

1980

An investigation of staff development programs designed for Virginia school officials

Bob L. Sigmon

College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sigmon, Bob L., "An investigation of staff development programs designed for Virginia school officials" (1980). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. William & Mary. Paper 1539618462.
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-80ng-eb27>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8017905

SIGMON, BOBBY LEE

AN INVESTIGATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DESIGNED
FOR VIRGINIA SCHOOL OFFICIALS

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

ED.D.

1980

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

An Investigation of
Staff Development Programs
Designed for Virginia School Officials

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Bob L. Sigmon
January 1980


APPROVAL SHEET

We the undersigned do certify that we have read this
dissertation and that in our individual opinions
it is acceptable in both scope and quality as a
dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Accepted Spring, 1980

 Robert Maidment, Ed.D.,
Chairman

Robert Maidment, Ed.D.,
Chairman


Royce W. Chesser, M.Ed.

Royce W. Chesser, M.Ed.


John W. Sykes, M.Ed.

John W. Sykes, M.Ed.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to Dick, Gus, and Joyce in token payment for their patience and understanding while it was being prepared.

Acknowledgments

Sincere gratitude is extended to those professors at The College of William and Mary who assisted me through my program of studies. A special debt of gratitude is due my advisor, Dr. Robert Maidment, who guided me through this project. His support and constructive criticism will be remembered.

One's co-workers always make a contribution to the professional endeavors of an educator. Members of the Department of Elementary Education are no exception. Their understanding and support have been greatly appreciated. Dr. Elmer Gish has been most helpful. His advice, patience, and professional support have been invaluable.

To my sisters I owe a special debt. Their encouragement and appreciation of my efforts have been continuing reminders of my past and have caused me to struggle when quitting appeared to be the easier solution.

Table of Contents

	Page
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	vii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Justification and Need	4
Purpose of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Organization of the Study	11
2. Review of Related Literature	12
Summary	28
3. Design of the Study	31
Subjects	31
Instrumentation	31
General Plan for the Study	32
Treatment of the Data	33
4. Presentation and Analysis of the Data	34
Summary	74

	Page
5. Summary of Findings, Observations, and Implications for Further Study	77
Summary	77
Observations	86
Implications	96
Appendix	99
References	100
Vita	
Abstract	

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Number of Reporting School Divisions by Size Categories With Staff Development Programs	35
2. Number of Administrators and Supervisors Employed	36
3. Administrators and Supervisors Participating in District-run Programs	37
4. Administrators and Supervisors Participating in University or College-based Programs	38
5. Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Programs Run by Professional Organizations	39
6. Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Programs Run by Commercial Firms or Private Consultants	41
7. Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Staff Development Programs During the 1977-78 School Year	44

Table	Page
8. Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Staff Development Programs During 1978-79 School Year	45
9. Length of Experience With Staff Development Programs for Administrators and Supervisors	46
10. Programs Offered to Administrators in Particular Job Categories	47
11. Programs That Carry Salary or Academic Credit	48
12. Types of Staff Development Programs Offered During the 1977-78 and 1978-79 School Years	49
13. Number of Days Devoted to Staff Development for Administrators and Supervisors	52
14. Instructional Techniques or Program Organization Used in Staff Development Programs	53
15. Participating Colleges and Universities	56

Table	Page
16. Persons Responsible for Planning Staff Development for Administrators and Supervisors	58
17. Approximate Total Expenditures for Staff Development Programs for Administrators and Supervisors	59
18. School District Funding of Staff Development Programs	61
19. State Funding of Staff Development Programs	62
20. Federal Funding of Staff Development Programs	62
21. Foundation Funding of Staff Development Programs	63
22. Participating Administrators and Supervisors Personal Expense	63
23. School System Funding of College and University-based Staff Development Programs for Administrators and Supervisors	65
24. Season of Year for Staff Development Programs for Administrators and Supervisors	66

Table	Page
25. Time of Day When Staff Development Programs Are Offered	67
26. Methods of Evaluating Staff Development Programs	68
27. School Systems With Intern Programs	69
28. Persons Eligible to Participate in Intern Programs	70
29. Number of Years With Intern Programs	70
30. Intern Preference for Permanent Positions	72
31. Comparison of Educational Research Survey and Virginia Survey	88

An Investigation of

Staff Development Programs

Designed for

Virginia School Officials

Chapter 1

Introduction

The society which the public schools serve is changing with such rapidity that educators are often in a quandary in designing appropriate responses. With every major change there is a shift in public policy which has implications for most educators.

The role of the educational administrator and supervisor in responding to redirection includes the total spectrum of change in the schools, administrative and procedural, curricular, extracurricular, guidance, regulatory, discipline, and other aspects. The impetus for change within an educational setting stems from legal actions outside the school system, from the central office, from teachers and students, from parents, and from community pressure groups. With many constituencies becoming more vocal, pressures upon those responsible for administering and supervising educational programs are increased and the task of operating an effective and efficient school system is becoming more difficult (Small, 1974).

Homsam views the need for staff development programs for educational administrators and supervisors as universal because those who have to deal with these complexities

are too often inadequately prepared for their responsibilities. In times of rapid change, the advantage of experience tends to be lost and the need for continuous learning and relearning becomes increasingly apparent (Homsam, 1966).

Willis correctly predicted that most of the administrative posts in American education for the next 10 or 15 years at least will be held by persons who have completed their formal programs of education and who must learn in a variety of ways to cope with the problems they now face (Willis, 1962). He further stated that while the pre-service preparation for future school administrators is vital, the in-service, or continuing education of those persons now holding responsible administrative positions is of even greater significance. This point has been reiterated by Wolfe (1965) and Merrow (1974). It appears to be an uncontested premise that ongoing staff development programs are essential in public education.

Continuing staff development programs and training are necessary if educational administrators and supervisors are to meet the growing challenges of their profession. An increasing number of school districts currently offer staff development programs designed specifically for their administrative and supervisory staffs (Robinson, 1974). According to Pharis (1968) staff development can help the

administrator and supervisor remain an "open person--one who continues to receive, interpret, and evaluate new information or reconstruct old information into new and meaningful patterns of response."

