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ABSTRACT

The Principal’s Role in Promoting Standards-Based Professional Development

by

Barbara Jill Presler

Dr. Patti Chance, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to describe principals’ and teachers’ knowledge of recommended professional development practice as defined by The National Staff Development Council (2001). In addition, the study described teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of professional development practices in their schools.

This study was guided by three research questions: (1) how do principals perceive their own behaviors and activities relative to professional development; (2) how do teachers perceive administrator’s behavior and actions relative to professional development; and (3) to what extent did principals base the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards?

This study used both qualitative and quantitative methods via a questionnaire and interview. The Instructional Leadership Inventory (ILI) was developed in collaboration with two other researchers in order to gather data on teachers’ and
principals' perceptions regarding instructional leadership, including professional development. Of the 84 Likert-type scale items in each questionnaire, 39 items specifically related to principals' and teachers' perception of professional development practices in their schools. The 400 participants surveyed in this study were principals who had been named Principal of the Year in 2004 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals or the National Association of Elementary School Principals and three teachers selected from each principal's staff.

Findings from this study showed that principals did perceive themselves as providing effective leadership for teachers' professional development. However, there were responses which indicated that the National Staff Development Standards were not implemented nor relied on research based practices. Results of this study indicated significant differences between principals' perceptions of their own behaviors and activities relative to collaboration, teacher and principal professional development planning, research discussions, teacher implementation of new strategies, peer mentoring, and teacher leadership. This study supported Lieberman's 1995) findings that professional development ignores the context where teachers work (p. 595).
In memory of
my parents

Muriel and Mitchell Cerkel
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other.
John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 1963

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future [NCTAF] (2003) noted that the nation graduates more than enough new teachers to meet its needs each year, but after just three years it is estimated that almost a third of the new entrants to teaching have left the field, and after five years almost half were gone (p. 10). To counter this, reported the Commission, American teachers need to pursue professional growth in both content and pedagogy and schools need to be organized according to what research said about learning. NCTAF (2003) further called for a reallocation and appropriation of funds to provide teachers and school leadership with time, flexibility and resources needed to create and sustain small and well-focused professional learning communities (p. 16). Goldhaber and Anthony (2003) stated that as instructional leaders work to raise teacher quality, this will lead to student achievement.

Senge (1990a) noted that educators need to become a community of learners or a learning organization. Speck (1999) concluded that teachers have often overlooked their own systematic professional development. Likewise,
educational leaders, while occupied with student learning and achievement, often neglect their own continued professional learning. Calderon (1998) and others have addressed collaboration with one's educational colleagues as the means to professionally learn and solve problems (Calhoun, 2002; Easterby-Smith, 1990; Fullan, 2001; Lieberman, 1995; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001).

Joyce & Showers (1995) maintained that curriculum and technological change was impossible without strong professional development, while Willis (2002) documented that trainer oriented professional development was often divorced from practice and were intermittent "one shots" (p.6), unrelated to student achievement and school goals. Effective professional development needs to be an on-going, embedded process, coming out of the teachers' daily work in the classroom, and not remediation (Daresh, 2001; McLaughlin, 1991; Sparks, 2002).

Sparks and Hirsh (1999) pointed out that since districts spend nearly 90 percent of operational funds on personnel, they should be obligated to make sure these employees are trained, well-prepared, and supported. Stigler and Hiebert (1999) declared that teacher methods and the culture of teaching was as strong an influence on students as the content of the curriculum.

Sergiovanni (1994) agreed that schools that have the need and purpose to improve student learning, can improve themselves if the conditions are right. If these conditions are provided by learning leaders who understand that on-going professional development is vital for improvement, all members of an organization can develop the policies (or vision) of the organization (Kelly, 1999;
Lashway, 1998; Pritchard & Marshall, 2002; Willis, 2002). On-going professional development points to the fact that schools are living systems (Fullan, 2001). Change is most likely to occur when teachers or stakeholders accept ownership of the change process (Fullan, 1998; Chance & Chance, 2002).

Historically, professional development has consisted of little more than university pre-service training followed by sporadic in-service by outside experts. Steinhoff and Owens (1976) noted that schools were classically bureaucratic with top down written rules and impersonal relationships. The concept of professional development has continually expanded over the last few decades. In-service training was strongly supported in the 1960’s and 1970’s. According to Willis (2002), although pedagogy and current language were discussed in the literature through 1978, professional development was “...largely divorced from practice, often taking place outside of school” (p. 6). This continued through the 1990’s when McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) found in national survey data for 1993-94, that of all teachers surveyed, fifty percent had some professional development during that year, but only fifteen percent were engaged in professional development for nine or more hours (p. 141).

By 1996, The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future reported that two-thirds of teachers said that they had “no say in what or how they learn on the job (p. 41).” In 1997, Darling-Hammond reported that in material studied of selected states, 20-41% of teachers participated in at least nine hours of professional development that was focused on subject matter, teaching methods, or student assessments (p. 34-35). Harris (1998) spoke of a
paradigm shift in supervision as a collaborative function where the stakeholders may be involved in site-based decision-making (p. 3). This was followed by the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Public Law 107-110 (ESEA, 2001) known as The United States Congress, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), where assessing and raising student achievement were the key focus, and an assurance that all students will be taught by "qualified teachers" by 2005-06. In No Child Left Behind (2001), educators were directed to a more inclusive reformation of their own learning process to help all children succeed.

Loucks-Horsley and Stiegelbauer (1991) noted that reform or change, which is fundamental to participatory professional development, is a process, not an event. However, no organization can change unless individuals change. Glickman (2002) said that change or reform had to be consistent with core values. Loucks-Horsley and Stiegelbauer (1991) went on to say that change was developmental and must address the needs of the participants. However, they further noted that, in changing established systems, participants needed to have a systemic view of change and constantly adapt their behavior as the change progresses. There is a "ripple effect" as one element of the system affects another.

Chance and Chance (2002) summarized organizational development as a change process that parallels the human relations movement in organization theory and was grounded in the social systems theories (p 205). Social systems theories about the motivation and leadership that needs to be in place for continuing change has influenced professional development. The Interstate
School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC, 1996), Standard 6 for educational administrators addresses the educational leadership that reacts to change: “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger, political, social, economic contexts of schooling.

Schmuck and Runkel (1985) identified organizational development or change as a process where there were six underlying assumptions:

- Groups differ from a sum of the individuals.
- Change occurs through subsystems.
- Members' goals and motives have relevance.
- Members' feelings have relevance.
- Untapped resources have relevance.
- Change comes from within.

Steinhoff and Owens (1976) informed us that change in schools is systematic and depends upon understanding the school as a social system responding to political influence and public policy. They went on to say that organizational change will not happen unless there are processes for the entire staff that are responsive to innovators initiatives. Steinhoff and Owens (1976) elaborated that as the environment, expectations, and norms change, there are stresses and new demands on the system, and organizational behavior will change. The change taking place in an open system exchanges energy and information with its environment and is self-regulating. This can be seen with Title I, No Child Left
Behind (2001), which has created demands on state governments and local educational agencies.

In an effort to legislate systemic change, Title I, Title II, and Title V, of The No Child Left Behind Act (2001), mandated professional development based on scientific research. A strong example of systemic professional development was described in a four year research study by Pritchard and Marshall (2002) of “healthy and unhealthy” rural and urban school districts in the United States. According to the authors, healthy educational organizations combined practices to form a holistic system of professional development for all educators. This was built upon a system of activities supported and funded by the district, which created more sustainable professional development. Clair and Adger (1999) stated that district leaders and building principals should have current knowledge about effective teaching and learning trends and that district and school leadership must make student, teacher and organizational learning a priority.

Little (1993) pointed out that there must be sufficient time and resources for promising professional development to take hold. Zimmerman and May (2003) noted that the second largest factor that inhibited professional development was money. Resources to make learning a priority need equitable funding. Biddle and Berliner (2002) warned that research cannot be ignored that shows unequal funding in school districts or that the disparity between districts funding is great. However, Steinhoff and Owens (1986) noted that in the competition for resources, optimizing or using existing resources is one answer.
Joyce and Showers (1995) concluded that school improvement is really a collective process and the planning and involvement of principals in their staffs' professional development had a definite impact on a teacher's reflection and application in the classroom. Professional development may come from the top down, or the bottom up, but a well-designed program of professional development empowers educators. Lashway (1998) indicated that administrators who collect and disseminate information to track the school's performance, create forms of governance that support collective inquiry. Joyce and Calhoun (1999) said that school improvement must be in terms of "hypotheses", rather than solutions to be handed out. Subsequently, this attacks the barriers to collaboration and decisions made are democratic rather than bureaucratic (p. 28-31).

Calderon (1998) argued that although teachers need to learn to work together effectively, diverse philosophies, cultures, or linguistical and social patterns make it difficult to get to the equity in reform. Calderon further suggested that cooperation should be developed with well-defined reform models. The latest emphasis in Title I, NCLB (2001), demanded by the public policy on accountability for student learning and achievement, has had schools collaborating internally, or what Barth, (1990) called "collegiality", or Calderon renamed "collegial structure" which replicates the conditions of successful change and reform. Barth declared that changes emanating and sustained from within are likely to bring lasting improvement to our schools. However, other authors, like Fullan (1998) recognized the importance of the fact that the walls of
the schools are formed by outside influences and pressures such as public policy, government policy, parent and community demands, corporate interests and technology.

Barth (1990), assumed that principals had the largest influence on the professional development of teachers, and noted that there were three considerations about the principal's own professional development that should be addressed: (a) strengthen the pre-service professional development of principals; (b) improve the process of selecting principals; (c) increase professional development opportunities for principals. These forms of professional development would assist the principal in becoming a capable learner as she or he engages in learning; reflecting, articulating, understanding and improving practice.

Guskey and Sparks (1996) concluded that driving professional development in context with both good processes and well-defined content will produce successful student learning outcomes. Table 1 below summarizes Guskey and Sparks (1996) conclusions and these form the basis of the National Staff Development Council's Standards for professional development (2001). These standards are not mutually exclusive, thus process, content and context cross over into one another.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Context</strong></th>
<th><strong>Process</strong></th>
<th><strong>Content</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment of learning communities which aligns goals with the school and district</td>
<td>Uses disaggregated student data</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing leadership</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Quality teaching based on subject matter understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplying resources</td>
<td>Research based</td>
<td>Involves Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategically designed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge based on human learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kersh (1978) used the term "job-embedded" for the context of in-service. Also, the term “action research” was used by Glickman (2002) to describe a study within the school site or classroom that targets specific problems in a particular school setting and produces continuous feedback. Glickman further noted that this leads to sustained change.

Maslow's (1962) and Rogers' (1969) conception of a personal or psychological state where one's personal identity and needs operate is often the base for adult learning. Within school sites, peer-generated structures can be formal or informal, and attention is given to the educator's learning of new concepts. Conceptual systems theories were developed in part from Maslow's
self-concept theory, which described persons in terms of the concepts they use. In Maslow's theory, existing concepts are preserved and viewed as either right or wrong. At the higher stages of conceptual development, people integrate new information, and are more de-centered. Joyce and Showers (1995) called this states of growth where individuals become self-actualizing and feel good about themselves. This individual component in adult learning and professional development, said Joyce and Showers (1988), has led to success in teacher/adult learning and growth, thus ultimately influencing student performance and behavior.

Schon (1996) added to the base of knowledge about learning and professional development with his concept of reflective practice. The author used this as the basis of several hundred studies. Boud and Walker (1998) and Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) agreed that Schon's concept of reflective practice was tied to conceptual frameworks, and challenged teaching practices. Joyce and Showers (1995) felt that strategies, such as reflective practice, appeared to be learned well in small groups with technical assistance.

Glickman (1993) introduced the term "collaborative coaching". Other methodology, such as modeling, teacher coaching, peer mentoring (Huling & Resta, 2001), and the use of personal histories, dialogue journals and large and small group discussion about experiences led the way to continuing professional development.

Dufour (2002), Dufour and Berkey (1995), and Schlechty (2002) agreed that school principals as learning leaders attend to this belief system and guide
professional development. Edmonds (1979) stated that effective schools have strong administrative leadership, but it was a "distributed leadership" said Elmore (2002) that required people to operate in networks of share expertise. Glickman (2002) said that schools need to have structures that develop the knowledge and skills of individuals and this expertise must be stretched among people occupying the same roles, such as teachers, and between different roles, such as teachers and administrators. Researchers have noted that they no longer believe that one administrator can serve as the instructional leader for an entire school without the substantial participation of other educators (Elmore 2002; Lambert, 2002; Lambert, Collay, Dietz, Kent, & Richert, 1996).

Guskey and Sparks (1996) said that while learning is affected by a teacher's knowledge and practices, the road to classroom change comes as a principal's leadership role forms school policies and the organization. Subsequently, Guskey and Sparks went on to say that this impacts the curriculum, assessment, textbooks, discipline, attendance, grading and has a powerful effect on how and what students learn.

Problem Statement

In The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996), of the five recommendations for the future, one was devoted to creating stable, high-quality sources of professional development. Richardson (2004) proposed that identifying good practices in professional development enables teachers to perform at high levels in teaching. Furthermore, the mandates of the
reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 107-110 (ESEA, 2001), known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and the subsequent policies and laws states created to improve school districts, necessitated professional development as a part of the school improvement process.

Researchers in the last decade (e.g. Daresh, 1991; Lieberman, 1995; and Sparks, 2002) reminded us that traditionally professional development has been a one time process, often unrelated to school performance. Historically, professional development for educators was based on a trainer model to learn skills, sometimes unrelated to student achievement, and required a number of hours of in-service. Research from the last two decades has focused on professional development as the key to building the capacity of educators to make true school reform happen (Little, 1993; Sparks & Hirsh, 1999). Fullan (1993) identified the concept of professional development in the perspective of comprehensive change. Fullan further stated that it was not enough to be exposed to new ideas, we have to know where they fit and become skilled in them. Costa and Lieberman (1997) and Elmore (2002) agreed that the time has come to shift our focus from what the knowledge or content is, to the how of learning, or processes. Costa and Lieberman went on to say that we need to nurture the skills, operations, and dispositions that enable individuals to solve problems when answers are not readily known. Csikszentmihalyi (1990) spoke of integration or individuals accepting a cooperative role, and Senge (1990) discussed integrating individuals into “community members” who go beyond fixing problems to anticipating what might happen and searching for solutions.
In consideration of the research, The National Staff Development Council's (NSDC) twelve standards for professional development (2001) provide the foundation for their practice in elementary and secondary schools. The standards include learning communities, leadership, resources, data analysis, evaluation, research-based study, design and strategies, learning, collaboration, equity, quality teaching, and family involvement. Although proactive administrators should anticipate and plan for professional development, principals may not have the complete knowledge they need to engage their staff in professional development. Subsequently, the professional development used by teachers to increase their knowledge and skills in order to help improve student achievement, may be minimal or non-existent.

Other than exemplary case studies, as defined and published by the National Staff Development Council and anecdotal descriptions, there has been little comprehensive research describing typical professional development practices in the schools. Thus, there was a need to describe current practices relating to professional development in the elementary and secondary schools. Through a survey of principals throughout the United States and based on the NSDC Standards, this study discovered to what extent administrators and teachers understood professional development as it was happening in their schools; what principals perceived as important in their practice of professional development; and how teachers perceived administrators' behaviors and actions related to professional development.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe principals' and teachers' knowledge and understanding of recommended professional development practice as defined by The National Staff Development Council (2001). In addition, this study described teachers' and principals' perceptions of professional development practices in their schools.

Conceptual Framework

The National Staff Development Council (NSDC, 2001) has twelve Standards for professional development that reflect previous educational research and form the basis for this study. They are divided into three areas beginning with context. The context of professional development includes (1) learning communities, (2) leadership, and (3) resources. The second area of professional development is the process. The process of professional development is (4) data-driven, (5) evaluative, (6) research-based, and has good (7) design and strategies, (8) learning, and (9) collaboration. The third area of professional development is content. The content of professional development is (10) equity, (11) quality teaching, and (12) family involvement. These areas are not mutually exclusive and they blend into each other.

These twelve Standards are the result of the past decade of research in education. Joyce and Showers (1995) found professional development to be individual, collective, or systemic. For professional development to become collective or systemic, change or reform must occur. Glickman (2002) referred to
sustained change resting on the framework of a covenant of beliefs developed through broad participation of the stakeholders.

Harris (1998) defined the principal's role in professional development as facilitating participation by promoting effective teaching practices; providing for continuous personal and professional growth; and thus changing the character of the school and teaching. Harris (1998) further stated that building principals, supported by their knowledge of professional development, enable teachers to become learners as they engage in concrete tasks of teaching, assessment, observations, and reflection. Then during the processes of learning and development, teachers become grounded in inquiry, reflection, and experimentation that is participant-driven. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) advised that teachers' practices connect to and derive from their work with students. The work is sustained, ongoing, intensive, and supported by modeling, coaching, and the collective solving of specific problems of practice. Finally, the community of practitioners is connected to other aspects of school change.

Research Questions

The study was guided by and attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How did principals perceive their own behaviors and activities relative to the best practices of professional development (NSDC, 2001)?
2. How did teachers perceive administrator's behavior and actions relative to professional development?
3. To what extent did principals base the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards (2001)?

Population/Sample

The population for this national study was 100 K-12 principals, two from each of the 50 states. Each participant had been named Principal of the Year for 2004 of their state, and was affiliated with The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) or the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). In addition, participants included three teachers selected from the building staff by each participating principal.

Research Design and Methodology

This was a descriptive study using a mixed method design (Creswell, 1994) in which conditions in professional development practice in elementary and secondary schools was described and analyzed. The survey was designed to gather information related to principals’ knowledge of professional development standards and best practices as set forth in the National Staff Development Council Standards (2001) and the degree to which these standards were practiced. A second survey gathered information from teachers regarding their perceptions about what principals’ practiced.

