreditation through NASC using the school improvement process. I need your help to do this.

I have already surveyed the 623 high school principals in the NASC region of Alaska, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Oregon, and Nevada regarding their professional development needs to facilitate the Northwest Accreditation school improvement process and their preferred delivery method of professional development. I am now asking you to share your perceptions of the professional development needs of high school principals to facilitate the Northwest Accreditation school improvement process and the preferred delivery method of professional development. Your position in the state department of education and your responsibilities for annual accreditation provides valuable information regarding future professional development planning within the NASC organization.

With this letter you will find a questionnaire that addresses these areas. I am hoping that you can please complete the survey and return it to me – it will take about five to seven minutes. I am also sending you a weblink to the survey if you would prefer to complete it online. The web address is [www.ccsd.net/schools/nwsurvey](http://www.ccsd.net/schools/nwsurvey). I really appreciate your help with this.

By completing and returning this survey instrument, you are voluntarily consenting to participate in this study. Questionnaire responses are confidential – your name will never be associated with your response. Your identification code is your state on the questionnaire and is designed to track the return of the questionnaires. It also serves as your password to respond online.

The results of this research will be especially valuable for the design of professional development for principals. Results of this study will be available in December 2001. If you would like a summary of the results or if you would like additional information before completing the survey, please email me at [rexdog@hotmail.com](mailto:rexdog@hotmail.com) or call me (702) 799-8000 ext. 311. I will gladly answer any questions that you may have. This is an excellent opportunity to help establish some directions for future professional development activities that can be used to enhance the skills of principals in the school improvement process. Your contribution to this study is greatly appreciated. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Pamela Salazar, Principal of Basic High School  
Principal

## **VITA**

**Graduate College  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

**Pamela Cummins Salazar**

### **Home Address:**

**7145 W. LeBaron Ave.  
Las Vegas, NV 89124**

### **Degrees:**

**Bachelor of Science, Education, 1974  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

**Master of Science, Curriculum and Instruction, 1985  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

### **Special Honors and Awards:**

**CCSD Educational Excellence Hall of Fame, 1994  
Disney All-American Teacher Award Nevada Honoree, 1994  
Presidential National Science Teacher Awardee, 1993  
Tandy Technology National Teaching Award, 1992  
GE Utilities Teacher of the Year, 1990  
NASA Western Regional Teacher of the Year, 1988  
Nevada Distinguished Teacher of the Year, 1986**

**Dissertation Title: The Professional Development Needs of High School Principals  
for School Improvement**

### **Dissertation Examination Committee:**

**Chairperson, Teresa Jordan, Ph.D  
Committee Member, Patti Chance, Ph.D  
Committee Member, Robert McCord, Ed.D  
Graduate Faculty Representative, Len Zane, Ph.D**