Staff development programs that are needed to keep educational administrators and supervisors abreast of current challenges and to prepare for future ones require substantial resources in time, money, personnel, and materials. Homsam (1966) suggests that 10 to 20 percent of an administrator's time should be devoted to staff development. Goldhammer (1966) points out the growing need for sabbatical leaves which provide the busy administrator with the time for study and contemplation. Lutz and Ferrante (1972) recommend that educational institutions should follow the lead of American business in spending greater amounts on staff development programs. They state that American corporations now allocate approximately ten times more for staff development than their educational counterparts. Funds for staff development too often receive low priority in a school district's budget. Such funds should be viewed as a valuable investment in the quality of education (American Association of School Administrators, 1963).

Regardless of the nature or quality of pre-service training, school systems without a staff development

program might well lack that vital component necessary to cope with the pressing needs generated by rapid societal changes.

Justification and Need

Continued professional growth for school administrators and supervisors is often an assumed need by those closest to the education profession. New knowledge of the learning process, group dynamics and administrative behavior, and the ever changing industrial, political, and social character of our society suggest that the acquisition of the knowledge necessary to become and continue to be an effective educational leader is a lifelone endeavor. As stated by Mason and Rhode (1972), "the education or training of any professional does not cease once he receives his diploma. This education or training must be continuing."

As a society makes new demands on the school administrator, staff development programs become more and more significant in providing opportunities for professional growth. Very often staff development for school administrators is a low priority item because people should be "qualified" before they are employed in an administrative or supervisory position. Frymier (1972) states that in-service programs of many school districts across the country are tangential, lacking in continuity, impersonal,

and meager in every way.

Staff development is the career counterpart of pre-service education. It provides for change, renewal, and professional competence. One purpose of staff development is to seek an affirmative response to the changing social and political scene and to criticism that professionals are inadequate, and that educational institutions represent lag rather than progress (Edmonds, Ogleetree, and Wear, 1966).

Those responsible for staff development bear the brunt for continuity in program quality, for responsiveness to educational needs, and for the opportunity for individuals to engage in renewal. These programs focus on professional growth rather than upon credentialing. They assume a need for change and renewal (Gardner, 1963). The emphasis is upon those attitudes, competencies, and knowledge that enhance learning and professional adequacy (Henry, 1957).

The best catalyst for staff development is a relevant, need-oriented, well-conceived, and organized program. These programs must be based upon community, school, and personal needs (Quander, 1979).

The Commission on In-service Education for School Administrators has pointed out that school administrators themselves have not had sufficient opportunity to raise

their own sights. Despite the valiant efforts on the part of those to whom the leadership of the schools of the nation have been entrusted, it has too often been a case of the blind leading the blind (1963). Frymier states that many school officials feel that they have the necessary expertise within the system to cope with problems at hand (1972).

It was perceptively observed by Moore (1957) that most of the jobs in school administration for the next ten years will most certainly be held by those persons who are now in those jobs. The likelihood of many people leaving the principalship is not very great (Olivero, 1979). For this reason alone, efforts to strengthen the administrative and supervisory staff should receive top priority if schools are to meet societal demands.

School administrators frequently cling to procedures that are obsolete. According to Finnegan (1972), reasons for this lack of change are:

1. Administrators often become so involved in the mechanics of school operation, they overlook the primary goal--the maximum learning of each student in their school.
2. Traditional content and traditional approaches to education are firmly entrenched beliefs that are difficult to change.
3. Educators fear that community criticism will grow

if changes are made.

4. The path of least resistance is easier to follow.

5. Educators lack the skill and knowledge of how to effect improvements.

6. The responsibility of decision-making has not been clearly delineated or is vaguely left to someone else--usually no one.

7. Educators are indifferent to or ignorant of the findings of educational research.

8. Educators fear failure when experimenting with new ideas.

Progress depends on overcoming these powerful barriers, which can only be accomplished by effecting change in educators.

Because there has been a greater emphasis placed on public education by society, it is increasingly important that school administrators and supervisors become thoroughly familiar with those concepts and practices which will contribute to their effectiveness as educational leaders (Wolfe, 1965). This fact has been summed up by Merrow (1974) when he states:

Rarely does professional training actually prepare people for the job; they learn that on the job itself. . . . The school administrator who recognizes the inadequacy of his training invariably looks for

better training.

Gappert (1979), speaking at a national workshop on school administrator training held by the Office of HEW's Assistant Secretary for Education, emphasized this need for better training when he stated:

Since training for principals continues to focus, for the most part, on the tasks and functions necessary for maintaining schools, principals are now in need for training that will equip them with the intellectual and human relations skills necessary to manage improvement effort in their schools.

According to a survey of school officials conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (1978), the respondents, all practicing administrators, felt a need for training in:

1. community involvement and taxpayer support
2. energy management
3. budget management and school finance
4. program evaluation
5. education law
6. staff evaluation
7. implementing state and federal programs
8. curriculum development

A well-developed staff development program based upon these expressed needs might be one means of strengthening

the skills required of educational administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to conduct a survey of each school division in the Commonwealth of Virginia to determine the types of staff development programs being offered to educational administrators and supervisors, the amount of time and money devoted to such programs, the variety of techniques used in the programs, colleges, universities, and consultants utilized, methods of evaluation of local efforts, and the source of responsibility for planning and directing administrator and supervisory staff development programs at the local school district level. Through the analysis of these data, it might be possible to draw conclusions as to the emphasis being placed on staff development for educational administrators and supervisors in the state of Virginia and to make some recommendations based on the findings and conclusions.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Staff Development

Staff development is defined as those continuing educational activities of professional school personnel for which the local school district plans, coordinates,

and/or provides full or partial funding. Courses and other programs that are completely independent of district direction or financial support are not included nor are sabbatical leaves.