The questionnaire consisted of both forced response and open-ended questions. Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) and Gay and Airasian (2000) stressed the
importance of designing questions for the questionnaire to get specific information based on the research problem and specific objectives. The questionnaire items were designed based upon the twelve standards of the National Staff Development Council (2001) and a review of literature related to these standards. The twelve standards of professional development are context, process, and content. The context of professional development includes (1) learning communities, (2) leadership, and (3) resources. The second area of professional development is the process. The process of professional development is (4) data-driven, (5) evaluative, (6) research-based, and has good (7) design and strategies, (8) learning, and (9) collaboration. The third area of professional development is content. The content of professional development is (10) equity, (11) quality teaching, and (12) family involvement. The Council developed these standards and ethics from the identification of good practices, with the intent to improve the quality of school leadership, teaching and student learning (National Staff Development Council Code of Ethics, 2004). The Council's standards apply to educational leaders and providers, including superintendents, school board members, principals, teacher leaders, curriculum coordinators, consultants, mentors.

The results from the questionnaires were examined using descriptive statistics and the measure of central tendency. Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) described descriptive statistics as mathematical techniques for organizing and summarizing a set of numerical data (p. 131). The authors further noted that a measure of central tendency is a single numerical value that can be used to
describe the average of an entire set of scores. This includes the mean, median, mode, and measure of variability such as standard deviation, variance and range (p.131).

In addition to the survey, semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with 2 principal participants and 2 teacher participants. This use of both survey data and interview data gave a more complete picture as it cross-checked information looking for patterns and links (Creswell, 1994; Gay & Airasian, 2000).

Significance of the Study

Currently, in the literature and research on professional development there was very little reporting of professional development practice in elementary and secondary schools. Other than exemplary case studies as defined and published by the National Staff Development Council and anecdotal descriptions, there was little comprehensive research describing typical professional development practices in the schools. The mandates of the reauthorization of ESEA, Public Law 107-110 (Elementary and Secondary School Act), known as No Child Left Behind (2001) and the need for school reform and improvement makes professional development a part of the school improvement process. Thus, the need was to describe current practices relating to professional development in the elementary and secondary schools.

Lieberman (1995) spoke of professional development practice as ignoring the “context within which teachers work” (p. 595). Costa and Lieberman (1997) and
Elmore (2002) agreed that the time has come to shift our focus to the knowledge and content of professional development and to the process of learning. To fill the gap and assist principals and teachers in their school leadership of professional development, this study was generated and designed to conduct survey research on the administrators' practice of standards and best practices regarding professional development and the teachers' perceptions of the extent to which these were practiced.

This closer look at the extent of principals' and teachers' understanding of professional development based on the NSDC standards (rev. 2001), and the role and function in which they engaged in promoting and participating in these activities, has provided a valuable source of information for professional development leadership.

Delimitations

Due to the sample of convenience the study was partly limited to the perceptions of principals about the knowledge of their roles of professional development. There was limited generalizability and may reflect only the perceptions of the participants.

Limitations

1. The resulting were limited by the method of data collection, a mailed questionnaire. Non-response is difficult to control in a mailed survey (Borg, 1987).
2. Questionnaires were subject to bias because the way a question is asked can influence the responses. This survey used closed-ended and open-ended questions. Open-ended questions that permit the responding person to create answers leaves the answer to be interpreted, thus reducing the reliability of the data. (Borg, 1987; Johnson, 1977)

3. Because the survey asked participants to make self-reports, he or she may have told us only what he/she wanted us to know. Self-ratings can be threatening to a subject or he may lack the insight to do so, thus the answers could be inaccurate (Borg, 1987).

4. As a three member team designing and producing the survey research, inter-dependency in this process could be a detriment (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003).

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are applicable:

1. Professional Development- defined as focusing on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required of teachers, administrators, and other school employees so all students can learn and perform at high levels (National Staff Development Council, 2004). Also, it may include high quality, ongoing training programs with intensive follow-up and support.

2. Staff Development- used interchangeably in the literature and research,
primarily before 1990, with professional development, as those processes that improved the job-related knowledge, skills, or attitudes of school employees (National Staff Development Council, 2004).

Summary

Chapter I contained an introduction to this study, a background and statement of the problem, the purpose and importance of the study, theory and supportive research, research questions, methodology of the study, limitations, and definition of key terms. It rested on the assumption that teachers, as the single most important factor in student achievement, must have the opportunity, resources, and support to develop professionally. This effort cannot be attained without the facilitating role of administrative leadership (Lambert, 2002).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

As increasing pressure was put upon schools through the reauthorization of Title I (NCLB, 2001) for students to perform at higher levels of achievement, professional development for educators became a vital preparatory link to reform and improved student learning. Goldhaber and Anthony (2003) concluded that there are significant reasons to be concerned about the academic proficiency of the teacher workforce. Stigler and Hiebert (1999) pointed out that without a way to get better, teaching will not improve. The National Staff Development Council (2004) holds to the view that skills can be improved by providing professional development opportunities for teachers to learn new ideas. They have concluded that as teachers are led in professional development by administrative leadership whose standards meet those of the National Staff Development Council (2001), learning will occur.

Dufour (2002) demonstrated as a principal that the school leader guides and directs the establishment of a learning community where ongoing professional development occurs. Schmoker (1996) stated that the most important function for school leaders is to create professional development that keeps everyone's eyes focused on improved student learning. Harris (1998)
noted that although professional development for educators has been addressed in educational literature for several years, recently supervision is considered a vital link to professional development.

Glanz (1998) gave a historical overview of professional development beginning with colonial times in America. Glanz (1998) pointed out that supervisors in colonial times defined their role as improving the quality of education. Glanz (1998) also reported that early schools did not have the hierarchy of officers supervising that we have today, but by the nineteenth century, schools in large cities began to organize into networks and uniformity reigned.

Subsequently, in the 19th century, teacher institutes were established by states and recognized the need for professional development (Ward, St. John & Laine, 1999). Although these institutes were funded by the states, they were controlled by the county superintendents in states such as Connecticut, New York, Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois. Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) noted that as these institutes evolved into normal schools of education with the advent of land grant universities, partnerships for professional development began with local universities.

Ward et al. (1999) stated that in the 19th and early 20th centuries, efficiency became a priority in the workforce and the worker was a cog in the business machinery. For about twenty-five years, teachers became rated and
despite opposition, salaries and bonuses, as well as firings, were tied to performance. Between the 1920's and 1930's supervisory roles became more professional in nature, more democratic, with a human relations approach. At this time, Glanz (1998) considered improvement of instruction, not rating efficiency, as the goal or theme of education. He further stated that classroom teachers by this time had developed their own organizations, such as the Department of Classroom Teachers, founded in 1914 (p. 55).

Glanz (1998) looked at supervision after World War II as a role that changed to the bureaucratic-professional construct, where the superintendent assumed responsibility for supervision and an evaluative-improvement function. Glanz further noted that this often led to conflict between the bureaucratic model and the professional model. Lieberman (1995) pointed out that in 1957 The National Society for the Study of Education proposed that schools and entire staff should become collaborators. Harris (1998) indicated that The National Defense Education Act in the 1950's gave rise to funded studies of supervision, including staff development study, which provided a base of inquiry and further research.

Scribner (1999) reported that up until 1996, academic training did not prepare a teacher for context based learning even though the literature at that time reported context to be vital. Professional development still had little impact on teacher practice. Scribner further noted that the focus was on district or state reform agendas and not individual teacher needs. Glanz (1998) noted the rise of clinical supervision during the middle of the 20th century, which strove to improve teaching by a prescribed formal process of collaboration between teacher and

Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989) stated that the 1970's led to a new wave where programs were conducted in school settings and linked to school-wide efforts; teachers participated as helpers to each other and along with administrators, as planners of in-service activities. There was an emphasis on self-instruction, with differentiated training opportunities; teachers were in active roles, choosing goals and activities for themselves while demonstration, supervised trials, and feedback emerged as concrete training that was ongoing over time.

In the 1980's, school district leaders saw professional development as a key aspect of school improvement efforts. Darling-Hammond (1997) identified three waves in educational reform: the first wave sought to raise achievement through testing mandates; the second wave argued for improvements in teaching and teacher education through groups such as The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986); and the third wave focused on more challenging standards for learning while restructuring schools for better outcomes.

Evans (1996) described training in that latter part of the 20th century that was tailored to the current knowledge, practice, and felt needs of teachers. Fullan and Stigelbauer (1991) focused on collaborations that were formed with universities and groups. Sirotnik (1987) reported on The National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) with 14 different partnerships involving 17 higher educational...
institutions and 115 school districts. O'Neill (1995) told about subsequent groups which were formed, such as the Creative Learning Exchange in Acton, Massachusetts.

The National Staff Development Council (2001) was formally organized in 1976, and had as its mission "to ensure success for all students by serving as a network for those who improve schools and by advancing individual and organization development" (p. 2). The NSDC standards for professional development covers twelve points organized under three separate areas. These twelve standards formed the structural organization for this study.

The first area is a context where the framework of professional development improves the learning of all students by:

1. organizing adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district (Learning Communities)
2. requiring skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement (Leadership)
3. requiring resources to support adult learning and collaboration (Resources)

The second area is a process for professional development which improves the learning of all students by:

4. use of disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement (Data-Driven)
5. use of multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact (Evaluation)

6. preparing educators to apply research to decision making (Research-Based)

7. use of learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal (Design).

8. applying knowledge about human learning and change (Learning).

9. providing educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate (Collaboration)

The third area is content where research based subject matter improves the learning of all students by:

10. preparing educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement (Equity)

11. deepening educators' content knowledge, providing them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and preparing them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately (Quality Teaching)

12. providing educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately (Family Involvement)
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Scribner (1999) reminded us that schools are community organizations devoted to learning. The link between professional development and student learning must be potent in content and have a good design, not only with workshops, but through the design or context of the workplace, creating new structures (p. 592). Darling-Hammond (1997) spoke of a new paradigm for educational policy, one that shifted from designing controls to developing capacity (p. 6). Terminology for this workplace has been referred to by Calhoun (2002), Evans (1996), and Schlechty (2002) as a "collaborative work culture", and by Sergiovanni (1994) as a "learning community".

Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) emphasized that the majority of professional or staff development experiences did not incorporate the characteristics of effective change processes. The authors stated further that in workshop or one-time experiences, the change that produced learning was rare (p. 317). Little (1982) had previously held that professional development communities that supported teacher learning through practice, tradition and culture were effective with students.

Schools have not always established a culture that supported professional development. Corcoran (1986) argued that public schools were sub-optimal work places and of their effectiveness problem can be traced to a poor quality of work life and to low productivity. Additionally, Corcoran tied low productivity and low
job satisfactions to goals that are ambiguous. He blamed social promotion, poor supervision, vague standards, centralized authority for curricular decisions, overwhelming paper work, isolation of teachers, and discipline problems as leading to a loss of efficacy. Scribner (1999) spoke of a “deep distrust” of outside experts who have little or no knowledge of teachers’ contexts. The attitude of teachers in Scribner’s studies of teacher peer groups was that formal professional development was ineffective.

Peter Senge, in an interview by O’Neill (1995) reflected that teachers don’t work together collectively. He said learning is always on the job in the context where one is taking action (p.20). He spoke of our incapacity to integrate “significant changes in the context and process of education...[that] require coordinated efforts throughout a school; ... [one] cannot implement learner-directed learning. There must be fundamental cultural changes” (p. 21). Senge went on to tell O’Neill that educators saw themselves as powerless and that people in an organization who feel disempowered have a very low ability to learn. They don’t think they have leverage to make any difference.

Maslow (1962) and Rogers (1969) spoke of a personal or psychological state where one’s personal identity and needs operate. McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) stated that collectively, this creates a social system where the “cultural context of schooling [is] embedded in teachers’ work” (p. 145). Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) found innovation is not sustained unless there is a shared understanding of its purposes. According to Fullan (2001), the culture of change that surrounds the school is critical in determining the professional learning experienced by
teachers and principals. Fullan (1993) also noted that the climate and learning habits of community are important and permeate everything we do; "It is not enough, to be exposed to new ideas. We have to know where the ideas fit and become skilled in them..." (p. 16). Individuals and groups must be recognized and celebrated. Praise, celebration, recognition and rewards in learning communities target specific successes and unite others in leadership. Organizations must pay attention to the social and psychological needs of its workers (Blasé & Kirby, 1992; Schmoker, 1996).

Little (1982) conducted a one-year study in six schools. The observations provided data for a focused ethnography of a school as a workplace. Four relatively successful and two relatively unsuccessful schools were studied. Successful schools, particularly those receptive to staff development, were differentiated from less successful schools by patterned norms of interaction among staff. As evidence through interviews and observations, in successful schools more than in unsuccessful ones, teachers valued and participated in norms of collegiality and continuous improvement (experimentation). They pursued a greater range of professional interactions with fellow teachers or administrators, including talk about instruction, structured observation, and shared planning or preparation (Little, 1993; Little & McLaughlin, 1993). Little (1982) stated earlier, "Along one measurement, relevance, in successful and adaptable schools, continuous professional development was made relevant to, an integral part of, the occupation and career of teaching" (p.334). Little continued by stating that schools that worked together, not by “intent” but by
"design", were continually building substantive knowledge in a collegial way, and had continuous improvement (p.339).

Scribner (1999) examined the factors that motivated teachers to participate in development activities and experience professional learning. His design used a multiple-site, embedded case study with three levels of analysis. The primary objective was to understand high school teachers' perspectives of their own professional development. Scribner studied two cases in the Lakeland School District high schools, population 100,000, and then used the school district as the secondary and tertiary units of analysis (p.5). Scribner found in this study that teachers engaged in learning activities for: (a) content knowledge needs; (b) pedagogical skills deficits; (c) challenges to classroom management; and (d) gaps in student-centered knowledge. Also, a sense of moral obligation and personal interests followed to a lesser amount. They wanted “nuggets” of wisdom. Extrinsic benefits such as paid Saturdays were also of concern, even though these, Scribner concluded, do not ensure relevant learning activities (p. 5).

The United States Department of Education Professional Development Team (1994) used available research to create a set of principles. They concluded that high quality professional development:

1. focuses on teachers as central to student learning;
2. focuses on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement;
3. respects and nurtures the intellectual and leadership capacity of individuals within the school community;
4. reflects best available research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership;

5. enables teachers to develop further expertise in subject, content, teaching strategies, and technology;

6. promotes continuous inquiry and improvement;

7. involves collaborative planning;

8. requires substantial time and other resources;

9. is driven by a coherent long-term plan

10. is assessed by its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning.

Corcoran (1986) concluded that in the collegial community of learning, organizational improvement and changing district structures with vision, reality and strategies are vital. Many researchers have tried to make industry the model for school change. Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) compared schools with industry. Schools, they found, de-compartmentalize their curriculum into isolated bodies of knowledge; but industry, on the other hand does not divide high technology into separate tasks or knowledge.

Smylie and Conyers (1991) formulated that decentralization allowed for more tailored professional development activities and had implications beyond the topic and content of the activity (p. 12). Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) advised policy makers to redistribute existing resources in school restructuring to a policy that anticipates teachers’ time for collegial work and learning in strong communities of practice (p. 567). The new paradigm, Darling-
Hammond (1997) advocated, requires policymakers to shift from designing controls to developing capacity among schools and teachers responsible for student learning (p. 223).

Leadership

Willis (2002) stated that it is important that professional development is led by a strong principal and also a strong superintendent who supports the principal and that this professional development continues over a period of time (p. 11). Willis noted further that leaders should focus on developing student learning, not on changing practice, although practice will change (p. 103). McLaughlin (1991) also pointed out that school principals are primarily responsible for establishing the expectations for professional development (p. 73). He further emphasized the establishment of a culture or climate where it is safe to take risks. Later, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) found that “habits and cultures inside schools foster critical inquiry into teaching practices and student outcomes and this will enable teachers to solve problems, consider new ideas, evaluate alternatives and frame school-wide goals” (p. 4). Sagor (2000) considered that school leaders can make practical use of student data so that inquiry and action research is integral into the fabric of school life (p. 201).

While Little (1993) saw teachers equipped through professional development as “shapers, promoters, and well-informed critics of reform”, she cautioned against giving teachers full responsibility for implementing those reforms. She identified five areas for reform in: subject matter; equity for diverse student
populations; changes in assessment, social organization of schools; and the professionalization of teaching (p. 130).

Schlechty (2001) stated that the effective proactive leader always focuses on improvement of student learning (p. 109). Further, Daresh (1991) defined six characteristics of effective proactive leadership as (a) an awareness of personal beliefs; (b) understanding organizations; (c) instructional leadership as an ongoing process; (d) consistency of personal behavior; and (e) an ability to understand people (p.109-112). Both Daresh (2001) and Schlechty (2001) summarized that effective principals have clear goals, both long and short-term, and their priorities deal with the happiness and achievement of students. Additionally, the authors agreed that when principals balance task and interpersonal relationships, task takes priority over human relations if needed.

Blasé and Anderson (1995) noted that for years, effective administrators have realized the political significance of the use of informal and formal power, known as micropolitics, by individuals and groups. The authors identified that this power is used by groups to achieve their goals and influence action. It may be cooperative or conflictive (p. 11).

Fullan (1993) declared that “the new work of the principal was to extend leadership beyond” themselves, and to “help create conditions and capacity for every teacher to become a leader” (p. 101). Gehrke (1991) advocated Site-based Management as conducive to developing leadership. Blasé and Anderson (1995) also reported their research in two studies. In the first study, they used a sample of 74 full-time teachers taking graduate education courses; and in the second
study, the sample was 770 full-time teachers taking graduate courses from the population of two major universities in the southeastern and northwestern United States. In their conclusions, Blasé and Anderson reported that 404 teachers identified their principals as "open and effective". Supportive principals provided their teachers with relevant and timely information, and encouraged their participation in special seminars, conferences, and in-school staff development programs. These principals helped teachers to obtain meaningful information and knowledge, which contributed to their self-esteem and professional growth (p. 82).