Educational Administrator

An educational administrator is defined as any educational officer, other than a school board member, responsible for the management or direction of some part of an educational establishment or system (Good, 1945).

Educational Supervisor

Educational supervisors are those persons who deal primarily with the achievement of the appropriate selected expectations of educational service (Eye and Netzer, 1965).

Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations can be anticipated with any questionnaire approach. In this study there is a possibility that questions may be answered without a full understanding of their meaning. The terms educational administrator and supervisor have differing connotations in school divisions in the state; therefore, reporting of data may vary. The interest, motivation, and willingness of the respondents will also affect the findings. The writer is responsible for staff development for certain school officials; his personal bias might have an effect

on data interpretation. Because the study is limited to Virginia, the applicability of the findings and conclusions may also be limited to that area.

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study is organized into four succeeding chapters as follows. A review of the literature relevant to this study is presented in Chapter Two. Chapter Three contains the design of the study. The analysis of the data is presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five contains the findings, observations, and summary of the study.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The purpose of this chapter was to present a review of the literature as it related to the need for staff development for school officials.

The past twenty years have been ones of pervasive and continuous turmoil at all educational levels. Parents at the elementary level have pressed for change while at the secondary level both parents and students have demanded redirection. Teaching staffs have also become involved--some advocating change while others opposing anything that is not consistent with past practices and procedures. Typically, at the center of contradiction has been the school leader, whether he/she be the principal, central office administrator, or the superintendent.

The main reasons for these frustrating conditions are well known. One is the imposition of federal and state standards requiring public schools to provide equal opportunity to all students. Another is the frustration of the unemployed who blame their plight on the failure of the school system to prepare them for the world of work. Yet, another cause which is sometimes also a consequence has been the loosening of moral valves leading to an experimentation with social relationships to seek new life-styles that are viable (Creamer and Feld, 1972).

According to McDonald (1977), schools are viewed as middle-class, white institutions. Schools are accused of being single-class, single-race oriented institutions that load the dice against lower social-class and minority children. The school systems are looked upon as self-serving bureaucracies--we have displaced goals; instead of getting down to achieving our educational goals, we set other goals for ourselves with which we feel more comfortable. Those in the education profession feel that schools cannot really be blamed for anything since they merely reflect the same problems seen in all our social institutions; any criticism of the schools is a criticism of the total society. Finally McDonald states that we are tools of the military-industrial system.

These devastating criticisms leveled at the American school for the past two decades have not as yet been convincingly converted to positive action. Although not all the criticism directed against the American school has been responsible, such criticism does underscore the need for some fundamental introspection of school practices (Ward, 1977).

One apparent positive outcome of this criticism surrounding public education has been the renewed interest of the lay public. Gish and Saxe (1978) state:

Lay participation in educational planning and

policymaking is growing at the present time, and the need for such public attention to education is increasingly apparent. The problems of our youth, as manifested in deviant behavior patterns, demand solutions. Low academic achievement, violent and rebellious behavior, and general lack of purpose in youngsters are symptomatic of the inadequacy of the schools' solutions. Active collaboration among parents, students, teachers, administrators, and citizens appears to provide the greatest potential for improving the educational opportunities of youth.

As society becomes more complex and change is accelerated, school officials are facing new responsibilities which extend into areas not usually covered in traditional training programs. Today's school officials are faced with problems in managing more austere budgets, dealing with teacher organizations, implementing state and federal mandates, coping with violence and discipline, and other change-related areas. As a result of these expanded responsibilities, attention has focused on the need to improve and expand training opportunities so that school officials can be better prepared to deal with current school operations (Klopf, 1974). Those responsible for our educational institutions must become involved in a

systematic renewal program that will bring about change to meet specific purposes (Bellon and Jones, 1970). This fact was repeatedly emphasized in the literature (Comfort and Bowen, 1974; Goodlad, 1972; Martin, 1972; Mial, 1971; Miller, 1974; Ruben, 1972). In the words of Kimple (1970), "The only way to change schools is to change the perceptions and behaviors of administrators."

Where does this retraining of school administrators begin? Sarason (1971) is convinced that the most critical office for exercising leadership and instituting change is the school principalship. He argues that any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal. Any change will be diluted by principals whose past experiences and training, interfacing with certain personality factors, ill prepares them for the role of educational and intellectual leader. He further states that the principal is more closely related to the problem of change, whether in his own school or that intended for all schools in a system. Particularly in our urban centers where schools have become a battleground involving community groups, city, state and federal governments, teacher organizations, and student groups, the leader of the school would seem to be an appropriate starting point for retraining. When the focus for change is on a system, too often the question of how

any change is to be reflected in the classroom is bypassed. An effective staff development program should begin with the principal because any kind of system change puts him in the role of implementing the change in his school.

Other persons experienced in the operations of the public school system tend to place greater stress on the leadership role of the superintendent of schools. Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee (1965) conclude that the superintendent of schools, as the formally recognized leader, is the most visible, the most vulnerable, and potentially the most influential member of the organization. It will be chiefly at the level of goals and policy that the superintendent will give leadership to the staff. Usually, subordinates to the superintendent can extend and implement his leadership with the staff. If the superintendent is not aware of the system's shortcomings there is little likelihood that the missing leadership will be provided at other levels of the administrative hierarchy.

There is some empirical evidence in support of this position. Gross and Herriott (1965) found that the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) of the principal is related to the character and support and leadership exercised by the higher administrative officer who oversees the performance of the principals. These findings strongly

suggest that ways to bring about change in the public school system should focus on higher administrators as well as on their subordinates. Staff development for school officials must be all inclusive if desired changes are to be effected.

With the public demanding more efficiency, better productivity, and accountability in the schools, it might be appropriate to focus attention on staff development programs for practicing school officials. Those currently employed in leadership positions need rejuvenation. Too busy tending brush fires, they have had no time away from the job to learn about new methods, approaches, and ways of dealing with the educational problems that are continuously arising (Frymier, 1972).