Blasé and Kirby's (2000) research and analysis of strong school leadership during the last two decades found that successful administrative qualities were initiative, confidence, tolerance for ambiguity, analytic abilities, resourcefulness, vision, democratic-participatory style, listening, problem centeredness, openness, time management skills, high expectations, knowledge of curriculum, and the ability to locate resources effectively (p. 2). Daresh (1991) admitted there are principals who advocated the importance of professional development based on the latest research, but whose staff never participates in any professional development activities (p. 109-112). Schlechty (2001) articulated the need for educational leaders to invest in professional development and continue their own professional development by taking stock of their own skills, identifying like-minded leaders to communicate ideas, becoming part of a collegial group, talking with persons in other sectors, reading regularly, and employing technologies as a transformational tool (p. 199).
As leaders plan schedules and assignments within a school, they should allow time in the schedule for collective inquiry, such as one afternoon a week (Darling-Hammond, 1997; DuFour & Berkey, 1995; Raywid, 1993). Louis, Kruse and Byrk (1995) pointed out the need for communication, such as email, regular faculty meetings and common space for working. Joyce and Showers (1998) expected administrators to participate in professional development and called a school where staff interaction takes place regularly a "synergistic" school (p. 17). They envisioned 15-20 days a year for teachers to interact with one another (p. 26). These interactions can evolve over years. Willis (2002) maintained that a focus over time was important. He warned that excellent site-based programs sometimes fall apart when the principal leaves because the new principal comes in with a new agenda (p. 11). Chance and Chance (2002) noted that when leaders facilitate the development of positive norms, they promote a group's effectiveness. They recommended that explicit ground rules facilitate such things as attendance, promptness, participation, agendas, and behavior, and may bring about implicit norms.

As leaders prepare for professional development, Licklider (1997) noted that during self-directness, including self-learning in natural settings and effective teacher professional development, should involve more than occasional large-group sessions. He further noted that successful group dynamics involves dialogue rather than debate with the emphasis on listening, suspending judgment, and seeking common understanding. Joyce and Showers (1995) offered useful guidelines for professional development which actively involve
participants in programs based on the participants’ and school’s needs. Joyce and Showers (1988) presented a model, which began with the superintendent and a cluster of committees, and was honed down to a coaching team consisting of two faculty members. The authors further stated that governance could be individual, collective, or systemic. Joyce and Showers (1989) predicted that when the entire faculty was involved in large-scale projects, the transfer rate could approach 100%; but without peer coaching, the transfer rate to the classroom practice could be as low as 10%.

The size of a school has been the topic of debate regarding a lack of learning, communication and reform. Leadership appears to be the key in communicating and structuring for reform even in larger schools. Lewis, Kruse, and Byrk (1995) found that in the fifteen restructured schools they studied, school size was not a significant factor and could be overcome. They said “specific efforts and supportive leadership” created “cohesive patterns of interaction among faculty members in large schools” (p. 6).

Hall, Hord and Griffin (1980) found that the principal’s concern about the teachers use of a specific innovation make its use more consistent. Blasé & Anderson (1995) concluded that real change begins at the “base” and cannot be mandated from legislatures, or “delivered” by research and development think tanks. Rather, it must begin with the inclusion of all stakeholders at the school level (p. 140).

Abal-Haqq (1996) saw effective professional development as incorporating a constructivist approach to teaching and learning. Lambert, Collay, Deitz, Kent
and Richert (1996) discussed constructivist leadership as reciprocal and non-hierarchical, and depending on the current problems, or context, this leadership unfolds toward the solution. When uncertainty looms in tasks, contextual leadership helps both the leaders and those in collaborative groups manage. Furthermore, the authors gave nine design principles for professional education based around commitment, knowledge, and skills. The skills were categorized into collaboration skills, learning skills, and community building skills. The authors suggested that teachers participating in professional development have a mutual responsibility to teach veteran administrators about the culture of their learning environment. Roles may change in constructivist leadership and “individuals can collectively reframe their roles through continuous interaction and feedback from each other” (p. 30-31).

Lambert et al. (1996) also emphasized that the role of the constructivist leader is to create and sustain occasions for people to learn; constructivist leadership is non-hierarchical and the teacher leaders assumes leadership responsibility based on his or her knowledge or expertise; and leadership is contextual with each context different from the next, so the requirements for leadership unfold toward the end of the process. This helps the leader and collaborative group deal with change and uncertainty (p. 146)

Glatthorn (1984) included in clinical supervision examples of scientific and artistic supervision which demonstrated professional development. Tracy (1998) concluded that the purpose of learning-centered clinical supervision was to help, not evaluate, the teacher. The teachers targeted for this type of supervision are
those that are beginning, those making a major move in teaching assignment, those having problems, or competent teachers who feel they need intensive supervision. Tracy referred to cooperative professional development, which is categorized under "peer or collegial supervision" (p. 90). In this type of supervision, two or more teachers work together for their own professional development in a non-evaluative way. They observe each other's classes, sometimes with video cameras, and give feedback discussing professional concerns. This would be an outcome of clinical supervision and Glatthorn (1984) noted that skills such as data collection, data analysis, and conferencing, increase the success of this option. While this may not change instructional behavior, it lifts the level of professional discussions. Tracy (1998) summarized that collegial supervision can improve the approach and professional interdependence of teachers who receive it (p. 90).

Tracy (1998) concluded that the value of Glatthorn's (1984) model was that teachers work independently rather than being supervised by others; that teachers set professional development goals emanating from their own assessment of need; that teachers have a variety of resources available to support work on those goals; and that the outcomes are not used to evaluate teacher performance (p. 90).

Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989) identified differentiated supervision as calling for "self-directed development", where teachers had a variety of resources to meet their collaboratively identified needs. Hering and Howey (1983) summarized research conducted on fifteen teacher centers sponsored by the Far
West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development from 1978 to 1982. They found that the most important thing that came out of these centers was their emphasis on working with individual teachers over time (p. 2). Hering and Howey discovered that teachers who were given money and support in the form of mini-grants to fund classroom projects, reported a high level of satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment. They developed projects anchored in the realities of the classroom and responsive to the needs and interests of their students. This influenced change and innovation in other classrooms, as well as their own, through the projects they designed (p. 6).

Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) noted that linking teacher evaluations in the clinical evaluation process to teachers’ professional development had a strong support base in the literature. Boyd (1989) urged working with teachers to set specific, achievable goals. Smythe (1991) spoke of seeing clinical supervision as a form of collaborative professional development where “…teachers can become actively involved in the collective and reflexive process of analyzing and theorizing about their own teaching, its social antecedents and the possible consequences” (p. 2). Smythe argued that it was not a matter of just bringing people into the process, but “…change in an educative model of supervision requires that teachers, as well as students and parents, have an opportunity to decide for themselves on the basis of lucid, critical self-awareness, the manner in which [they] wish to live (p. 79). Wiggins (1993) questioned, “What if performance appraisals were centered on teacher self-assessment in reference to a range of student work from a major assignment (p. 264)?” Dufour and Berkey (1995)
suggested using the clinical supervision model where the logic of events was to meet prior to classroom visits with the teacher; collect objective data during classroom observations; review the data; identify patterns of teacher behavior; and provide feedback on instructional strategies during post conferences (p. 1-7).

Sparks (2002) wrote extensively on the leadership of superintendents and principals who were positive professional developers. They aired conflicts and created structures and cultures that supported high levels of student and adult learning. Blasé and Kirby (2000) stated that involvement could be managing agreement, involving individuals formally or informally, knowing when not to involve others, respecting the decisions of the team, and suggesting rather than directing (p. 55-56). Furthermore, Blasé & Kirby cited leadership factors on professional development which affected teacher performance. They were: (a) discretion in implementing new learning by teacher; (b) assisting teachers in evaluating newly attempted techniques; (c) and using pragmatism to explain the effectiveness of training (p.89).

The National Staff Development Council (2004) summarized the role of principals and superintendents as one that distributes leadership responsibilities among teachers and other employees. This facilitates teachers to become members or chairs of school improvement committees, trainers, coaches, mentors, and members of peer review panels. Helping their staff gain “knowledge and skills and other forms of support” brings success in their new posts (p. 1). Dufour (2002) put the burden directly on the principal for encouragement, recognition and collaboration: “… a school cannot make the transition to the
collaborative, results-oriented culture of a professional learning community without a principal who focuses on learning" (p. 12-15).

Resources

Zimmerman and May (2003) noted that both elementary and secondary leaders list a lack of time and a lack of money as the two resources that inhibit professional development. The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2004) raised the question of who should pay for professional development. Should it be the state, region, local agencies, or schools? Ward et al. (1999) made the following comment on the history of funding and resources for NCREL: "From at least the mid-nineteenth century on, the proper preparation and continuing education of teachers has been a critical state education policy concern" (p. 4).

Willis (2002) considered that a Site Based Management (SBM) structure that feeds professional development needs funding. Jordan (2002) proposed site-based budgeting and/or intra-district allocations to achieve this. Wood and Thompson (1980) pointed out that federal and state mandates pushing for higher standards for student achievement, remediation, and professional-development programs have not provided the massive funding needed to enhance student success. Gratz (2000) noted that as of 1999, only eleven states offered such funding.

Abal-Haq (1996) stated that effective professional development is "school based and embedded in teacher work". He further advocated strategic allocation
of resources. Strategic allocation of resources such as staff expertise, time, federal dollars and community support has been consistently recommended (Arnold, Simms, and Wilbur, 1999; Collins, 1997; Hord, 1994). Blasé and Anderson (1995) and Burnett (1993) held that administrators need to be cognizant that schools cannot operate outside the fiscal and political realities that state legislatures and school boards represent, and administrators needed to develop relationships with these groups in order to have the flexibility for school restructuring. Arnold et al. (1999) discussed how the allocation or reallocation of resources might include "unpopular decisions" like eliminating programs that did not contribute to student achievement.

Fullan (1998) also pointed out that the walls of the school are formed by outside influences and pressures such as government policy, parent and community demands, corporate interest and technology. Fullan (1998) and Sparks (2002) agreed that this culture was critical and determined the professional learning experience by the teachers and principal. Sparks (2002) rallied against negatives that hindered this professional development learning, among which are inertia and isolation.

would conduct and monitor research; determine conditions and resources
required in states; provide technical assistance; evaluate effective programs;
monitor, analyze, and disseminate policy that promote professional development;
and function as a research and information clearinghouse to publicize research
findings (p. 6-7).

John Goodlad, in an interview with Tell (1999), also called for increases in
district budgets or resources for professional development. The National Staff
Development Council (Sparks & Hirsh, 1999) recommended allocating at least
ten percent of school budgets for professional development. Greenwald, Hedges,
and Laine (1996) found that student achievement increased with every additional
$500 spent on teacher professional training, as opposed to spending the same
money on raising salaries or reducing class size. The Center for the Study of
reported by NDSC (2003), that spending on professional learning is up slightly,
about 3% of total expenditures (p.4).

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future [NCTAF] (1996)
reported that professional development support ranged from only 1% to 3% of
the districts operating budgets, even when the cost of staff time was factored in
(p. 40). The Commission further offered the suggestion that resources should be
“invested in vehicles that offer relevant, sustained learning for teachers” (p.84).

The Commission (1996) offered the following steps to accomplish this:

1. Allocate at least 1% of state and local education funding to be devoted to
   high-quality professional development organized around standards for
student learning and for improving teaching practices. States should provide matching funds for districts to increase their investments in professional development to 3% of total expenditures.

2. Organize new sources of professional development such as teacher academies, school-university partnerships, professional development schools, and networks for learning across schools.

3. Make on-going professional development part of teachers’ daily work through joint planning, research, curriculum and assessment work, study groups, and peer coaching (p. 84-86).

The National Staff Development Council (2004) reported the per pupil expenditure for professional development as $168 to $241 nationwide (p. 5).

Wood (1997), Speck (1999), and Wood & Thompson (1993) called for school improvements based on staff development, site-based management, and site-based budgeting. Speck further noted that a site planning committee should consider, modify, and adopt the budget, while managing, reviewing, and evaluating professional development programs. The National Education Summit (1999) recommended that teacher compensation programs should be changed to provide salary credit for professional development only when it was standards-based, linked to state and district priorities, and part of school-wide plans to raise student achievement. However, incentives do not have to be monetary. Fitch and Knopp (1990) offered ideas for rewards such as release time, in-service, certificates, and conferences.
Ward et al. (1999) analyzed a study by the North Central Regional Laboratory (NCREL) on the role of state support and funding for professional development. The states which participated were Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Ohio. Several other states gave some information. Six patterns regarding policy context for state-funded professional development:

1. States' requirements for school districts to develop professional development plans were underused as a policy mechanism for school change.

2. Regionalization of state services was linked to a more direct state role in professional development.

3. State policy on on-going teacher certification is in flux.

4. Alternative certification is sometimes still widely used.

5. States rarely provide special subsidies for professional development, but some limited programs were established in Minnesota, Georgia, Missouri, and Michigan.

6. Release days were most often built into state financial systems. States did not play an active role in mandating and supporting teacher professional development resources in a general policy way (Ward et al., 1999, p. 8).

In conclusion, Ward et al. (1999) noted that it is difficult to determine how much states spend on teacher professional development. There is a great variation among states in the number, kinds, and levels of state-funded teacher professional development programs, and it is not clear whether state funding is directed primarily at the comprehensive and systematic professional
development of teachers at the local level. State funded programs focused
directly on teacher professional development are targeted on narrow curricular
areas, and state requirements for school districts or schools to develop
professional development plans were underused as a policy mechanism for
school change. When they did exist, however, they were part of required school
improvement plans. Regional education agencies' roles need further exploration
(p. 9). Ward et al. raised the question that if states fund teacher professional
development, then would there be some discernible improvement in student
performance as a result?

McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) found that rates of teacher participation in
longer-term professional development are higher for states that have invested in
professional development as a strategy to improve instruction. The authors
stated further that “Investing in teacher learning communities as a strategy to
build teachers' capacity for effective teaching in 21st century classroom entails a
shift from system policies that seek to prescribe standardized practices to those
that aim to strengthen teachers' judgment and opportunity to learn” (p. 135).
McLaughlin and Talbert concluded, “States and districts are ill equipped to
develop or provide these knowledge resources, and teacher's professional
organizations can contribute critical expertise to government-sponsored
investments in teacher’s learning” (p. 136).

Professional development activities help “teachers to improve their practice
and to work in a collegial manner toward the solution of commonly identified
problems” (Sykes, 1983). Sykes further noted that pay alone cannot induce
participation or performance, but should be part of a district’s approach to professional development. In addition, he argued that district salary increments did not attract teachers to university coursework and contended that extra pay discouraged school-initiatives.

Recent concerns about quality in the teacher workforce have caused states to want to become involved in professional development as public policy changes. Federal funds for teacher professional development are available and mandated through various titles and sections of The Improving America’s Schools Act (P.L. 103-382, amended ESEA of 1965).

Watts and Castle (1993), in a survey of schools involved in the National Education Association initiative, described five ways to structure time for professional development.

1. Freed up time using teaching assistants, college interns, parents, and administrators to cover classes and regularly scheduled early release days.

2. Restructured or rescheduled time lengthening school day on four days, with early release on day five.

3. Better-used time by dedicating regular staff or district meetings for planning and professional growth rather than for informational or administrative purposes.

4. Common planning for colleagues having similar assignments.
5. Purchased time through the establishment of a substitute bank of 30-40 days per years, which teachers can tap when they participate in committee work or professional development activities (p. 306-310).

The importance of knowing what resources can be used for professional development may make the difference in having school-wide programs. Burnett (1993) noted that principals were often unaware of professional development options for their schools.

Data-Driven

Begin with the end in mind, wrote Covey (1989) in *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. Dufour and Berkey (1995) advised creating a consensus in the school for what educators hope to become. The “end” added Dufour and Berkey (1995) must be described in “clear and compelling terms” (p. 1-7). Kaufman (1997) proposed data driven decision making as one of the four elements in his system of professional development (p.2). If data analysis defines future learning, Dufour (2002) found that teachers needed support to develop common outcomes and analyze student data (p.12-15). Joyce and Showers (1995) told us that implementation is where it all happens or falls apart (p. 127). Further, several authors have advised setting a target, collecting data, analyzing the data, using the data, and adjusting behavior (Joyce & Showers, 1995; Kaufman, 1997; Schmoker, 1996).

The National Staff Development Council (2001) listed several sources of data from student learning which included norm referenced or criterion referenced
standardized tests, district-made tests, student work, grade retention, high school completion, disciplinary action, vandalism, advanced enrollment, portfolios and post-secondary enrollment figures. These data are usually disaggregated to include gender, socioeconomic status, native language and race. Processing these types of data leads the content of teachers’ learning in instruction, curriculum, and assessment. A second use of data aids the design and evaluation of professional development, for formative and summative purposes. These same data help policy makers and funding sources evaluate the effectiveness of professional development on teacher practice and student learning (NSDC, 2004). Finally, a third source of data is that collected at the classroom level, including teacher-made tests, assignments, portfolios, and other evidence of student learning, which is analyzed by teachers as to the effectiveness of professional development on their classrooms. NSDC (2004) concluded that both teachers and administrators require professional development knowledge in formative classroom assessment instruments, data analysis, and data-driven evaluation. Pardini (2000) gave six examples of data-driven decision making effects on teacher education, multi-age reading classes, literacy education, tracking of student achievement, ongoing professional development and school discipline. In these examples, surmised Pardini, the data-driven materials guide professional development and result in successful student learning outcomes.