According to Ellena and Redfern (1970), experience, research, and common sense indicate that a continuing program of staff development for educational leaders should be based on several assumptions about professionals. It is assumed that professionals: (a) have a vested interest in America's purpose, (b) are able to make decisions which result in instructional improvements, (c) know the "basics" for deployment of staff and pupils, (d) know what science and research present about characteristics of teachers and learners, (e) understand the role of the "public", (f) exercise efficiency in using

public funds, and (g) possess leadership abilities.

Additional competencies which educational leaders are assumed to possess are skills in oral and written communication, including good judgment; adaptability to change; diagnostic, planning, and evaluation skills; and an insatiable desire for continuous professional growth.

Culbertson, Henson, and Morrison (1974) state that a school system interested in designing staff development programs for administrators and supervisors is faced with four decisions. First, the scope of the staff development program must be determined. Topics of training must be agree upon as to coverage of concepts in one or more domains. The question then arises as to whether the program should be continuous covering all domains of the educational leader's responsibility. Finally, the question remains as to differentiation of staff development programs according to the interest and perceived needs of a select group.

An underlying theme of any staff development program is that those involved must view learning and acquisition of new competencies as a lifelong, ongoing process (Klopf, 1974). Planning for any staff development program should be undertaken cooperatively, with those persons to be affected by the staff development program involved in all

stages of the program (Harris, 1966; King, Hayes, & Newman, 1977). Research consistently has suggested that administrators tend to resent and reject any form of staff development that is planned for instead of with them (Pinkney, 1977).

The literature on staff development is vast and yet many common conclusions are reached. There is unanimous agreement that, (a) the current status of staff development is less than satisfactory, (b) hard research on staff development is meager, (c) broad-based conceptualizations are lacking, and (d) the very meaning of the terms staff development and in-service are problematic (Phi Delta Kappa, 1979).

The results of a national sample of 15,344 school districts (Goor, 1978) reveal that an estimated 70 percent of the nation's superintendents perceive a need for expanded or improved training opportunities for school officials. The topics of concern were community involvement and taxpayer support, energy management, budgetary matters, program evaluation, education law, staff evaluation, implementing state and federal programs, public relations, curriculum development, and issues involving teachers and non-certified personnel unions. The need for expanded training opportunities generally tended to increase as the enrollment size of the district increased.

Forty-three to 50 percent of those surveyed rated traditional training approaches inadequate while up to 28 percent indicated that major improvement was necessary.

The literature revealed varied approaches to staff development programs. Though differing in organizational structure, most programs are designed to strengthen the educational leader's knowledge and skills in the areas of management and human relations (Robinson, 1974; Bishop, 1976). A survey to determine the content of university sponsored activities for practicing educational leaders revealed these two areas as major topics (Martin, 1972).

A study by Steige (1977) found the following managerial needs rated highest by respondents: developing strategies, time management, programming, managing change, leadership behavior, measuring results, communicating, group dynamics, analyzing problems, motivating, and team building. Management and operating of programs and services were also expressed needs as cited by Curtis and others (1972) and Mangers (1979).

A specific managerial function, management by objectives, was an expected demand on educational leaders according to Crawford (1974). This issue was also presented by Drachler (1973) who stated that "any program should include the issue of management by objectives." As to the value of this topic, Koch (1977), reported that

a training program in management by objectives had a positive effect on participants' attitudes about their roles.

To strengthen management skills, attention has been directed to Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS); Management by Objectives (MBO); and Long-range Planning. PPBS is based on systems analysis theory (Granger, 1971), while MBO involves the identification of organizational objectives, the definition of individual responsibilities for goal achievement, and the use of agreed upon objectives as guides for managing the organization and evaluating performance (American Association of School Administrators, 1973; Spillman, 1977). Each of these approaches requires long-range planning so that future goals, alternative approaches, and evaluation procedures can be developed (Conrad, Brooks, Fisher, 1973).

The prevailing practice is for those involved in education to train others who are also involved in education. It has been suggested that administration should be studied without reference to the type of organization to be administered. Educational, business, and governmental administrators should be trained in the same programs. Administrators from different types of organizations need the same basic managerial skills. Using this approach, educational administrators could benefit from advances

made in business management training and practices (Miklos, 1972).

One of the most pervasive changes in staff development programs for educators has been toward theory-based content drawn from the social and behavioral sciences (Wynn, 1973). While there is a need for educational leaders to focus their attention on management skills, there is also the need to broaden their studies to include all areas of the social sciences (Ryan, Newman, & Johnson, 1978).

If the educational leader is to be an effective manager and perform in a style that will bring about positive change in the educational institutions, he/she must have a keen understanding of those human relations skills which allow for cooperative growth of those responsible for educational development of the young people in our society. Critical to the educational leaders' effectiveness is a realization that implementing change requires more than simply facilitating individual growth. Sometimes the system has to be changed and human relations becomes paramount if indeed behavioral changes are to occur (Comfort and Bowen, 1974).

With today's society demanding more participation in decisions affecting our schools, an awareness of group processes and interpersonal skills is of primary importance

for effective school leadership. There is a definite trend toward greater use and acceptance of collective bargaining by public employees. School boards and teacher organizations are seeking viable alternatives to strikes to bring about peaceful settlement of disputes (Peterson, Rosmiller, and Volz, 1978).

The societal problems of the disadvantaged and minority segments of the population are and have been receiving much attention in staff development programs. The implications of drug abuse, crime, and poverty in the inner cities are receiving attention, particularly from the urban administrators and supervisors. Desegregation of schools is still a major problem (Flemming, 1976, 1977, 1979; Forehand, 1976).

Effective supervision and administration require a variety of creative approaches if improvement in interpersonal skills is to become a reality. Thomas (1971) found that after a five-day laboratory on interpersonal relations, the participant's behavior did change, and those changes in behavior did affect the social-emotional climate of the schools. There was a notable improvement in the participant's effectiveness in group processes and in cooperative decision making. Ruben (1972) reports that after a 13-week workshop dealing with behavior modification and humanizing schools, rapport with others was improved

significantly on the Minnesota Teachers Attitude Inventory Test. Improved human relations and more open communication can be brought about through sensitivity training (Jerrems, 1971; Mial, 1971). While sensitivity training can bring about positive change, a one-shot laboratory experience might not be as effective (Lansky, Leonard, and others, 1969). A more effective means of bringing about a lasting change in behavior and an understanding and acceptance of others was the outcome of a program conducted at Indiana State University. This program was a six-week summer institute and 10 follow-up workshops for educational leaders to train them to deal effectively with students from culturally different backgrounds (1972).

The concept that job skills and behaviors can be changed through staff development was reported by Sanders (1975). Sergiovanni (1979) argues that "most leadership training programs oversimplify complex matters and emphasize style rather than substance." He further states that the hypothesis that leaders can change styles needs further investigation. Etzioni (1972) found that people have deep-seated preferences in their work behavior that are very difficult to change. Sexton and Switzer (1977) report that leadership styles are linked to personality and are very difficult to change. Another conclusion is presented by Fiedler (1964) who advocates changing job situations to

fit the leaders' style. Hunt (1978) advocates staff development programs designed on the basis of the administrator's leadership style. Dunn & Dunn (1977) report that faculty success is dependent on administrative style. Sergiovanni suggests that those persons responsible for staff development programs for educational administrators and supervisors would be wise to shift emphasis from leadership training to leadership exploration (1979).

The opportunity to enhance leadership ability and individual job skills is the basic principle upon which the National Academy for School Executives operates (1979). The Academy is dedicated to the continuing professional development of school officials. They plan and sponsor programs relevant to the ever changing demands on educational leaders. Their programs enrolled approximately 1,450 during 1979 in areas of management, improvement of personal skills, public relations, and others.

Prior to the establishment of any staff development program, those responsible must obtain the support, cooperation, and commitment of those who will be affected (Conrad, Brooks, and Fisher, 1973; Sanders, 1975). Educational leaders, like those for whom they are responsible, need direction (Davison, 1973). Davison offers the following proposals for planning staff development

sessions:

1. Plan the program with selected participants who can later function as a leadership cadre at the training sessions

2. Do not assume that educational leaders approach professional development activities with more positive mental sets than other school personnel

3. Program content should be designed to ensure balance and connectedness between needed philosophical understandings and their application to specific operational tasks

4. Design programs around those administrative and supervisory situations most crucial to the participants

5. Emphasize throughout the staff development program that the intent of training is to assist participants in their consideration on innovative administrative and supervisory practices

6. Include a full range of cognitive (knowledge-based) and affective (feeling) experiences in the training program to ensure that the behaviors required for necessary organizational and instructional change can be attained.

It is evident that staff development for educational administrators and supervisors might be an important factor in helping educational leaders meet the demands of a changing society. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, where

this study was conducted, a program of staff development is mandated for the five-year school improvement plan in each school division. Through action enacted by the Virginia General Assembly in 1976, staff development became a part of the standard requiring the development and annual revision of this plan (Shingleton, 1977).

Specifically, Standard 5C states:

Each school division shall provide a program for personnel development. This program shall be designed to help all personnel to become more proficient in performing their assigned responsibilities, including the identification of individuals with special instructional needs.

Currently in operation in the state are vehicles for providing such training for school administrators. Superintendents meet regularly in seven regional groups to study problems affecting public education. Personnel from the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, and Virginia Polytechnical Institute, act as advisors to these groups.

Each summer the University of Virginia offers a summer institute for division superintendents. The State Department of Public Instruction assists with this endeavor by offering tuition stipends for those persons who enroll.

With the exception of division superintendents, all certified school personnel are required to have his or her certificate renewed every five years. A minimum of six semester hours of course work is required for this renewal.

The vehicles for professional improvement exist. These might be improved to meet current demands of school officials.

Summary

Present society is in a state of change. Public accountability demands that this change be reflected in the public schools. In response, innovative approaches to staff development programs for school officials might be implemented.

There are differing views as to the proper point for beginning the retraining of educational administrators. The school principalship might be the focal point since this position is in most direct contact with the daily operation of the school. However, the leadership qualities of the superintendent might be viewed as the major focal point for retraining. Usually, subordinates to the superintendent can extend and implement his leadership with the staff.

Staff development programs are likely to be meaningful when the training is directed toward the individual's

performance goals rather than toward meeting the instructional improvement goals of the school district. In the determination of training topics, attention should be given to the many roles staff must perform. Participants should be actively involved as opposed to being in the more passive role of listener, observer, or reader.

Whatever direction is taken for staff development for practicing school officials, efforts of these administrators and supervisors must be focused on objectives that will allow them to meet public demands. Only once these objectives have been determined and strategies adopted can positive changes and improvements be made. Inherent must be the skills, the knowledge and experience, the frame of mind, and a team effort consistent and steady to follow through on adopted objectives which must be viewed as top priority.

The public has recommended redirection for the public schools. Staff development for those persons responsible for the operation of these schools is necessary if current problems are to be solved and changes effected.

According to the literature, staff development should assure higher levels of proficiency. Programs of high quality have shown positive results.

Based on this review of the literature, the following criteria are presented as worthy guidelines in the

development and evaluation of an effective staff development program for school officials:

1. Local governing bodies must assume funding responsibility for staff development programs.

2. Staff development programs should be based upon needs as determined by those school officials who will be effected--teachers, students, parents, and representatives of the lay public.

3. Planning for staff development programs should be long-range with one person responsible for coordinating all activities.

4. An open line of communication should exist between local school divisions, area colleges and universities, and local business and professional organizations.

5. Staff development programs should be evaluated and findings should be used as the basis for future planning.

Chapter 3

Design of the Study

The content analysis survey method of research was employed in this study to investigate the status of staff development for Virginia public school administrators and supervisors.