Joyce and Calhoun (1996) presented five case studies of programs to improve learning and the use of action research as a tool in school improvement.
In action research, teachers use existing data to analyze and plan action. Sagor (2000) and Calhoun (2002) found that action research generates data to measure the effects of various programs and methods on student and staff learning. According to Sagor, teachers who “...engage in collaborative practices, such as action research, develop high efficacy, a professional ethos, and their students begin to perform better than before” (p. 33). Calhoun saw action research as a way to embed professional development in the school culture and behavior. Action research gives feedback that targets specific problems in schools (Boud and Walker, 1998). Joyce and Showers (1995) further suggested that professional development should be operated as a large-scale action research project and improved continually by the community of people operating it. Schmoker (1996) specified that in data-driven professional development, the data should be used to select the best, most results-oriented initiatives. Schmoker and Sparks (2002) agreed that the alignment of data assessment and strategies meant more than just assessing what the teacher has taught; the focus should be on what students are learning.

 Evaluation

Professional development needs to be evaluated by the leadership developing it and the participants. Guskey (1998) maintained that since we live in the age of accountability, evaluation should be systematic, but not event driven (p. 3). Guskey also recommended that to improve professional development we don’t just add a day or two. He approached evaluation for professional
development in three stages: (a) planning: gathering both quantitative and qualitative information from various sources; (b) formative; and (c) summative: making recommendations for future work (p. 3). Little (1982) stated that when "...expectations for analysis, evaluation, and experimentation, a norm of continuous improvement", are treated as tools of professional development, teachers value professional development (p. 339).

Guskey (2000) provided a five step model that could be used forward or backward in evaluating professional development. It went from Participant’s Reactions to Student Outcomes Learning and the evidence gathered at each level provides data that rates effectiveness from one level to another and pinpoints breakdowns (p. 50). Cushman (1996) described strategies, a formal structure, or protocols for evaluation used by teachers in Essential Schools. The "tuning protocol" was used in a non-judgmental public forum, to discuss critical issues and gain the benefits of diverse perspectives (p. 2-3).

One strategy Hord (1994) gathered from her work in the Change Project in Austin, Texas, was to regularly check on implementers to assess their progress. She reported that the frequency of the monitoring interventions correlated significantly with a higher degree of implementation. In other words, "walking around" communicated to teachers the importance of the new program and increased their feeling of being supported in the effort (p.5).

Regardless of the evaluation methods used, or the sources of information, evaluation design can improve the quality of professional development and
determine the effects of professional development in terms of its intended outcomes (NSDC Standards, 2004).

Research-Based

During the 1960s and 1970s, professional development research was limited to an evaluation of specific in-service and staff development models. Research based learning has been largely ignored. Also, since then, false research without supporting evidence has found its way into professional development. The National Staff Development Council [NSDC] (2004) reminded teachers and administrators to take time to study the research that supports claims for school reform. Further, they advised that this may take several months of reading reports published in peer reviewed journals; talking with researchers in telephone interviews or inviting them to visit; and visiting schools that have adopted the proposed changes. NSDC (2004) recommended that one should compare their students with the students in the sample of the research, examine the methodology, and determine if the conclusions match the evidence provided.

Ross (2002), writing for the Center for Research in Educational Policy, stated that evaluation of research can be simple and gave these guides for evaluating research:

1. The evidence should be statistically significant with a t-test or an analysis of variance and the difference in results due to factors other than chance.

2. The evidence should be educationally significant.
3. The evidence should be from a third party.

4. The supportive evidence should have internal validity and be in refereed journals.

5. The research evidence should have external validity.

6. The evidence should be based on comparison to control groups.

7. Determine the implementation success (p. 8).

Calhoun (2002) reiterated that action research helps staff members draw on the current research base, adds to their current knowledge, and creates new knowledge-in-action, which she maintains makes instruction more effective for student learning (p. 25). Apart from school site action research, Calhoun submitted, "Whether action research is used as a school improvement tool or an individual professional development option, staff members who draw on the current research base, add to their current knowledge, and create new knowledge-in-action that can make instruction in the school or in the classroom more intentional and effective for student learning" (p.23).

Designs and Strategies

Sparks (2002) referred to school superintendents and principals as "system designers" or "school designers" who air conflicts and create structures and cultures that support high levels of student and adult learning. Although the current culture for educators in professional development is still often limited to training or workshop oriented, other site specific efforts can be initiated such as coaching, collaborative lessons, student work evaluation, curriculum
development, research case studies, action research, study groups, and professional networking. The National Staff Development Council (2004) declared that successful professional development leaders combine learning strategies and base them on intended outcomes and the learner’s prior knowledge and experience, then follow up throughout the school year. These learning strategies can also include technology, such as virtual learning communities.

Joyce, Calhoun, and Hopkins (1999) maintained that embedding professional development in the workplace during the work-week and work-year would increase inquiry into new practices and the implementation of school improvement initiatives (p. 113, 122). However, they further noted, the workshops in staff development are selected through either a brief or elaborate needs assessment and implementation should be done by participants in their classrooms (p. 122). Joyce, Calhoun, and Hopkins advocated expanding the curriculum and instructional repertoire; selecting a focus; and involving everybody in designing the workplace and designing the training (p. 123-4). An example of this was reported by Lambert (2002) as taking place in the professional development program at the Eden Gardens School in Hayward, California, part of the San Francisco Bay Area School Reform collaborative, where the principal set aside Wednesdays as a collaboration day for the cycle of inquiry, action research, grade-level meetings, new teacher support meetings and parent community involvement. The principal said that during these
collaborations, student assessments and data helped them find patterns that guided instruction.

Louis et al. (1995) found that after structural conditions are in place, teachers needed time to meet and talk, have physical proximity, interdependent teaching roles, communication structures, and teacher empowerment and school autonomy (p.4-5). Saxl, Lieberman, and Miles (1987) observed that school-based teacher educators (SBTE) start from what they know, respond to both the professional and personal development needs of the faculty and utilize other teachers as resources with the designed program. The authors identified critical skills needed by SBTE which include interpersonal ease, group facilitation, educational content, initiative taking, rapport building, support, confrontation, collaboration, diagnosing, and demonstration abilities. Sparks and Hirsh (1999) amplified the connection between subject matter and pedagogy in professional development design which give teachers a repertoire of research-based instructional methods to teach their students content matter and master new skills directly related to the classroom.

Schon’s (1996) reflective practice is another widely discussed strategy for professional development. This practice has led to professional development strategies that were best learned in small groups and has provided motivation, support, sympathetic sounding boards, and technical assistance. Boud and Walker (1998) stated that with a link to conceptual frameworks teachers can explore theories through reading personal histories, journals, lectures, and discussion; modeling of skills through films and live training; the practicing of
skills under simulated conditions such as peer teaching; and finally, peer coaching. Joyce and Showers (1995) identified peer coaching as collaborative and needed to solve the questions from the training components (p. 115). Huling and Resta (2001) and Darling-Hammond (1997) enumerated the benefits that professional development programs based on reflective practice and professional competency brought. According to the authors, reflective practice brings renewal and collaboration and contributes to teacher leadership.

York-Barr, Sommers, Ghere, and Montie (2001) discussed reflective learning. "As individuals, staffs, and organizations reflect on their learning, they gain important information about how they perceive the efficacy of their planning, experimenting, data gathering, assessment, and self-modification" (p. xv). The authors referred to this as the Reflective Practice Spiral. With continuous growth through reflection, Oja (1991) declared that individuals should be placed in role-taking experiences with constant guided reflection. York-Barr et al. (2001) further showed that learners reflect individually, in groups, or in partnerships, but only within an atmosphere of trust. With the trust factor, students, teachers, and administrators can be thoughtful and strategic. Continuous reflection said York-Barr et al., requires an active and conscious processing of thoughts (p. 6). York-Barr et al. further stated that in addition to the processing of thoughts, reflection is an examination of beliefs, goals and practices (p. 7). York-Barr et al. (2001) pointed out that reflection can improve schools by:

1. creating the opportunity to continuously learn from and about educational practice.
2. giving a greater variety of perspectives.
3. giving new knowledge and understanding.

4. increasing efficacy as educators see the positive effects on their own context-generated solutions.

5. assuming personal responsibility for learning and improvement.

6. strengthening relationships and connections among staff.

7. building bridges between theory and practice and reducing external mandates (p. 9).

Joyce and Showers (1995) maintained that teachers who wish to apply reflective methodology to acquisition should understand the research from cognitive psychology regarding association, memory and the nature of reinforcers and how they operate (p. 115). Smylie and Conyers (1991) extended the notion that reflection sharpens a teacher’s skills in problem solving, determining students’ needs, and conducting action research. However, the authors stated that because of the way schools are organized reflective practices and research are hampered by time constraints and isolation.

Renyi (1996) summarized that when designing professional development programs they should be lengthy or a seamless part of the yearlong job; teachers should have a role in defining the content; scheduled meetings should be interspersed with classroom practice; and teachers should work in groups rather than in isolation from community partnerships.

Learning

Goldhaber and Anthony (2003) were concerned about the academic
proficiency of the teacher workforce. The National Staff Development Council (2004) advised that skills can improve by providing professional development opportunities for teachers to learn new ideas, receive feedback, and participate in group problem solving. The NSDC further stated that while this does involve change and some anxiety, an understanding of adult learning will facilitate professional development regardless of learning styles, negative feelings, or life stages.

Knowles (1970) defined adult learning as androgyny (the art and science of teaching adults), where maturation produces a self-concept that moves from dependency to self-direction. Knowles explained that the mature adult accumulates a reservoir of experience that provides a resource for learning, and one's readiness to learn is oriented toward the developmental tasks of his or her assigned social roles. Further, Knowles noted that when an adult's time perspective changes from a postponed application of knowledge to an immediate application, his/her orientation toward learning shifts from subject-centeredness to problem-centeredness. Darling-Hammond (1997) and Gardner (1991) concluded that people learn best when they make connections between what they already know and what they are learning, when they can draw on their experiences and see how ideas relate to one another, and when they can use what they are learning in concrete ways.

Little (1982) found a shared language in continuous job-embedded professional development, and Smythe (1991) noted that this was when "...teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and
precise talk about teaching practice as distinct from teacher characteristic and failing, the social lives of teachers, the foibles and failures of students and their families, and the unfortunate demands of society on the school" (p. 88).

Rogers (1969) found human beings will seek growth given the appropriate conditions. Knowles (1970) believed that adults become self-directed and their readiness to learn was stimulated by real life tasks and problems. Gregorac (1982) noted that adults have learning differences as individuals in the ways they perceive and process information. Hall and Loucks (1978) showed that as individuals learn new behaviors and change their practice, they experience different types of concerns that require diverse types of responses from staff developers.

York-Barr, Sommers, Ghere, and Montie (2001) concluded that people learn well when what they learn is personally meaningful and challenging, and they accept the challenge. The authors made the distinction that adults learn better when it is appropriate for their developmental level. York-Barr et al. also found that when people learn they can learn in their own way, have choices, and feel in control; and they use what they already know as they construct new knowledge; they have opportunities for social interaction; they get helpful feedback; they acquire and use strategies. Finally, York-Barr et al. discovered that adults learn in an environment where they experience a positive emotional climate and the environment supports the intended learning (p38).

Costa and Kallick (2000) extended the notion that in a community of
learners intelligent behavior can be taught as an educational outcome. They listed sixteen habits of mind beneficial to learning. These included persisting, managing impulsivity, and listening with understanding and empathy; thinking flexibly; thinking about thinking-metacognition; striving for accuracy; questioning and posing problems; applying past knowledge to new situations; thinking and communicating with clarity and precision; gathering data through all the senses; imagining and innovating; responding with wonderment and awe; taking responsible risks; finding humour; thinking interdependently; and remaining open to continuous learning.

Darling-Hammond, Griffin and Wise (1992) spoke of teachers as implementers, not conceptualizers. They felt teachers need knowledge of learning styles, strategies, motivation, behavior-learner interactions, child and adolescent development, human intelligence, and multi-cultural learning. Smythe (1991) summarized the learning steps for teachers to make the transfer of learning to the classroom. This involved making a compelling case for the information in the first place, a demonstration of the teaching strategy, followed by extensive practice by the teacher in the actual classroom, and above all, assistance in making the transfer back to the classroom through open-ended feedback about the in-class performance of the strategies being used.

Socio-cultural theory advocated by Vygotsky (1962) and Calderon (1998) showed that learning occurs in a social context in which individual action and understanding is negotiated by members of a group. Unruh and Turner (1970) defined four stages of professional growth in school staffs as:
1. the pre-service period as student teaching and internships promote high interest.

2. the initial training period where beginning teachers from one to five years sought activities that helped them deal with insecurity or uncertainty about limited knowledge, discipline, routine organization, and curriculum development.

3. the security building period as teachers with five to fifteen years experience focused on personal knowledge and skills; when students' instructional needs become important.

4. the maturing period where master teachers had an undefined number of years, but possessed professional expertise.

   Wood and Thompson (1980) spelled out learning guidelines for adult learners. They noted that goals and objectives in adult learning needed to be considered realistic by the learner and related to a specific issue at hand; that adults will learn, retain, and use what they perceive as relevant to immediate personal and professional needs; that adults need to see the results of their efforts and have frequent and accurate feedback about progress that is being made toward their goals; that adult learning is highly ego-involved and when a person is unsuccessful at a given learning task, it is likely that he or she will take it as an indication of personal incompetence and failure; that adults always come to any learning task with a wide range of previous experiences, knowledge, skills, and competencies. Further, Wood and Thompson wrote that adults want to be the origins of their own learning and they wish to be directly involved in the
selection of learning objectives, content, and activities; adults will tend to resist any learning experience that they believe is either an open or implied attack on their personal or professional competence; adults reject prescriptions by others for their own learning; adult motivation comes from the learner and not any external source. Wood and Thompson concluded with the idea that as persons mature, efforts to motivate from outside will decrease in probable effectiveness.

Wiggins and McTighe (1998) created six facets for understanding in adult learning. The authors stated that adult learning has to be explained and supported with facts, data, and phenomena; has to be interpreted with meaningful stories, translations, and provide historical or personal dimension to ideas and events; needs application, used and adapted to what is known in diverse contexts; needs a perspective where points of view are seen and heard through critical eyes and ears; needs empathy by the learner to find value in what others might find odd, alien, or implausible; and must process from self-knowledge which understands our own personal learning style, prejudices, projections and habits that shape or impede our own understanding. Wiggins and McTighe (1998) further identified teaching types for adult learning as didactic or direct instruction, coaching, and facilitative, constructivist, and reflective (p.160).

Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) and Smith and Wigginton (1989) discussed professional development learning sources such as the teacher-to-teacher and school-to-school networks. Examples of these include The Foxfire Teacher Network and Lesson Lab (Willis, 2002). Other examples of networks are
partnerships with neighborhood-based youth organizations like those promoted by the United States Government, as part of the 21st Century and Safe Schools grants. Such partnerships traditionally become involved in district, regional, or national activities with professional associations and unions, and their function is to document and disseminate professional development results.

Trainer models continue to exist, such as Slavin's Success for All (Slavin & Madden, 2001), developed at Johns Hopkins University. This trainer model includes three days of professional development for teachers and tutors with follow-up during the year. SFA expanded to schools in 31 states that received grants from a National Defusion Network (Slavin & Madden, 2001; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1966).

Joyce, Calhoun, and Hopkins (1999) stated five major components for professional development that increase transfer value of learning when combined. They are:

1. presentation of theory which raises awareness and increases conceptual control
2. modeling and demonstration through a live demonstration or media
3. practice in the workshop setting or under simulated condition
4. structural feedback is learning a system for observing teaching behavior
5. coaching for classroom application (p. 118-119).
Collaboration

Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) introduced the notion that as districts have moved away from traditional credit-for-seat-time staff development, teachers have moved toward professional development that collaboratively involves them in networks, professional assessment, and peer review. After a good design and strategies are in place for professional development, collaboration is the next step. Louis et al. (1995) argued that this collaboration is a change that will have to take place in order for students and teachers to benefit (p. 3). Further, Louis et al. addressed the critical demands teachers must demonstrate as reflective dialogue, de-privatization of practice, collective focus, collaboration, and shared norms and values (p. 4).

Joyce and Showers (1995) reminded us that teaching is in an isolated environment and teachers need time to be collegial, reflecting on practices. Smylie and Conyers (1995) held that if schools are organized as places to learn as well as to teach, the paradigm needs to be shifted to address teacher isolation. Schmoker (1996) stated teamwork was the way to overcome isolation. Schmoker further proposed that collegially establishing goals, using performance data, emphasizing short-term results, using research, strengthening work within disciplines, and recognizing leadership will improve schools.

Louis et al. (1995) found that gender plays a role in collaboration. In a study of fifteen restructured schools, the authors found that faculties with more women tend to develop a stronger sense of community and stronger intra-personal relations (p. 6). Louis et al. discussed the social and human resources of all
participants to enhance professional communities. They are openness to improvement, trust and respect, a cognitive and skill base, supportive leadership, and socialization (p. 5-6).

Bodilly, Keltner, Purnell, Reichardy, and Schuyler (1998) reported on the Rand Corporation's New American Schools (NAS) established in 1991 to help schools organize to increase academic performance. They found in their two year study from 1995-1997 that cooperation and collaboration of schools and districts that had design teams were necessary for success. In the study, effective communication in schools avoided staff confusion and collaboratively planned core elements of curriculum, instruction, student assignment, assessments, and professional development ensured higher levels of implementation. The last key to success was implementation of whole-school training, facilitators, extensive training days, and common planning time.

Corcoran's (1995) framework for professional development specified that teachers need more time to work with colleagues (p. 69-79).