Subjects

The sample population for this study consisted of 134 school divisions in Virginia. While there are 141 legal school divisions in the state, seven of these divisions are city-county units and thus report jointly. The respondent was the superintendent of schools or a person whom he had designated as key instructional leader.

Of the 134 divisions surveyed, 122 or 91% responded to the questionnaire. Those divisions that did not respond represented all areas of the state in relationship to location and size.

Instrumentation

A 24-item questionnaire was used in this study. This questionnaire was a modification of a survey instrument developed by Dr. Glen Robinson, Executive Vice-President and Director of Educational Research

Services, Inc. (Appendix). This instrument was used in a 1974 study to determine the status of staff development for school officials nationally. The instrument was modified in two areas: where university and college courses were used, respondents were asked to name the college and/or university; and where consultants were used, respondents were asked to specify whether they were from Virginia or out of state.

The questionnaire was structured so that the following types of information could be obtained:

1. Demographic data
2. Program planning and management data
3. Program scope and sequence data
4. Program implementation data

Personal interviews were held with a random sample of persons in Virginia who are responsible for local staff development programs to validate the questionnaire.

General Plan for the Study

The following procedure was used in the implementation of this study:

1. Permission was obtained from Dr. Glen Robinson to use the questionnaire.
2. The questionnaire was mailed to 134 state school divisions in April 1979. A follow-up letter was mailed in June 1979 to those school divisions who had

not responded.

3. During the months of June and July, the data were coded, key punched, and analyzed.

Treatment of the Data

School divisions in the state were divided into four enrollment size categories: large (35,000 or more students), medium (10,000-34,999 students), small (2,500-9,999 students), and very small (less than 2,500 students). After key punching the information from the survey instruments, a computer program was written to generate frequency tables for each item. Responses were tabulated for each school system and each table was then analyzed in narrative form. Results of this study were compared with the criteria for effective staff development as presented in Chapter 2 and the highlights of the study completed in 1974 by Educational Research Service, Inc.

Chapter 4

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

The purpose of this chapter was to analyze and graphically display the data collected for this study. Tables related to the items on the survey instrument are presented. An analysis of information in each table is included.

In April 1979, a survey of staff development programs for school administrators and supervisors was sent to Virginia school systems. While there are 141 legal school divisions in the state, some of these divisions are funded as city-county units and report jointly; therefore, 134 units were surveyed. Out of 134 school systems surveyed, 122 responded representing 91% of the total. Of the 122 that returned the survey questionnaire, 79 school systems provide administrators and supervisors with staff development training. The remaining 43 systems which have no formal programs were mostly in small and very small size systems. Table 1 presents data on the distribution of respondents by size of school system as well as the number of systems in each size category offering staff development programs for administrators and supervisors.

Table 1
Number of Responding School Divisions by Size
Categories With Staff Development Programs

Size	Number Respondents	% of Total	Number with Programs	% of Totals
Large				
(35,000 or more)	3	2.45%	3	2.5%
Medium				
(10,000 to 34,999)	22	18.03%	16	21.5%
Small				
(2,500 to 9,999)	56	45.90%	40	50.6%
Very Small				
(Under 2,500)	<u>41</u>	<u>33.60%</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35.4%</u>
Total	122	100%	79	100%

The following tables and analyses are based on the 79 Virginia school systems which do provide staff development programs for administrative and supervisory personnel. In some instances totals do not equal 79 because one or more items on the survey form were not completed by all respondents.

Table 2
Number of Administrators and Supervisors Employed

Number of Employees	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
100 or more	3	7	10
	100%	43.8%	12.7%
50 to 99	...	8	3	...	11
	...	50.0%	7.9%	...	14.0%
20 to 49	...	1	21	1	23
	...	6.3%	55.3%	4.5%	29.1%
Less than 20	14	21	33
	<u>36.8%</u>	<u>95.5%</u>	<u>41.7%</u>
Total	3	16	38	22	79
	3.8%	20.2%	48.1%	27.8%	100%

Having eliminated non-program school systems from the analysis, the distribution of administrators and supervisors within the size categories of the surveyed school divisions is shown in Table 2. As would be expected, larger school systems generally have greater numbers of administrators and supervisors. Small and very small systems generally have fewer than 50 administrators and supervisors, medium systems are approximately split between having 50 to 100 and

having 100 or more administrators and supervisors, and the three large systems have more than 100 administrators and supervisors.

Table 3
Administrators and Supervisors
Participating in District-run Program

Category of Administration	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Superintendent	2 9.5%	10 9.6%	31 14.6%	13 14.6%	56 13.1%
Assistant Superintendent	3 14.2%	13 12.5%	22 10.4%	14 15.7%	52 12.2%
Business and Budget	2 9.5%	13 12.5%	13 6.1%	1 1.1%	29 6.8%
Curriculum	3 14.2%	14 13.5%	31 14.6%	8 9.0%	56 13.1%
Research	2 9.5%	9 8.7%	7 3.3%	...	18 4.2%
Supervisors	3 14.2%	15 14.4%	36 17.0%	16 18.0%	70 16.4%
Principals	3 14.2%	15 14.4%	37 17.5%	20 22.5%	75 17.6%

Table 3 (continued)

Category of Administration	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Assistant Principals	3	15	35	17	70
	14.2%	14.4%	16.5%	19.1%	16.4%
Total	21	104	212	89	426
	4.9%	24.4%	49.7%	20.9%	100%

Table 4

Administrators and Supervisors
Participating in University or College-based Programs

Category of Administration	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Superintendent	2	4	18	12	36
	11.0%	5.1%	11.3%	17.6%	11.1%
Assistant Superintendent	2	11	15	6	34
	11.0%	14.1%	9.4%	8.8%	10.5%
Business and Budget	2	5	7	1	15
	11.0%	6.4%	4.4%	1.5%	4.6%
Curriculum	2	12	26	5	45
	11.0%	15.3%	16.3%	7.4%	13.8%

Table 4 (continued)

Category of Administration	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Research	2	6	3	1	12
	11.0%	7.7%	1.9%	1.5%	3.7%
Supervisor	3	12	29	12	56
	15.6%	15.3%	18.1%	17.6%	17.2%
Principal	3	14	31	18	66
	15.6%	18.0%	19.4%	26.5%	20.3%
Assistant Principal	3	14	31	13	61
	<u>15.6%</u>	<u>18.0%</u>	<u>19.4%</u>	<u>19.1%</u>	<u>18.8%</u>
Total	19	78	160	68	325
	5.8%	24.0%	49.2%	20.9%	100%

Table 5

Administrators and Supervisors

Participating in Programs Run by Professional Organizations

Category of Administration	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Superintendent	2	8	12	6	28
	15.4%	16.7%	14.0%	20.0%	15.7%

Table 5 (continued)

Category of	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Administration	1	8	12	2	23
	7.7%	16.7%	14.0%	6.7%	13.0%
Business and Budget	1	6	9	1	17
	7.7%	13.0%	10.5%	3.3%	9.6%
Curriculum	1	7	13	2	23
	7.7%	14.6%	15.1%	6.7%	13.0%
Research	2	4	1	...	7
	15.4%	8.3%	1.2%	...	4.0%
Supervisor	2	6	15	6	29
	15.4%	13.0%	17.4%	20.0%	16.3%
Principal	2	5	14	9	31
	15.4%	10.4%	16.3%	30.0%	17.4%
Assistant Principal	2	4	10	4	20
	<u>15.4%</u>	<u>8.3%</u>	<u>8.6%</u>	<u>13.3%</u>	<u>11.2%</u>
Total	13	48	86	30	178
	7.3%	26.9%	48.3%	16.9%	100%

Table 6
Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Programs
Run by Commercial Firms or Private Consultants

Category of Administration	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Superintendent	1 14.3%	2 5.3%	7 9.6%	3 9.4%	13 8.7%
Assistant Superintendent	...	6 15.8%	8 11.0%	3 9.4%	17 11.3%
Business and Budget	1 14.3%	3 7.9%	3 4.1%	1 3.1%	8 5.3%
Curriculum	...	7 18.4%	12 16.4%	2 6.3%	21 14.0%
Research	1 14.3%	1 2.6%	1 1.4%	...	3 2.0%
Supervisor	2 28.6%	9 23.7%	15 21.0%	9 28.1%	35 23.3%
Principal	1 14.3%	5 13.2%	13 17.8%	9 28.1%	28 18.7%
Assistant Principal	1 <u>14.3%</u>	5 <u>13.2%</u>	14 <u>19.2%</u>	5 <u>15.6%</u>	25 <u>16.7%</u>
Total	7 4.7%	38 25.3%	73 48.6%	32 21.3%	150 100%

Tables 3 through 6 show the numbers of administrators and supervisors participating in programs run by four different sponsors. Table 3 records a fairly even participation by school officials in all of the categories of administration. The highest level of overall participation in district-run programs is by small size systems; 212 employees from these systems form nearly half of the total participation. The total number of administrators in all categories of administration is 426, higher for district-run programs than any of the other three types.

As shown in Table 4, 325 employees participate in programs based on colleges and universities. This is the second most popular base for program operation. Again, small size systems have the highest level of participation with 160 school officials forming nearly half of the total of all systems. The lowest level of participation by category of administration is by research workers; only 3.7% of the total is comprised of this group. The same low level of research administrators is to be seen in Table 3, only 4.2%; Table 5, 4.0%; and Table 6, 2.0%.

Table 5, programs run by professional organizations, shows this as the third most popular approach with 178 participants. Again, small system administrators form nearly half of the participants. With the exception of

low attendance by research administrators, there is again an even dispersion of attendance by all categories of administration.

Table 6 shows that commercial firms or private consultants come fourth in popularity with 150 participants. A slightly higher proportion of supervisors in all size systems are shown to participate in these programs. Below this high percentage of supervisor participation, 23.3% of the total, participation in other categories of administration is fairly evenly distributed. Once again, this is with the exception of low participation by research administrators (2%).

In summary, Tables 3 through 6 generally show even participation in most categories of administration. Also it is revealed that district-run programs are most popular followed by college and university programs, professional organization programs, and finally private programs. The apparently low level of participation by research administrators might mean one of two things: there are few administrators in this category or there are equal numbers of these employees in school systems but for some reason staff development programs are not of interest to these persons.

Three other categories of administration were reported: four directors, three psychologists, and one coordinator.

Table 7
Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Staff
Development Programs During the 1977-78 School Year

Number of Employees	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
100 or More	1	4	5
	50.0%	26.7%	7.14%
50 to 99	...	5	3	...	8
	...	33.3%	8.8%	...	11.4%
20 to 49	...	5	16	1	22
	...	33.3%	47.1%	5.3%	31.4%
10 to 19	1	1	13	9	24
	50.0%	6.7%	38.2%	47.4%	34.3%
1 to 9	2	9	11
	5.9%	47.4%	15.7%
Total	2	15	34	19	70
	2.9%	21.4%	48.6%	27.1%	100%

Table 8
Administrators and Supervisors Participating in Staff
Development Programs During 1978-79 School Year

Number of Employees	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
100 or More	1	3	4
	50.0%	21.4%	7.1%
50 to 99	...	5	2	...	7
	...	35.7%	5.4%	...	9.3%
20 to 49	...	5	17	1	23
	...	35.7%	45.9%	4.5%	31.4%
10 to 19	1	1	16	11	29
	50.0%	7.1%	43.2%	50.0%	38.7%
1 to 9	2	10	12
	5.4%	45.5%	16.0%
Total	2	14	37	22	75
	2.7%	18.7%	49.3%	29.3%	100%

Tables 7 and 8 show the participants in staff development programs for the 1977-78 and 1978-79 school years. For most school systems, a slight increase in participation is shown from 1977-78 to 1978-79. This could be attributed to growth of programs or increased employee knowledge and

interest in the same programs.