DuFour and Berkey (1995) cautioned that the principal's role in nurturing learning cooperatively, creating consensus, and systematic collaboration is crucial. Setting up teams of teachers within a classroom may be one way the principal can design collaboration. Meier (1997) reviewed an account of two team teachers, Daniel and John, who wrote about their team teaching in a classroom. They used journals and recorded the ways change occurred with students, parents, and each other as "an organism evolving over time" (p. 160). Speck and Knipe (2001) found that when teachers team, they can use their common
preparation time to prepare curriculum and discuss strategies. However, the authors added that teachers also need to schedule professional development time to collaborate with other teams, to discuss student data based on performance testing, to analyze individual students' results, and to agree on exemplars.

Sirotnik (1987) reported on collaborative networking between universities and school districts such as the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) which included 14 different partnerships involving 17 higher educational institutions and 115 school districts. Many universities partner with school districts to establish professional development schools. Schwartz (2000) informed us that there were 1,000 of these schools in almost all states. Michigan State University sponsored The Holmes Group (1990) that advocated a fifth year of preparation for pre-service teachers. The Holmes Group found that professional development school faculty members became equal working partners (p.8). In a professional development school study by Schwartz, an important aspect of the PDS model was that it could be learner-centered, be based on an inquiry model, and have on-going action research and constructivist practices.

Sparks (2003), urged collaborators of professional development to form strong partnerships at the school level and form national organizations that represent school board members, superintendents, and teachers. Further, Sparks believed professional organizations should educate those on the front
lines of contract negotiations about the necessity of high quality professional learning.

Daresh (1991) advocated on the inclusion of all stakeholders, pointing out that conflict often erupts when the administrators ignore experienced teachers, presenting them with an agenda for in-service for which they are unprepared and they feel was forced on them without clear goals. Hirsh (2003) gave some clues to handle conflicts that hinder collaboration:

1. clarify the problem
2. separate positions from interests
3. identify criteria for win/win resolution
4. brainstorm potential solutions without judgments
5. evaluate each solution against the criteria
6. choose the best solution (p. 3).

Goodlad in an interview by Tell (1991) addressed the teacher shortage with a suggestion that career teachers or head teachers take on a cluster of neophytes or interns. Goodlad indicated that he felt professional development schools with university collaboration could work with neophytes in an internship year. There might be a head teacher with 80 students, a couple of career teachers, and a group of interns. This can be carried further on school sites with peer mentoring.

Fitch and Knopp (1990) regarded peer mentoring and coaching as a positive effect on the mentor and the recipient and a means of negating teacher isolation. Huling and Resta (2001) reported that facilitators of mentoring programs derived substantial professional development benefits from the mentoring experience.
When teachers are coaching and working collaboratively there is a shared vision which is a prerequisite for the implementation of new skills or strategies (Lieberman & Miller, 1991; Showers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987).

Linda Darling-Hammond (1997) spoke of “New York’s New Compact for Learning” which provided professional learning opportunities to isolated teachers with a computer database. This contained prototypes of performance tasks, exhibitions, portfolios, and documentation protocols. State assessments were widely circulated to use and practitioner-teachers were encouraged to send in curriculum materials and student work. Renyi (1996) reported that The National Education Association called for collaboration and working with the community for long-term, high quality professional development. This could include public and private institutions, such as universities, libraries, and museums. According to Renyi, many communities with resources are following through with this.

Equity

Little (1993) identified equity for diverse student populations as one of the five areas essential for professional development (p. 130). Kaufman (1997) pointed out that students often move “through a system which denies them equal access, provides unequal resources, and produces inequitable outcomes” (p.3). He reminded readers that teachers are at the core of equity issues; their perceptions of students may be stereotyped; and professional development is a "critical agent" for equity reform. Kaufman wrote that professional development is a means to helping teachers understand cognitive, multicultural, and
social/emotional differences in students so the teachers can provide
differentiated learning and developmentally appropriate curriculum (p. 1).

Equity also extends to opportunities for teachers as well as students.
Calderon (1997) made the distinction that although federally funded programs for
the past 25 years have targeted specific educational needs of bilingual and ESL
students; they have disempowered minority teachers and students. Calderon
further noted that they have been alienated from the social and academic
mainstream and these programs have deprived students of high achievement
academically (p.2). The National Staff Development Council (2004) advised
educators that through their attitudes and behaviors they establish a safe
learning environment. However, background or assignment levels could hinder
this acceptance and behavior.

Kaufman (1997) proposed a system of professional development that would
integrate equity:

1. A stance of critique and inquiry
2. Data-driven decision-making
3. Investigation of best practices, including instruction, curriculum, and
   materials.
4. Teacher leadership development (p.1-2).

Calderon (1998) gave recommendations for a professional development
program to reach an isolated multilingual, multicultural teaching staff. He went on
to state that these teachers need "state-of-the-art knowledge about learning
theory, cognition, pedagogy, curriculum, technology, assessment, and programs
that work" (p. 2). Calderon additionally found that researchers at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR) learned successful strategies to use in instruction, based on cultural relevance and equitable power relations with language minority students (p.4-5).

Calderon (1998) felt that the literature was very clear on having high expectations for minority students.

Quality Teaching

Harris (1998) wrote that the function of professional development for teachers should be quality effective teaching, continuous personal and professional growth and changing the character of the school (p. 12). Further, the author listed proven effective supervisory practices which can be used to improve teaching such as observation, clinical conferencing, and lesson analysis techniques no matter whether “…clinical, formal training, coaching, or self-directed approaches” were chosen (p. 13). Harris chided private consultants and publishers who profited from such programs as phonics, wait-time and programmed teaching which have little to do with quality teaching results (p.13).

Darling-Hammond (1997) found that in schools where professional development had brought about successful changes, teachers were known for their area of expertise and were encouraged to lead and contribute to curriculum initiatives and related school projects based on their interests (p. 171).

To meet the new standards, Corcoran (1995), Kaufman (1997), and Sykes (1983) argued that teachers need professional development to increase their
content knowledge; to investigate best practices, including instruction, curriculum, and materials; and to develop new teaching approaches.

Little (1982) found in a one-year study that in successful and adaptable schools "...continuous professional development was made relevant to the occupation and career of teaching" (p. 334). Little further stated that teachers learn by experience as they work together, discussing, analyzing, evaluating and experimenting with the business of teaching (p. 338).

Darling Hammond (1997) addressed the issue that many teachers leave the profession within the first five years of employment and these new teachers are assigned primarily to schools and classrooms serving the most at-risk students. These at-risk students learned less in areas like reading, writing, and mathematics that were critical to later school success.

Joyce and Calhoun (1996) noted that without support, less than 10% of teachers given professional development persisted long enough to integrate new skills. But with support, by the end of the first year, 88% of the teachers were using the new strategies regularly and effectively. This impacted student performance. Further, the authors reported that in one middle school promotion rates soared, while the average achievement test score jumped from the 25th to the 42nd percentile. In addition, disciplinary referrals dropped to about 1/5 of the previous level. Blasé and Kirby (2000) suggested that effective principals assume that all teachers have room for professional growth and these principals share their expertise with teachers, providing them with opportunities to learn from one
another, and inviting external experts to assist with professional development (p. 89).

Iwanicki (1998) linked teacher evaluation and professional growth, stating that “the primary purpose of teacher evaluation in most schools has been on professional growth and school improvement” (p. 166). Iwanicki took the appraisal process through three steps (a) year 1-Appraisal; (b) year 2-Support; and (c) year 3-Continued Professional Growth.

Glickman (1993) used a developmental model of supervision that applied directly to professional development. He felt that there were activities appropriate for low, moderate, and high ability abstract thinking teachers. He described abstract thinking as “the ability to determine relationships, [and] to make comparisons and contrasts between information”. Glickman concluded that low abstraction teachers needed techniques of explanation and demonstration; moderate abstract thinking teachers needed classroom practice, peer supervision, and observation of other teachers; and high abstract thinking teachers used modification of classroom practice through teams, brainstorming, and group problem solving (p. 285-287).

More than word differences, professional development and in-services were distinct functions according to Harris (1998). He offered that in-service programs provided learning opportunities for teachers, while advance preparation or professional development offered training and knowledge needed to move to different or higher level positions. However, perhaps recognizing the reality of the structure of everyday schools, Harris gave practical ideas that could be used in
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either in-service or professional development for quality teaching. These included large group activities, such as lecturing, panel presentations, and demonstrations; small group activities such as buzz sessions and discussions; and individual activities, such as interviewing and classroom observation. Harris questioned the fact that professional development as a major function in education was always recognized in theory, but not practice. Harris noted that traditional misconceptions in education, such as “anybody can teach”, “you learn to teach by teaching”, and “a license certifies competence” (p. 13), limited the function of professional development in supervisory education. However, he stated “that training, coaching, simulating, demonstrating, and directed practice can produce improved teaching and has substantial support in research and best practice” (p. 12).

Darling-Hammond, Griffin, and Wise (1992) held that professional development should be governed by teacher’s professional knowledge and judgment and focused on the needs of children. The authors felt teachers need to know the following to be quality teachers:

1. Have knowledge of cognition of how children learn
2. Know learning styles and teaching strategies
3. Know motivation and behavior-learner interactions
4. Know child and adolescent development, the physical, psychological and cognitive
5. Know organization, instruction and class management
6. Know effective teaching methods
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7. Know special education learning
8. Know human intelligence

Family Involvement

The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) Standard for Family Involvement (2004) is explained by the Council as a result of district administrators who build consensus around their schools and unify community efforts around a school's mission. Administrators who have skills such as "communicating in clear, direct language (orally and writing), are effective in conducting meetings that balance task achievement and relationships (p. 1). The NSDC added that these leaders are clear about their own values and respectful of other's values. The Council went on to say that teachers must be able to establish partnerships with families and understand the cultural backgrounds of their students. Teamwork is important and so is providing support for students' learning at home (p. 1).

Epstein (1997) stated a Framework of Six Types of Parent Involvement. They are parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community. Epstein's (1997) led A National Network of Partnership Schools, which gives technical assistance and helps form partnerships between schools, districts, states, and the Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships/CRESPAR at John Hopkins University. The
Partnership Schools have Action Teams that include teachers, parents, and an administrator and may include students and school support staff.

Hirsh (2003) commented that effective communication, increased involvement, and support at home are essential to ensuring a student's success (p. 3). Renyi (1996) reported in a National Education Association Foundation for Improvement in Education that parents are the teacher's most important partners and advocated using technology as a tool for this work of binding schools and families (p. 3). No Child Left Behind (2001) mandates that parents of Title I students serve on parent groups such as Site Councils, and are part of the decision-making process in the school.

Lingman (1995) reported on a parent study group in an elementary school in California who were concerned about the 5th grade transition to middle school. This helped build a "collective dialogue" and was structured around a parent facilitator (p. 55). The group identified key questions and concerns, and print resources were provided. At the end of the process, parents said they valued open dialogue with the staff and the principal, and that they felt like "partners in learning" (p. 56).

Saunders (1998) reviewed another California school program where the school principal created a learning community that includes the surrounding neighborhood. Saunders defined a seven-step process to accomplish this: (a) to create a shared vision based on research-based ideas; (b) to develop specific outcomes to provide structure; (c) to design a thinking curriculum based on community's agreed on student outcomes and this included listening to support
groups for a racially diverse student population; (d) to let constituents accept fiscal and governance responsibilities; (e) to use continual assessment on protocols and the annual action plan; (f) to provide on-going professional development that enhances teachers' abilities to improve academic achievement; and (g) to nurture a culture that includes all constituents and recognizes their role in the change process. Finally, Saunders described parent focus groups, open meetings, and technology that includes parents through email and a web page. Daresh (1991) and Schlecty (2001) agreed that the behavior of effective leaders is to secure support from the community and higher administration for school improvement efforts.

Summary

Elmore (2002) noted that learning communities that prioritize student achievement, put professional development as their central focus, and promote teacher ownership of their own professional development, have practicing, committed principals as instructional leaders. Andrews and Lewis (2003) and Blasé and Kirby (2000) agreed that to sustain professional development, district leaders and building principals should have current substantive knowledge about effective teaching and new developments in curriculum and instruction. Clair and Adger (1999) noted that district and school leadership must make student, teacher, and organizational learning a priority. Little (1993) cautioned against putting the full responsibility for implementing education reforms on teachers.
Corcoran (1986) concluded that effective schools that supported professional development which led to student achievement, had strong leadership, sound management, clear goals, efficient allocations of resources, effective use of time, few disruptions or distractions from their instructional mission, high levels of staff commitment, and high levels of cooperation.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction and Review of the Study

Joyce and Showers (1995) and Fullan (1998) noted that principals who collaborate on professional development with their staffs reported that such collaboration impacts teacher reflection and student achievement. McEvoy (1987) came to the conclusion that effective principals stimulate and reinforce teachers' professional development (p. 73). The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) (2001) has formulated twelve components on which the standards necessary to guide successful professional development are based. The Council has formed these standards and ethics from research on good practice in professional development to improve school leadership, teaching and student achievement. These are organized under three main areas, context, process and content. These areas form the foundation for this study.

The first area was a context where the framework of professional development improves the learning of all students by:

1. organizing adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district (Learning Communities)
2. requiring skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement (Leadership)

3. requiring resources to support adult learning and collaboration (Resources)

The second area is process standards for professional development which improves the learning of all students by:

4. use of disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement (Data-Driven)

5. use of multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact (Evaluation)

6. preparing educators to apply research to decision making (Research-Based)

7. use of learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal (Design)

8. applying knowledge about human learning and change (Learning)

9. providing educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate (Collaboration)

The third area is content standards where research based subject matter improves the learning of all students by:

10. preparing educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement (Equity)

11. deepening educators’ content knowledge, providing them with
research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and preparing them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately (Quality Teaching)

12. providing educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately (Family Involvement)

This study was designed to collect information on how school principals promoted and supported professional development in their schools and to determine the principal's perception of professional development. Principals may not have the complete knowledge they need to engage their staff in professional development. In addition, this study enumerated (a) the concepts underlying quality professional staff development; (b) a principal's practices related to professional development; (c) the extent to which professional development is perceived by conducting a national survey of top principals for the purpose of improving teacher and student learning; and (d) when it is put into practice, the way professional development is used by teachers to increase their knowledge and skills in order to help improve student achievement. If these standards are to be used in national classrooms, what principals and teachers know about professional development is important and this assessment is needed for school professional development practices and reform.

Purpose of the Study

This purpose of this study was to described principals' and teachers' understanding of recommended professional development practice as defined by
The National Staff Development Council (2001). In addition, this study described teachers' and principals' perceptions of practices in their schools.

Research Questions

The study was guided by attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How did principals perceive their own behaviors and activities relative to the best practices of professional development (NDSC, 2001)?

2. How did teachers perceive their administrator's behavior and activities relative to professional development?

3. To what extent did principals base the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards (2001)?

Research Design

Data for this descriptive study were collected through surveys and self-report instruments. Gay and Airasian (2000) defined surveys as a collection of data from selected individuals in a single time period, stand-alone study. Self-report research collects standardized, quantifiable information from the population (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). They further noted that the objectivity of the survey, and the basic descriptive information of the characteristics of its subjects, aids the understanding of a subject.
Biemer and Lyberg (2003) stated that one time surveys can measure population characteristics, behaviors and attitudes (p.16), and identified survey research as a way to obtain the attributes of a larger population from a smaller group of individuals. Creswell (1994) noted other advantages included economy of design and a rapid turnaround in data collection (p. 119). Based on the large geographical area and a relatively large population, a questionnaire will be the best instrument.

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) agreed that descriptive research is a non-experimental research design providing valuable data and concerned with the current or past status of something. It may describe achievement, attitudes, behaviors, or other characteristics of a group. It asks what is or what was. There is no manipulation of independent variables. Creswell (1994) defined descriptive research as a qualitative design where the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding, rather than outcome. This is gained through the collection of words or pictures (p.145). McMillan and Wergin (2002) added that the sample and instrumentation are keys to understanding the results (p. 13).

This survey research employed mailed questionnaires and interviews to determine the perceptions of principals and teachers on the subject of professional development. Gay and Airasian (2000) declared that as a self-reporting instrument, the mailed questionnaire requires less time, is less expensive, is confidential, is easier to score on most items, has standardized items and procedures, and permits collection from a larger sample. However, they further noted that one of the drawbacks of survey research is its time
consuming nature if the respondents are many and geographically scattered. Also, other disadvantages are that its response rate might be small, it cannot probe or explain items, and there is the possibility of response sets.

However, Hopkins (1980) found that in descriptive research, with a study of conditions, there could be a study of relationships, present practices, attitudes, and trends that seem to be developing. Hopkins further noted that although opinion survey samples may be fewer in number, they lead to inferences about a population.

To strengthen this research, a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods enumerated by Creswell (1994), were used. In combining the methods of quantitative (mailed questionnaires) and qualitative (telephone interviews), Creswell (1994) and Greene, Carocelli, and Graham (1989) agreed on the term triangulation for this combined methodology. Creswell further noted that as "between methods", triangulation assumes that bias inherent in particular data sources, investigator and method is "...neutralized when used in conjunction with other data sources, investigators and methods" (p. 174).

Creswell (1994) discussed the advantages of using both qualitative and quantitative methodology. These advantages were to have a better understanding of the concept being tested or explored; to consider integrating the paradigms at several phases of the research process; and to use a two-phase design.

Using triangulation, these qualitative and quantitative paradigms check the validity of findings and eliminate biases that might result from relying exclusively
on any one data-collection method or source (Creswell, 1994; Gall et al., 2003). Creswell (1994) and Greene, Cracelli, and Graham (1989) specified other reasons to use multiple methods, which included (a) an overlapping or an emergence of different facets; (b) a sequential development, where the first method helps inform the second method; (c) an initiation, where contradictions emerge; and (d) an expansion, where mixed methods add scope to the study.

Population

The population for this national study was 100 K-12 principals, two from each of the 50 states, who had been named as Principal of The Year for 2004 of their state as a result of their affiliation with The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) or the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). In addition, three teachers selected by each principal from their building staff, a total of 300 teachers, were asked to complete a teacher's questionnaire.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

A three person graduate student team project participated in the design of the survey and collection of the data. According to Gall et al. (2003), the advantage to a team is that they can participate in a larger study and each member of the team brings their own perspective to the process (p. 44). Framing their own research questions in separate research and design, the team collected the data in a project survey collectively written (Gall et al.). The structural base provided
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by the National Staff Development Council Standards provided a framework for
the literature review and set up existing categories.

The team refined 300 questions for the Instructional Leadership Inventory
(ILI) to determine the best language and format for the survey. The survey is 4
pages, and begins with 10 demographic questions which was used to
disaggregate data according to years taught, years at present school or, for
administrators, years in present position, gender, age range, grade level of
school, location of school, number of students in school, and the district student
population. The resulting survey questions were narrowed down to 84 multiple
choice questions with 4 stems, and 12 open-ended questions.

The protocol for the ILI was submitted to The University of Nevada, Las
Vegas Office for the Protection of Research Subject and contained an Informed
Consent with a protocol cover page listing the investigators, faculty advisor,
duration, funding, subject data, procedures and signatures. A CITI Course in The
Protection of Human Research Subjects was taken through the University of
Nevada, Las Vegas, in Learner Group 2 for Social/Behavioral Research
Investigators and Key personnel. Sixteen modules were completed and the
course was passed on October 17, 2004.

Subsequently, the researchers examined the data base to answer the
research questions and presented their findings in three individual dissertations.
Data was collected from a mailed survey questionnaire to 100 secondary and
elementary school principals identified as Principals of the Year 2004 by the
National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National
Association of Elementary School Principals, and teachers randomly chosen in each of the 100 schools (for a total of 300 teachers); and through follow-up telephone interviews.

The ILI included thirty-nine forced response questions on the survey were developed based on the NSDC Standards (2001). Appendix I presents a matrix which categorized questions according to the twelve NSDC Standards. The Likert scale forces respondents to indicate their perception as to the extent a behavior was practiced or the extent of knowledge about professional development research and best practices on a scale of 1 to 5. The numeric scale enabled the researcher to use a systematic method for recording the frequency and central tendencies of responses.

Creswell (1994) spoke of the protocol or form for recording information. The Instructional Leadership Inventory included ten demographic questions for principals and nine demographic questions for teachers which provided information about the time, place, and subjects' backgrounds, and included position, years taught, years in position, gender, age range, highest educational degree, location of school, number of students, and student population. Johnson (1980) indicated that the demographic data, helps the study by providing a complete picture of the population examined (p. 298).

An interview protocol was designed for conducting interviews which followed the survey. Interview questions included key research questions, probes to follow key questions, transition messages for the interviewer, space to record the interviewer's comments, and space to record reflective notes (Johnson, 1980).

87
Creswell (1994) indicated that the interview data should be coded into categories, themes, and patterns which will emerge. He also urged comparing these patterns with the literature.

In order to establish content validity, experts from the field of instructional supervision, Dr. Sally Zepeda, University of Georgia, and Dr. George Pawlas, University of Central Florida examined the questionnaire for its accuracy of the information, its match to reality, and to provide feedback.

Gall et al. (2003) and Creswell (1998) gave the option of piloting a questionnaire before using it in a study. Borg and Gall (1989) asserted that piloting a questionnaire allows the researcher to analyze responses of a small sample of subjects before starting the main study. Results from the pilot can then be used to refine the questionnaire and locate potential problems such as leading questions, using psychologically threatening questions, checking if the subjects did the subjects have the information requested, and assessing what percentage of the questions were answered. Hopkins (1980) stated that pilot studies are also useful to establish face validity and to improve question, format, and scales.

Hopkins further stated that a pilot study should be used to "check how well design procedures are articulated and to identify any areas where logic and mechanical detail need additional attention" (p. 182).

This survey was piloted at a public high school (grades 9-12); a public middle school (grades 9-12); and a public elementary school (grades K-5). The piloting was done using the following steps: (a) informally contacting the principal to explaining the purpose of the study, and (b) providing a packet including a cover
letter with instructions, a comment sheet for suggestions, one principal
questionnaire, and three teacher questionnaires to those principals who indicated
a willingness to participate. Each questionnaire included an extra sheet where
respondents could place comments aimed to improve ease of administration,
format, scaling, and eliminate vague questions (Creswell, 1994; Miller 2002;
Johnson, 1980)

McMillan and Wergin (1997) urged that survey questions be adopted from the
literature search and be checked for clarity, double-barreled questions, and
competency of the respondents to answer the questions. Also, McMillan and
Wergin noted, check for relevancy, simplicity, biased items or negative terms (p.
253-54). The authors further directed that principal and teacher questions should
be parallel in order to accurately compare principals’ and teachers’ perceptions.

Miller and Salkind (2002) shared practical directions for questionnaires to:
(a) keep data to what is needed; (b) keep language appropriate to the level of the
respondent; (c) use common words that have meaning; (d) avoid long questions;
(e) not assume a priori that respondents possess factual information or firsthand
opinions; (f) establish a frame of reference that is specific; (g) think of all possible
alternative answers; (h) protect the respondents ego; (i) decide whether
questions should be direct, indirect, or an indirect followed by a direct; (j) avoid
ambiguous words; (k) avoid biased or leading questions; (l) phrase questions so
that they are not objectionable; and (m) decide whether second person ‘you’
should be used for a more personal approach.
The survey instrument used in this study is what Gorard (2001) classified as self-administered. It was designed and revised by a dissertation study team which consisted of three graduate researchers working in collaboration for a period of two years. This instrument has proceeded from the instructional leadership research literature review in Chapter 2 on supervision and professional development practice. It was structured and coded according to the 12 standards from the National Staff Development Council (2001).

Within the body of the mailed Instructional Leadership Inventory was 84 questions proceeding from stems. Respondents chose one of five responses from a Likert type scale. Creswell (1994) noted that the reporting of percentages and means are adequate analytical methods, and the use of computed means from Likert-type responses are the most useful to researchers. Using the same Likert scale for each questionnaire item will allow for the computation of means for each item. Means will easily illustrate agreements and disagreements among respondents.

Fink and Rosecoff (1998) stated that the respondent can indicate personal agreement or disagreement while weighting the response by marking a point on an ordered response scale. In the survey no branching or skip questions will be used. Miller and Elkin (2002) and Creswell (1994) suggested the researcher organize the questionnaire with a minimum of open-ended questions. Rea and Parker (1997) agreed that some degree of data standardization on open-ended questions means a subjective and time-consuming categorization by the
researcher. Furthermore, reliability checks are important [on both types of designs] in a survey (Rea & Parker, 1997, p. 40).

Gorard (2001) illuminated the fact that simple scales on an open-ended format mean the respondent is the main source of measurement error, but open ended questions with post hoc classification of the results adds another layer of measurement error due to the researcher (p. 93). Gorard went on to say that open-ended questions are best when it is clear how the responses will be analyzed or where the responses will not be used to create a statistical pattern, but instead, to help explain it. Gorard added that it is probably advisable to mix the types of questions in any survey. The terms should be as neutral as possible; familiar, but not patronizing. Reasons not covered by a list could be put in an additional section. He reminded the researcher that the answers to all open-ended questions may not have equal weight.

Miller and Salkind (2002) noted that survey researchers should send reminder cards and re-mail surveys to non-respondents. The type of mailing may matter; for certified mailed surveys the response rate was nearly double said Miller and Salkind. Gorard (2001) added that cover letters which provide information on the value of the survey's salience should increase response rates.

Data Analysis

As surveys were returned, responses were entered into SPSS for later descriptive analysis. The open-ended questions were recorded for input on a
simple spreadsheet (e.g. Excel) for categorization by themes emerging from the data (McCormack & Hill, 1997).

McMillan and Wergin (2002), Fink and Kosecoff (1998), and Cates (1985) stated that descriptive research that is quantitative describes the phenomenon with statistics that show counts or frequencies; proportions or percentages; measures of central tendency or the mean, median, and mode; and averages and measure of variability, such as the range and standard deviation. Percentages are computed and displayed that indicate the number of respondents who marked a particular category in relationship to the total number of respondents.

Continuous data checks were done to ensure accuracy of data entry and data analysis. Data displays were visibly inspected for input errors. After waiting a period of time, the analysis results were checked, recalculated, and re-examined (Fink & Kosecoff, 1998; Gall et al., 2003). Each respondent was assigned an identification code in the pre-collection stage to protect privacy and to identify the respondent easily. Creswell (1994) suggested that names should not be used, but letters be assigned to each respondent (p. 146).

The researcher in her data analysis examined data for themes, or patterns which emerged. The data was discussed in terms of the National Staff Development Council Standards (2001).
Summary

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996, 2003) and national government guidelines for the Reauthorization of ESEA, Title I, No Child Left Behind (2001) set the stage for reinventing and mandating district standards on professional development. According to government research, teacher education and professional development programs was to be organized around standards for students and teachers. Lashway (1999) stated that new school accountability puts the focus on the school rather than the district as a unit of improvement, and the use of continuous improvement strategies rather than a one-time fix. Lashway further noted that school district officials must provide policy and a planning framework as well as resources for professional development and school improvement.

Principals are a vital part in the professional development of their schools (Sagor, 2000). Lashway (1999) indicated that principals must see themselves as "learning leaders" (p. 28-31). Learning becomes collaborative in a community structure that is continuous and supports collective inquiry. Lieberman (1995) told us that the change from "teaching to learning is significant because it implies that teacher develop opportunities must become integral to the restructuring of schools" (p. 592).

The National Staff Development Council (2001) has led the way for this study by setting standards to improve the learning of all students. It is based on a context of learning communities, leadership, and resources. Next, there are process standards which use disaggregated student data, evaluative tools for
teachers, research based curriculum change, appropriate strategies, and knowledge about human learning. Finally, the professional development standards also include equity, quality teaching, and family involvement.

Professional development that follows these standards needs the services of a present, involved principal (McLaughlin, 1991). Therefore, what the principals know about professional development is important and leads to the next question. According to their own insight and the observation of their teachers, are principals practicing what they know about professional development to improve instruction and student achievement? After this assessment by principals and teachers of the practice of principals in the professional development process, educators may be able to figure out the best way to apply the standards to individual school learning and change (Schlechty, 2002, p. 60).
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The research is clear that effective professional development needs to be an on-going, embedded process, coming out of what teachers are doing in classrooms. Professional development should not be a one-time process or sporadic attempts to remediate (Daresh, 2001; McLaughlin, 1991; Sparks, 2002). The demands on school districts from Public Law 107-110, Title I, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, 2001) call for professional development as a requirement for receiving Federal funding. This professional development must be supported by scientifically based research.

This study was guided by three research questions:

1. How did principals perceive their own behaviors and activities relative to professional development?

2. How did teachers perceive administrators' behavior and actions relative to professional development?

3. To what extent did principals base the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards (NSDC, 2001)?
The NSDC Standards are based on three areas: context, process, and content. Context refers to (a) learning communities, where a collaborative work culture or climate exists (Calhoun, 2002; Evans, 1996; Schlechty, 2002); (b) leadership, from school teachers, principals, or district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement (Fullan, 1993; Little, 1993; McLaughlin, 1991); and (c) resources which, for the purposes of this study, are defined by time and money (Zimmerman and May, 2003).

Process is defined as being (d) data-driven, analyzing student data to develop common outcomes (Dufour, 2002); (e) evaluative, which is formative and summative (Guskey, 1998); (f) research-based, where evidence is educationally significant and has external validity (Ross, 2002); (g) designs and strategies, where the school structure supports student and adult learning (Sparks, 2002); (h) learning, where skills and problem solving are continuously facilitated for adults within the school (Smythe, 1991; York-Barr, Sommers, Ghere, and Montie, 2001); and (i) collaboration, where the principal nurtures cooperative learning for teachers (Dufour and Berkey, 1995; Joyce and Showers, 1995). The content of professional development includes (j) equity, which helps teachers understand the cognitive, multicultural, and social/emotional differences in students to provide differentiated learning (Kaufman, 1997); (k) quality teaching, where teachers are encouraged to increase their content knowledge, explore best practices, and develop new teaching approaches (Corcoran, 1995; Kaufman, 1997; Sykes, 1983); and (l) family involvement, where school partnerships are developed with families and the community for student success (Hirsch, 2003).
The Council developed these standards and ethics from the identification of good practices, with the intent to improve the quality of school leadership, teaching and student learning (National Staff Development Council Code of Ethics, 2004).

Research Methodology

This study utilized a Likert-type questionnaire with 10 demographic questions, 84 Likert-type scale items, and 11 open-ended questions. (See Appendix I, Principal Survey and Appendix II, Teacher Survey). Questions related to professional development were designed and based upon the 12 NSDC standards. Refer to the matrix in the appendix (see Appendix III, Question Matrix) for the breakdown within the three areas of the 39 cross-referenced items. In addition to the questions, 3 telephone interviews, approximately 20 minutes in length, were conducted with principal and teacher volunteers who indicated a willingness to participate. This combination of data, or triangulation, from the mailed questionnaires and the telephone interviews was employed to provide more reliable data (Creswell, 1994; Greene, Carocelli, and Granham, 1989).

Population

The population for this national study was 100 K-12 principals, representing public elementary and secondary schools within the United States. Each participant was a recipient of the “2004 Principal of the Year Award” from The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) or the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). The schools were located
in rural, suburban, and urban areas throughout the country. In addition, the participants included three teachers selected from the building staff by each participating principal to participate in the teacher survey.

Questionnaire

The 100 principals who received the “2004 Principal of the Year Award” each received a questionnaire packet. The 100 principals were comprised of 50 secondary school principals and 50 elementary principals. The questionnaire packet mailed to the 100 principals included an introduction letter, one principal questionnaire, three teacher questionnaires, and stamped, addressed return envelopes for each participant. The principals were asked to complete a principal questionnaire and distribute the teacher questionnaires to any three teachers in the school. The first mailing resulted in 53 school packets returned, for an initial return rate of 53%. Forty-five principals and 2 other administrators totaling 47, responded, with an initial return rate of 47%; and 94 teachers responded for an initial return rate of 31.3%.

To increase the return rate, a reminder postcard was sent after the first mailing to those principals and their selected teachers who had not responded to the first mailing. In addition, a second packet was sent to those principals. The packets again contained a principal questionnaire; teacher questionnaires; stamped, addressed return envelopes for each participant; and a reminder letter for each participant to complete the enclosed questionnaire and send his/her responses to the researchers.
The second mailing brought responses from 12 more schools, for a total of 65 schools, increasing the total return rate for schools to 65%. There were responses from nine more principals and 43 more teachers to the second mailing, bringing the total return rate to 56 administrators (54 principals) and 137 teachers. The total return rate was increased to 56% for administrators (54% for principals) and 45.6% for teachers. According to the pilot responses, the time the questionnaire took to complete was 10-15 minutes for each respondent. Item responses for each question ranged from (1) Not at all to (5) To a great extent. The respondents were instructed to choose the number (1-5) that described their perceptions for each item. The results reflected all 56 administrators that responded to the questionnaire. The two respondents that identified themselves as an "Assistant principal" and "other administrator" were included.

Teacher and Principal Interviews

Teacher and principal interviews were conducted 6 months after receiving the returns of the questionnaire packets. A total of 25.9% percent (14/54) of principals and 13% (18/137) of teachers indicated on their completed questionnaire that they would volunteer for a telephone interview. Three principals and three teachers were randomly selected from those lists of volunteers.

On the questionnaire sent to each participant, the participants were asked to provide a number and a time most convenient for a telephone interview. A semi-structured interview was used consisting of 6 questions that revolved around the
three research questions (See Appendix V). Each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes and was tape recorded and transcribed with the knowledge and permission of each participant.

The results of both the mailed questionnaire and the telephone interview data are enumerated below.

Description of Teachers and Administrators

Administrator respondents were asked a total of 10 demographic questions and teacher respondents were asked a total of 9 demographic questions to identify the population under study. The respondents supplied information about the following: (a) the title of their current position, (b) the number of years in their current position, (c) the number of years at their current school, (d) teaching experience, (e) gender, (f) range of age, (g) level of education, (h) type of school, (i) location, (j) school population, and (k) district population. Demographic information was collected to illustrate in more detail the examined population.

Of the 137 teachers, 136 responded to the question on gender; 81.8% were females (112/136) and 17.5% were males (24/136). Of the 56 administrators who answered the question on gender, 57.1% (32/56) were females and 42.9% (24/56) were males.

Of 137 teachers, 135 responded to their level of education. The degrees earned varied from 32.8% (45/135) with a bachelor's degree, 62% (85/135) with a master's degree, 2.2% (2/135) with an educational specialist's degree, and 1.5% (2/135) with a doctoral degree. In contrast, 0% of 52 principals reported...
only a bachelors degree, 53.7% (29/52) had a master's degree, 22.2% (12/52) had an educational specialist degree, and 20.4% (11/52) had a doctoral degree.

Of the 136 teacher respondents to years taught, 6.6% (9/136) taught 1-3 years, 19.7% (27/136) taught 4-6 years, 10.2% (14/136) taught 7-10 years, 22.6% (31/136) taught 10-15 years, 19.0% (26/136) taught 16-25 years, 12.4% (17/136) taught 26-30 years, and 8.8% (12/136) taught 30+ years. Of 131 respondents reporting, the years at their current school varied from one year to thirty two. The total years teachers taught at their current school was a median of seven years and the mean was 9.46. In comparison, the years taught by administrators were 8.5% (5/56) for 1-3 years, 21.4% (12/56) for 4-6 years, 19.6% (11/56) for 7-10 years, 17.9 (10/56) for 10-15 years, 25% (14/56) for 16-25 years, 1.8% (1/56) for 26-30 years, and 5.4% (3/56) for 30+ years. The administrators' years in their current position ranged from 0.42 years to 38 years. Of those 56 reporting, 96% (54/56) were principals, 1.8% (1/56) was an assistant principal, and 1.8% (1/56) was listed as "other" administrator.
Table 2

Years of Experience and Degrees Earned: All Teachers and All Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Teachers and Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td>1-6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Teachers (N = 136*)</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*missing data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Principals (N = 56)</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees Earned</strong></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Teachers (N = 135*)</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*missing data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Principals (N = 54*)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*missing data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, for purposes of reporting, the criteria for the two types of schools in the data were taken from the description of elementary and secondary schools as given by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). For the purpose of this study an elementary school consisted of any combination of grades 1-6, including elementary schools of K-5, K-6, or any other combination.

A secondary school consisted of any combination of grades 6-12, including middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools of K-6 or K-8. While
grades 1-6, including elementary schools of K-5, K-6, or any other combination, a secondary school consisted of any combination of grades 6-12, including middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools of K-6 or K-8. While the Instructional Leadership Inventory asked those surveyed to circle Elementary School, Junior High School/Middle School, and High School, and they did, one school was described as a 2-12 school by its principal and was considered as a secondary school based on the description of the NASSP and the reply given by the school's principal in the demographic reporting portion of the survey.

Findings

The Context of Professional Development

Principals' Perceptions

The National Staff Development Standards area, Context, refers to (a) learning communities, (b) leadership, and (c) resources. Ten questions on the ILI asked teachers and principals their perceptions related to the Context of professional development in their schools. Items 2, 18, and 38 specifically asked questions related to the use of learning communities as a vehicle for professional development. Items 5, 8, 25, and 29 posed questions relative to the development of leadership in the schools; and items 12, 43, and 47 inquired about the resources available for professional development.

In the results of principals' responses related to context (see Appendix C), a high mean score indicated that the principals agreed or strongly agreed with that survey item.
The majority of principals reported that they practiced some behaviors associated with the concept of using learning communities as a vehicle for professional development (items 2, 18, 38). The vast majority of principals (n=55) 92.5% reported archiving the school's major decisions to some or a great extent and 87.5% indicated that teachers met to discuss instructional practices to some or a great extent. However, of the principals, less than half, 47.3% indicated that they collaborated with university faculty to some or a great extent.

Regarding the items associated with Leadership (items 5, 8, 25, 29) principals overwhelmingly reported that they supported (behaviors) associated with developing teacher leadership. In terms of resources (items 12, 43) the vast majority of principals, 98.2%, reported that their school's professional development was financially supported. In addition, 98% of principals indicated that they utilized resources from their professional development organizations.

Furthermore, principals were asked to report the number of days that were allotted to professional development activities in a school year. Responses ranged from 1.5 - 18 days a year. Thirty-seven per cent of principals reported their teachers received professional development from 1.5 - 4 days a year. 40% of principals reported that their teacher's received professional development 5 - 9 days per year. Twenty-two percent of principals reported that their teachers received professional development from 10 - 18 days a year. In interviews, principals were asked to clarify what their resources were. One principal said, "We use a portion of our building money and set it aside for professional development costs. There would be some central office money that would come
to help us fund it as well.” He added, “We have an internal foundation for our
district. They have a grant writing process; and we’ve done some grant writing to
them. But we don’t do much external grant writing.”

Teachers’ and Principals’ Perceptions

The results of principals and teachers responses related to context for
research question two (see Appendix D), were reported for the three areas under
context: (a) learning communities, (b) leadership and (c) resources. All principals
and all teachers were divided into two separate groups so the results could be
compared between teachers’ and principals’ perceptions.

In every response for the learning communities results summary on a t-test
(p<.05) except one, there were no significant differences. The only significant
difference for learning communities was whether principals archived the school’s
major decisions so there was continuity in professional development (item 38).
Ninety-four percent of all principals (n=55) (with a mean of 4.30) agreed to some
or a great extent that they archived the school’s major decisions and plans,
however, only 73.7% of all teachers (n=137) (with a mean of 4.30) concurred that
their principals did archive materials. The majority of teachers reported that their
principals practiced some behaviors associated with learning communities. Both
principals and teachers concurred that they did not collaborate with university
faculty for professional development (item 2); this included 47.3% of all principals
(with a mean score of 3.00) and 51.5% of all teachers (with a mean score of
2.93) who agreed to some or a great extent.
The Leadership Results Summary which compared all principals and all teachers had no significant differences; however, the subgroups for leadership informed us that the greatest difference was in whether teachers were any part of the planning that impacted teaching and learning (item 8). All elementary principals (with a mean of 3.95) said teachers were a part of planning, while only 86.4% of all elementary teachers (with a mean of 4.64) said this was true. Almost ninety-seven percent of secondary principals (n=33) (with a mean of 4.56) reported that teachers were involved in planning to some or a great extent, while less than 90% of secondary teachers (n=76) (with a mean of 4.43), indicated that this was true.

The last comparison for Research Question 2, Context, was in Resources. Table 3 summarizes the two questions (items 12 and 13) for all principals and all teachers. No significant differences were reported in whether their schools were supported financially (item 12).

There was a significant difference on the question of using information from their professional organization as a resource when making decisions regarding instruction. Ninety-seven per cent of all principals (n=56) (with a mean of 4.48) said they did use such information compared to 64.7% of all teachers (n=136) (with a mean of 3.65) who said they used this resource when making decisions about instruction. Both elementary and secondary subgroup results supported this significant difference.

Principals generally agreed on the ILI that their schools were well supported financially. The open-ended question (item 89) demonstrated that resources
included rewarding teachers for participation in professional development activities. Sixty-four principals reported on how they rewarded teacher participation for professional development in their schools. Over two-thirds of the principals, 42, rewarded their teachers extrinsically, with money, time or recognition. Of the remaining principals, there were no external rewards for teacher professional development participation.

Teacher Interviewee 1 said, "Our principal writes grants. We do have some covered by the district, but most of the professional development we've done, the big type of stuff is all money that he has gone and found." She also commented about time, "We have full days where we do that kind of thing and then we have half days once a month." Teacher interviewee 2 stated that the district takes "...care of the time ... and the money that we need. In the last year or two we got a grant writer hired through the foundation. If there is a big school grant, teachers work on that too. We've done that a couple of times where people get together and do the writing of it."

The Process of Professional Development

Principals' Perceptions

The second area of the National Staff Development Standards (2001), process, refers to professional development being (d) data driven, (e) evaluative, (f) research-based, with effective (d) design and strategies, focused on (h) adult learning and (i) collaboration. Twenty-one questions on the ILI asked teachers and principals their perceptions related to the process of professional development.
development in their schools. Items 2 and 17 specifically asked questions related to the practice of using data to formulate professional development in their schools. Items 24, 31, and 33 inquired about evaluation in professional development. Items 20, 36, 42, and 44 posed questions relative to the input of research on professional development. Items 14, 21, 26 and 35 focused on design as professional development in their schools. Items 3, 28, 32, and 41 queried about learning which took place. Items 4, 6, 10, and 13 asked how collaboration was practiced in their school's professional development.

The table (see Appendix E) shows the results of principals' responses related to process. The majority of principals, 94%, responded to some extent or great extent on both of the questionnaire items indicated that data driven professional development was practiced in their schools. The highest response (n=56) was whether standards drive instruction at their schools (item 17) with a total of 100% (with a mean of 4.80) in agreement that this took place. The other high percentage was on the question asked of principals (n=55) as to whether they utilized data to plan professional development in their schools (item 27) and 94.5% of the principals responded that they agreed to some or a great extent this was true. A principal interviewee explained, "In the spring we take all of our standardized data, we decide what emerges from that and then we decide our goals based on that."

Regarding evaluation, over 80% of all principals to some or a great extent on two of the items (items 31 and 46) indicated that professional development is emphasized in their evaluations. In contrast, only 57.2% of principals (n=56)
agreed to some or a great extent that teachers in their school observed other teachers and provided feedback (item 33). Over seventy-eight percent of principals (n=55) indicated that they never or slightly used outside agencies when evaluating professional development (item 24).

During interviews, principals were asked how much of their evaluation time with teachers related to professional development: One principal answered that their professional growth model and their professional development model were integrated in the past year and building goals needed to be integrated into individual career development plans. He also said there was the expectation that his teachers' professional growth was tied to student achievement.

The majority of principals reported they practiced some behaviors associated with the concept of research based professional development in their schools. All principals reported that to some or a great extent they used information from current research on effective instruction when making decisions regarding instruction (item 44) and 92.7% indicated to some or a great extent that their teachers' professional skills improved when they read and used current professional articles and practices. However, the percentage in agreement dropped significantly to 64.4% on the question of whether they used their graduate education when making decisions regarding instruction (item 42). Furthermore, the agreement dropped to 61.8% on whether their teachers met to discuss research articles in order to improve instructional practices (item 20). One principal declared that his school was "using the research based strategies based on Marzano."
The majority of principals agreed that they practiced behaviors associated with effective designs and strategies (items 14, 21, 26, 35). On two of the four items for designs and strategies for professional development, there was agreement at 100% to some or a great extent among principals (n=55) that their schools objectives and practices aligned with district objectives and practices (item 14) and their professional development activities were related to their school's goals (item 26). The next highest percentage at 85.7% (n=56) was on the question of whether teachers in their school set their own professional development goals and activities (item 35) and, to a lesser extent, 82.2% of the principals questioned stated that their school used written objectives for professional development (item 21). During interviews, one principal stated that they focused on aligning teaching practices and learning so it was all tied together.

The majority of principals agreed on three of the four items related to adult learning (items 3, 28, 32, 41). All principals (n=55) reported to some or a great extent that teachers in their school were a part of the implementation of new strategies/techniques that affected teaching and learning (item 28). To a lesser extent, 91% (n=55) responded highly positive to the question of whether new teachers are mentored each year (item 32), and 87.5% of principals (n=56) were in agreement that those at their site who planned professional development provided feedback to other faculty members. However, less than half of the principals (40%) indicated to some or a great extent that they receive information
from their undergraduate education that helped them as a resource when they made decisions regarding instruction (item 41).

One principal stated in his interview about their adult learning process, "Once we get some training on the portion of Marzano that we’re working on, they do lessons on it and then write reflections on those lessons and then we all get together and get into our smaller facilitator groups and talk to one another and provide a feedback loop amongst our colleagues.”

The vast majority of principals (94.5%) reported that they were practicing behaviors to some extent or great extent on three of the four questionnaire items relating to collaboration. The highest response, 98.2%, was principals (n=56) who said their teachers grew professionally when they engaged in dialogue with other teachers (item 13) and the next highest response was at 96.4% of principals (n=55) who stated that they participated in planning professional development (item 10). Also, 94.5% of principals (n=54) declared that mentoring was used in their schools (item 4). To a lesser extent, 87.3% of all principals (n=55) agreed strongly that the professional development in their schools included input from all disciplines and/or grade levels (item 6). All results of principals' reports on their own behaviors for Process are shown in Appendix E.

Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions

Table 8 (See Appendix F) shows the results of principals’ and teachers’ responses related to process for research question two. In the responses for the
six areas under Process there were significant differences. Significant differences between teachers and principals were found in data driven (items #17); evaluation (items #24 and #46); research based (item #44); designs and strategies (items #14 and #26); and adult learning (items #28 and #41).

Regarding two items related to professional development as Data Driven, there was a significant difference between teachers and principals on whether standards drove the instruction at their school. Eighty-four per cent of all principals (n=56) (with a mean score of 4.80) agreed that standards drove instruction at their school (item 17), while 68.9% of all teachers (n=135) (with a mean score of 4.30) responded that standards drove instruction. Both principals and teachers concurred that their school utilized data to plan their professional development activities (item 27). 94.5% of all principals (n=55) (with a mean score of 4.72) and 91.2% of all teachers (n=137) (with a mean score of 4.50) agreed to some or a great extent.

In items related to evaluation, there were significant differences between teachers’ and principals’ responses for two out of four questions. The first was whether schools used outside agencies to evaluate professional development (item 24). The majority of principals and teachers declared that their schools did not use outside agencies to evaluate professional development, with 78.2% (with a mean of 1.89) of all principals (n=55) acknowledging that they never or only slightly used outside agencies; 48.2% (with a mean of 2.55) of all teachers (n=137) acknowledged that their schools never or slightly used outside agencies to evaluate professional development. Another significant difference was whether
principals used teacher participation in professional development to judge teacher effectiveness (item 46). 80.3% (with a mean of 3.89) of all principals (n=56) said they did judge teacher effectiveness based on teacher participation to some or a great extent as opposed to 67.2% (with a mean of 3.56) of teachers (n=137) who said their effectiveness was not judged on their participation in professional development.

In the area of Research, there was a significant difference on one item regarding the use of information from current research on effective instruction when making decisions in instruction (item 44). Overwhelmingly, 100% of principals (n=55) (with a mean of 4.80) agreed to some or a great extent that they used current research when making instructional decisions, however, 88.9% of all teachers (n=136) agreed they used research when making their instructional decisions.

Two of the four questions (items 2, 14, 26 and 35) answered by all principals and all teachers had significant differences in the area of designs and strategies. Ninety two percent (with a mean of 4.93) of all principals (n=55) declared that their school’s objectives and practices were aligned with district objectives and practices (item 14) to a great extent, while only 79.4% (with a mean of 4.74) of all teachers (n=136) agreed their school’s objectives and practices were aligned. The next significant difference was on whether professional development activities were related to a school’s goals (item 26). Eighty-five per cent (with a mean of 4.07) of all principals (n=56) compared to less than 63% of all teachers indicated that their school’s professional
development activities were related to its goals. The table in Appendix F summarizes these results.

Item 28 showed significant differences in the area of Adult Learning. Seventy-six per cent of all principals (n=55) perceived that their teachers were a part of implementing new strategies that affected teaching and learning, but only 65% of all teachers (n=137) agreed to a great extent that they were a part of implementing new strategies. The second significant difference was whether information from their undergraduate education was a resource when making decisions regarding instruction (item 41). Less than 40% of all principals (n=55) (with a mean of 2.78) said to some or a great extent that they used their undergraduate education when making decisions regarding instruction, however, more than 53% of all teachers (n=136) (with a mean of 3.99) agreed their undergraduate education was a resource to make decisions regarding instruction.

Regarding collaboration, over 98.4% of all principals (n=55) agreed to some or a great extent that they participated in planning professional development, however, teachers (n=136) disagreed at 88.2% to some or a great extent that their principals practiced this behavior.

The Content of Professional Development

Principals Perceptions

The National Staff Development Standards area, Content, refers to (j) equity, (k) teacher quality and (l) family involvement. Eight questions on the ILI asked
teachers and principals for their perceptions related to the category of Content. Items 7, 30, and 34 directly asked questions related to equity; items 16, 22, and 40 posed questions concerning teacher quality; and items 11 and 19 inquired about Family Involvement.

In the area of content, principals' responses showed (see Appendix G) that the majority, 87%, of the principals agreed that they were practicing equity in their school's professional development to some extent or great extent on all three of the questionnaire items relating to equity in their schools. The highest response (n= 55) concerned decision making in professional development based on the influences of outside entities (item 30) with the majority, 90.9% (with a mean of 4.36), in agreement that they did. The next highest percentage was on the question of whether all principals (n=55) discussed individual professional development when conferencing with teachers (item 7) and 89.3% (with a mean of 4.32) of the principals responded that they agree to some or a great extent this was true. The third highest response was whether professional development activities addressed their school's particular climate and culture and 87.0% (with a mean of 4.24) perceived that this was true to some or a great extent.

In open ended questions, equity was addressed by some principals in the answer to what strengths they would identify in their own teacher/principal preparation program. One principal identified the strength in his program as "culture shaping" and another as "building a school culture that's positive." Teachers identified strengths in their teacher preparation programs as making "connections to the community", and "heterogeneous grouping." Teachers were
more specific about weaknesses in their teacher preparation programs as a lack of "diversity of teachers," "teachers working in isolation," "cultural diversity," and a lack of "instruction ...for varied student groups."

Principals were also in agreement to some extent or a great extent on the three questionnaire items relating to the NSDC standard 11 for teacher quality in their schools. 100% of all principals (n=55) said their teachers felt safe to try new approaches in their classrooms (item 22). Over 90% of all principals (n=55) said their past teaching practice was a resource when making decisions about instruction (item 40), however, only 71.4% agreed that their teachers used peer coaching (item 16). Table 6 below summarizes the results.

The final standard for content, family involvement, showed agreement among principals on item #11 where a total of 93.9% of all principals (n=56) (with a mean of 4.39) agreed to some or a great extent that they made decisions regarding instruction based on the influences of outside entities. However, on item #19 only 42.9% (n=56) with a mean of 2.85) reported that they encouraged parents and community members to participate in their professional development activities.

In the interviews, principal #1 responded with, "We do not have our parents as part of our professional development planning. When the issue was probed further, he said "We also have a district wide school improvement team that’s from the community and they help us with some of that goal work and...we talk to them about what our plan is...they help us, but don’t do the formal planning at...the building level."
Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions

Table 10 (see Appendix G) shows the results of principals and teachers responses related to content for research question two. For the three areas of content: (j) equity, (k) teacher quality and (l) family involvement, all principals and all teachers were divided into two separate groups so the results could be compared between teachers' and principals' perceptions.

In every response for the equity results summary on a t-test, there were no significant differences. Principals and teachers generally agreed to some or a great extent on the questionnaire. The highest area of agreement was on item 30 in which 90.9% of principals (55) and 86% of teachers reported that they did make their decisions based on outside entities; that their professional development activities addressed their school's climate and culture; and that they discussed professional development during conferencing.

The next area under content, teacher quality, had only one significant difference in the three questions (items 16, 22 and 40) between all principals and all teachers. Only 45.5% of all principals (n=55) reported that they used their teaching experiences to a great extent as a resource when making decisions regarding instruction, while 77.2% of all teachers (n=136) perceived they used their teaching experiences to a great extent. The third area under content, family involvement, had no significant differences in the two questions for all principals and all teachers. Principals and teachers agreed that their parents and community members had none or a slight encouragement to participate in professional development activities.
In the interviews, teacher #1 responded to a question of how much time parents spend on professional development activities with "Boy, I don't have any idea. We have a community council once a month, but we have lots of committees with parents that help, so I just have no idea." When probed further as to whether any outside individuals took part or led professional development, she said, "They tried to, but not heavily. We try to have partnerships in the community and have other people representing groups or banks and private companies who get involved sometimes, but not heavily in professional development because most of them are at work."

Teacher #2 responded to the same question about parent participation with "Yeah, depends on what it is. Like the block scheduling... that was a big one. There were parents involved in that too. They made visitations with us; they sat in on our discussion and planning." He further elaborated, "But anything major and big in our district, [we have] a parent organization where you run things through them. Sometimes they don't have a clue what you are talking about. Other times they may have some very strong feelings about things and you want to know what those are before you get too far down the road." He went on, "...if we...undertake a task and there are some people who do something similar in the business community, sure, you're smart if you invite them in and say here's what we're going to do, what do you think? We have a college...that's a good resource for people and ideas."

Principal (P1 and P2) appeared to agree that their primary concern was student achievement. They acknowledged that they were responsive to
outside entities, and that all professional development was directly related to No Child left Behind and student assessments. Teachers (T 1 and T 2) felt strong responsibility for professional development in their school and other issues relating to professional development standards, except for resources. They did not feel responsible nor concerned with finding resources, that it was the principal's job to do this and their principals did seem to produce the funding and time to use for professional development activities. Both principals and teachers said that they did not include parents in professional development.

Summary

Principals were aware of standard based professional development research and, with a few exceptions, their responses showed that they promoted these practices and research based professional development. There were some responses, however, that showed that even with some awareness, they were not practicing all of the standards in their school sites.

Teachers' perception of administrative behavior in professional development was sometimes different than that of the administrator. Teachers often agreed with their principals on whether professional development standards were practiced in their schools, but they did not always agree to the extent that principals did. There were almost no significant differences when breaking down teachers and principals into elementary and secondary subgroups. Both teachers' and principals' responses indicated that the professional development
being practiced in school sites examined are, for the most part, not always based on the research or the National Staff Development Standards (NSDC, 2001).
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe principals' and teachers' knowledge and understanding of recommended professional development practices as defined by The National Staff Development Council (2001). In addition, the study described teachers' and principals' perceptions of professional development practices in their schools.

This study examined the practices of principals for professional development activities in their schools by concentrating on the three categories which organize the twelve professional development standards outlined by the National Staff Development Council (2001). The standards describe how professional development should be practiced in schools and districts. Context refers to (a) learning communities, where a school's personnel work while collaboratively learning; (b) leadership, by which all the participants, teachers and principals, who work for student achievement; and (c) resources, which include time and money. Process is defined as being (d) data-driven, which is used to analyze and reflects standards based teaching; (e) evaluation which includes professional development as part of the evaluative process; a continual process
that analyzes student data to develop common outcomes; (f) research-based, where evidence is educationally significant and replicable; (g) designs and strategies, where school leaders create structures to facilitate student and adult learning (Sparks, 2002); (h) adult learning, where experience matures into self-direction and immediate application (Knowles, 1970); and (i) collaboration, where the teachers network and the paradigm shifts from isolation to teamwork that establishes goals (Joyce & Showers, 1995; Schmoker, 1996; Smylie & Conyers, 1995). The content of professional development includes (j) equity, which helps teachers understand cognitive, multicultural, and social/emotional differences in students to provide differentiated learning (Kaufman, 1997); (k) quality teaching, where teachers are encouraged to increase their content knowledge, explore best practices, and develop new teaching approaches (Corcoran, 1995; Kaufman, 1997; Sykes, 1983); and (l) family involvement, where school partnerships are developed with families and the community for student success (Hirsch, 2003). The Council developed these standards and ethics from the identification of good practices, with the intent to improve the quality of school leadership, teaching and student learning (National Staff Development Council Code of Ethics, 2004).

The purpose of this study was to answer three questions:

1. How did principals perceive their own behaviors and activities relative to professional development (NSDC, 2001)?

2. How did teachers perceive their administrator's behavior and actions relative to professional development?
3. To what extent did principals base the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards (2001)?

Discussion of Findings

The results showed that principals agreed with many of the questions based on the twelve NSDC Standards (2001) which served as the framework of this study. The ILI addressed each standard through two or more questions. Participants were knowledgeable of research based professional development standards; however, principals surveyed did not always show they consistently understood or practiced these research based practices. There were discrepancies between the perceptions and actual practice of principals, and between principals and teachers about research-based professional development practices. Subgroups examined between elementary principals and secondary principals, elementary principals and elementary teachers, and secondary principals and secondary teachers had almost no discrepancies that did not emerge between the comparisons of all principals and all teachers.

Principals' Perceptions

The first research question that guided this study was how did principals perceive their own behaviors and activities relative to professional development? Barth (1990) stated that principals had the greatest influence on the professional development of teachers.
Principals in this study responded that they encouraged professional
development within learning communities for their teachers. For example, in
reporting their practice of learning communities, over 85% of all principals stated
they encouraged learning communities by giving teachers in their school the
opportunity to meet and discuss instructional practices in their classroom; that
mentoring was used; that professional development involved input from all
disciplines and grade levels; that their teachers grew professionally when they
dialogued with other teachers; that they archived their school’s major decisions
and plans so there was continuity in their professional development; that
teachers’ skills improved when they read and used professional articles; and that
their professional development activities reflected the school’s climate and
culture.

However, it was revealed through principals’ self-reporting that the
collaboration and climate for learning communities was not always practiced and
lacked external resources and networking. They reported that their school sites
did not collaborate with university resources, and only sometimes involved
outside agencies in evaluating their professional development. Furthermore
teachers were not meeting to discuss research, only sometimes used peer
coaching, nor were parents and the community participating in professional
development activities.

Within the area of leadership principals generally agreed that they
encouraged teachers to take leadership roles in professional development
planning, goal setting and improving instruction. Fullan (1993) stated that the
principal should extend leadership and create the capacity “for every teacher to become a leader (p. 101).” Ninety-six percent of all principals said their teachers took responsibility for improving instruction and 98% said teachers were a part of planning that impacted teaching and learning. However, in contrast, they self-reported a noticeable lack of participation in the planning of leadership development for teachers, and that their teachers were not setting their own professional development goals and activities.

Little (1982) defined evaluation as a tool of professional development. In regard to whether principals joined professional development with evaluation, over 80% of principals surveyed said their professional development was emphasized in their evaluation instrument; that they used teacher participation in professional development activities to judge teacher effectiveness; and that feedback was provided by professional development planners. However, only one half of the principals reported that teachers in their school observed other teachers and provided feedback. Finally, even though all principals said they used current research on effective instruction, there was a low value placed by principals’ on their undergraduate and graduate education as a resource.

Teachers' Perceptions

Research question two asked how teachers perceived administrators’ behavior and actions relative to professional development practices. Teachers did not always agree with principals who were surveyed using the ILI on the same questions. Teachers' perceptions of the principals' performance on the
questions relating to the NSDC (2001) twelve standards of professional development were sometimes at variance with principals’ perceptions.

Of the twelve research-based NSDC Professional Development Standards (2001) that contained items on the survey, all Standards showed significant differences on one or more questions between principals and teachers except leadership, equity, and family involvement.

Teachers in this study agreed with their principals that within their learning communities that they met to discuss instructional practices; that there was little or no collaboration with universities for professional development; that they did not meet to discuss instructional practices in their classroom; and that their skills improved when they read research articles. There was agreement by teachers that they did not set their own professional development goals and activities, nor did they collaborate with parents or the community on their professional development.

Apparently, principals are not collaborating within learning communities as much as they think they are. Principals overwhelmingly stated that they participated in planning professional development, but only slightly over half of the teachers reported that this is happening to a great extent. The percentage rises when to some extent is added, but there is still a significant difference. Also, teachers reported that they used current research as a resource to a lesser degree than principals reported. Teachers reported a lack of new teacher mentoring. Also, they differed on whether principals archived the school’s major decisions and plans. This may be because teachers had little knowledge about
what principals were doing to archive records. Differences emerged on data related standards where the majority of all principals reported standards did drive instruction to a great extent compared to teachers who disagreed significantly. One reason teachers may not feel as strongly that standards were driving instruction as principals did may be due to a lack of professional development regarding standards based instruction. The context of their schools’ learning communities did not exhibit continuity between objectives and goals and practice. Teachers differed with principals as to whether their school objectives aligned with district objectives and whether their professional development activities related to their schools’ goals.

Teachers were not aware that they were judged by their principals for their effectiveness by their participation in professional development activities, and although 80% percent of all principals reported that they did so, only 67.2% of all teachers reported this as true.

Principals agreed to a great extent that they used information from their professional organizations as a resource, but teachers disagreed that their professional teaching organizations were a valuable resource. Perhaps this is because principals’ professional organizations are sharing pertinent information on curriculum and leadership, whereas it also begs the question as to how much teachers are reading professional literature. Teachers responded that they valued their graduate education as a resource more than principals and definitely valued their past teaching experience as a resource more than principals.
Standards Based Professional Development

The purpose of research question three was to examine to what extent principals based the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards (NSDC, 2001) areas of content, process and context. In summarizing the reporting by principals and teachers on the I LI differences or agreement with the Standards based items, several areas stand out, particularly when cross-categorizing questions under the standards.

Almost across all areas principals are basing their professional development activities and practices on the standards. While principals and teachers report meeting within their learning communities to discuss instructional practices in their schools, they are not meeting to discuss research. Teachers and principals disagree that principals are part of collaboratively planning professional development. Also, principals are not archiving materials for continuity, nor are they utilizing university resources.

While all disciplines/grades within schools and teachers reported engaging in dialogue with other teachers to help them grow professionally and those planning professional development are providing feedback, there is no external feedback. Schools are not using outside agencies to evaluate their professional development. One of the components of a Title I, NCLB Schoolwide plan is to use an outside source to help develop the plan. Likewise, the NCLB, Title I School Improvement Process mandates the use of an outside source for assistance. While principals reported mentoring is used, teachers report that
teachers are not being mentored. Teachers further reported that they do not meet to discuss research.

As exemplified under the standard of leadership, teachers reported setting instructional goals, and being part of planning that impacted teaching and learning. Principals were planning leadership development for teachers, and teachers were taking responsibility for improving instruction. However, there were differences between perceptions and practice. For instance, teachers and principals agreed that teachers did not set their own professional goals and activities. The other differences included principals' perception that school objectives were aligned with district objectives to a great extent and professional development activities related to school goals, however teachers did not see it that way. Both principals and teachers agreed that teachers were not taking a leadership role in observing other teachers and providing feedback.

In the areas of evaluation and research, professional development is included as a part of an evaluation instrument, but teachers were not aware of the fact that it was included. While all agree that teachers' skills are improving when they read and use professional articles, teachers are not meeting to discuss research. Teachers disagree with principals that research is a valuable resource.

Finally, responses regarding the content standards indicate adherence in every area except Family and Community Involvement. While both teachers and principals agree that their decisions on instruction and professional development are on based on outside entities, their practice does not include parents nor community members within their professional development activities. Epstein's
(1997) framework of Six Types of Parent Involvement included parent decision-making as one type, and Hirsh (2003) saw effective involvement as ensuring a student's success at school. No Child Left Behind mandates that parents of Title I students are part of decision-making for professional development in schools. This federal mandate and research for parent inclusion were not consistently evident in principal responses with only 42.9% agreeing that they encouraged parents and community members to participate in their professional development activities. The lack of parental and community involvement was apparent in the participant interviews.

A lack of parental and community involvement also negatively impacts the practice of the equity standard. Researchers agree that professional development can be an essential agent for equity reform and a means to help teachers provide differentiated instruction and understand the cognitive, multicultural and social/emotional differences in students (Kaufman 1997; Little, 1993). The reporting of principals in this study agreed to a high degree at 87% that their professional development addressed their school's climate and culture. The question is raised then as to how equity fits into the reporting schools' systems of professional development (Kaufman, 1997) without inclusion of families and community.

Significance of the Study

This study described what principals were doing in their schools in professional development practices based on the twelve Standards of the
National Staff Development Council (2001). From this study, there has emerged some information that may prove practical in establishing learning in schools that is ongoing, embedded in teaching practice, and sustained (Daresh, 2001; Joyce and Showers, 1995; McLaughlin, 1991; Sparks, 2002). Change within educational systems will occur when teachers and stakeholders accept ownership of the change process (Fullan, 1998; Harris, 1998). This change can be consistent with the research and built around the three areas of the NSDC Standards of Context, Process and Content.

This study supported Lieberman's (1995) conclusion that professional development ignores the context where teachers work (p. 595). There were often gaps between this study's findings about professional development practices and recommended practices according to the NSDC professional development standards. Teachers perceived that their principals did not always practice standards based on the context of professional development. The structure of the learning communities reported reflected a lack of change process (Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) where activities were not based on school or district goals and outside resources such as research based articles, professional organization resources, peer mentoring, pre-service or graduate training, university collaboration, or past teaching experiences were either not used as a resource or were not valued as resources. Further, isolation from the larger context of the parents and community was reported by over half of the principals and teachers.

This study also found that is questionable whether or not professional development is a continuous process that is aligned to school goals. While
principals are the instructional leaders in the school, it cannot be presumed that they are the only resources for teachers. It appeared that teachers were not taking leadership roles as evidenced by their lack of setting goals for professional development; their lack of interaction with peers; and their lack of implementation of strategies that impact teaching and learning. Neither did teachers rely on their graduate education program or their professional organizations to provide them with leadership skills as evidenced by the value they placed on their graduate education and their professional organizations. On the other hand, while principals valued their graduate education about the same as teachers, they highly valued their professional organizations as a resource.

The context of learning communities needs the support system produced by more effective pre-service and graduate training from their universities to enhance professional development. However, schools must remain open and willing to collaborate with universities and outside resources to allow collective interaction. The fiscal resources to accomplish professional development should be an integral part of every site based school budget and the time to carry out professional development goals should be planned into every school calendar.

This research makes it clear that effective professional development needs the facilitating role of a present, involved principal who understands the research behind the NSDC Standards for Professional Development (2001). This principal is responsible for establishing a climate or culture based on a structure or context, where inquiry into teaching practices leads to student learning (McLaughlin, 1991; Willis, 2002). Practical activities which can be developed
include (a) linking teacher evaluations in the clinical evaluation process to teachers' professional development (Fullan and Steigelbauer, 1991); (b) coaching, observation, facilitating peer mentoring, archiving professional development, and managing resources (Arnold, Simms, and Wilbur, 1999; Blasé and Anderson, 1995); (c) recognizing achievement; (d) staff research collaboration; and (e) networking with and developing parent/community partnerships (Fullan 1998). Blasé and Kirby (2000) stated that effective principals assume that all teachers have room for professional growth, and principals need to provide them opportunities to learn from one another; however, they are also seeking external expertise for professional development (p.89).

Conclusions

This study found that principals did perceive their own behaviors as leading and practicing professional development in their schools. They are implementing effective professional development standards, with some exceptions, as verified by the perceptions of the teachers participating in this study.

Furthermore, this study found that although principals based their professional development on the National Staff Development Standards (NSDC, 2001), there was definite agreement between principals and teachers of known omissions to these practices and research based standards. Principals appear to agree with general principles of professional development, but when asked about specific practices their responses indicate a lack of implementation.
This study indicates that the knowledge base of teachers and principals on research based professional development is not as extensive as previously thought. The perceptions of what it takes to lead an effective professional development program and to professionally develop teachers' skills for student achievement often do not rely on research based practices that require little monetary or physical resources, such as nurturing learning communities, providing leadership opportunities, peer mentoring, strategizing, collaborating, ensuring equity, or promoting parent and community involvement.

Further Research Recommendations

As long as principals and teachers work together to raise student achievement, the research based NSDC professional development standards will be relevant. Further research is needed to assess the knowledge base of principals in the area of professional development. More research is needed to collect the longitudinal data and observations.

Furthermore, individual studies could be extended in one area of professional development, such as context, or further narrowed to one standard, such as resources. Defining the school types more clearly in terms of breaking down secondary into high school and middle schools could be done also. By studying these two groups separately, there may be significant differences between the two principals' groups.

In conclusion, this study recommends additional qualitative research to document the behaviors and activities of principals and teachers relative to their
professional development leadership. In addition, it is recommended that future researchers have a direct mailing to teachers instead of directing the principal to disseminate the questionnaire to the teachers. This may promote an even higher return rate as well as more honest responses.

Summary

This study asked how principals perceived their own behaviors and activities relative to professional development. It also questioned how teachers perceived administrators' behavior and actions relative to professional development. Finally, it asked to what extent did principals base the professional development activities and practices within their schools on the National Staff Development Standards (NSDC, 2001). While these standards set the baseline for professional development practices, it was found that not all practices reflect the standards and there were different perceptions between principals and teachers as to how these research based standards were practiced.

Current federal and subsequent state policies and funding are tied to the expectation that principals and teachers will have continual, sustained professional development to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Title I, NCLB. Title I Consolidated Plans, School Improvement Plans and Schoolwide planning all require research-based professional development goals. The NSDC Standards (2001) provide the basis to formulate a framework for on-going, sustainable professional development.
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