Table 9
Length of Experience With Staff Development
Programs for Administrators and Supervisors

Number of Years	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
1 or Less	...	1	3	3	7
	...	6.3%	8.1%	13.6%	8.9%
2 - 3	1	3	10	7	21
	33.3%	18.6%	27.0%	31.8%	26.9%
4 - 5	1	6	10	3	20
	33.3%	37.5%	27.0%	13.6%	25.6%
6 - 10	...	1	8	5	14
	...	6.3%	21.6%	22.7%	18.0%
11 or More	1	5	6	4	16
	<u>33.3%</u>	<u>31.3%</u>	<u>16.2%</u>	<u>18.2%</u>	<u>20.5%</u>
Total	3	16	37	22	78
	3.8%	20.5%	47.4%	28.2%	100%

Table 9 shows the length of experience with staff development programs. While approximately 9% of responding systems reported less than one year's experience, more than double that number reported extensive experience of 11 years or more.

Over 50% of the systems recorded experience with programs of between 2 to 5 years. There does not seem to be a positive relationship between school system size and the length of experience with programs. Even very small systems had proportionately equal experience with that of large systems.

Table 10

Programs Offered to Administrators
In Particular Job Categories

Program	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Elementary School	3	14	31	20	68
<u>Administrative Procedures</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>87.5%</u>	<u>77.5%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>86.1%</u>
Secondary School	3	14	30	20	67
<u>Administrative Procedures</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>87.5%</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>84.8%</u>
Elementary School	3	14	35	20	72
<u>Instructional Organization</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>87.5%</u>	<u>87.5%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>91.1%</u>
Secondary School	3	12	29	19	63
<u>Instructional Organization</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>72.5%</u>	<u>95%</u>	<u>79.7%</u>
Total Respondents	3	16	40	20	79
	3.8%	20.3%	50.6%	25.3%	100%

Presented in Table 10 are counts of school systems by the type of programs offered administrators in particular

job categories. More than 70% of all surveyed schools reported participating in all of the four listed programs. Very small and large systems nearly averaged 100% participation in the programs. Elementary school instructional organization programs were the most popular in all sizes of school systems.

Table 11

Programs That Carry Salary or Academic Credit

Credit	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Salary	...	1	1
	...	6.25%	1.3%
Academic	2	10	23	13	48
	66.7%	62.5%	62.2%	59.1%	61.5%
Both	1	2	6	2	11
	33.3%	12.5%	16.2%	9.1%	14.1%
Neither	...	3	8	7	18
	...	18.8%	21.6%	31.8%	23.1%
Total	22	37	16	3	78
	28.2%	47.4%	20.5%	3.8%	100%

The responses to the question dealing with credit for staff development appear in Table 11. Clearly the preferred

form of credit is academic. Of the reporting systems, 61.5% offer academic credit only to participants. Credit in terms of salary alone proved very rare with only one medium size school system providing this reward. Salary and academic credit were offered in 11 systems, over half of which were of small size. Eighteen school systems offered neither salary nor academic credit, representing 23% of the total school systems responding to the survey.

Table 12

Types of Staff Development Programs Offered
During the 1977-78 and 1978-79 School Years

Program	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Management Techniques	2	13	26	12	53
	66.6%	81.3%	70.3%	54.5%	68.0%
Team Management	2	7	9	3	21
	66.6%	43.7%	24.3%	13.6%	26.9%
Systems Approach	2	3	4	2	11
	66.6%	18.7%	10.8%	9.1%	14.1%
MBO	2	12	12	6	32
	66.6%	75.0%	32.4%	27.3%	41.0%
PPB	2	4	7	4	17
	66.6%	25.0%	18.9%	18.2%	21.8%

Table 12 (continued)

Program	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Small	
Performance Objectives	3	9	15	6	33
	100%	56.2%	40.5%	27.3%	42.2%
Long Range Planning	3	7	16	7	33
	100%	43.7%	43.2%	31.8%	42.3%
School Finance	2	10	11	4	27
	66.6%	62.5%	29.7%	18.2%	34.6%
Teacher Selection/Supv.	3	7	20	8	38
	100%	43.7%	54.0%	36.4%	48.7%
Negotiations and Strike Management	1	3	3	2	9
	33.3%	18.7%	8.1%	9.1%	11.5%
CBTE	2	9	16	7	34
	66.6%	56.2%	43.2%	31.8%	43.6%
Instructional Techniques	3	9	26	10	48
	100%	56.2%	70.3%	45.4%	61.5%
Research	1	3	5	2	11
	33.3%	18.7%	13.5%	9.1%	14.1%
Human Relations	2	12	22	12	48
	66.6%	75.0%	59.5%	54.5%	61.5%

Table 12 (continued)

Program	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Drugs	2	8	11	7	28
	66.6%	50.0%	29.7%	31.8%	35.9%
Desegregation	1	1	5	3	10
	33.3%	6.2%	13.5%	13.6%	12.8%
Other	...	3	1	2	6
	...	18.0%	2.7%	9.1%	7.7%

Table 12 shows a detailed listing of the number of programs offered in the surveyed school systems. All of the programs listed were offered in at least one school system from 1977 to the present. Most popular programs, those which were offered by 50% or more of the 79 reporting school systems, were management techniques, instructional techniques, and human relations. Least popular programs, offered by less than 20% of the reporting systems, were systems approach to management, negotiations and strike management, research in education, and desegregation.

Nearly every program type was offered in a higher proportion by medium and large school systems than by small and very small systems. The analysis of responses shows no

relationship, however, between types of programs offered and school system size; each program appears to be as popular in each size school system.

Table 13
Number of Days Devoted to Staff Development
For Administrators and Supervisors

Number of Days	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
1 - 5	2	9	13	8	32
	66.6%	56.3%	36.1%	40.0%	42.7%
6 - 10	...	6	14	9	29
	...	37.5%	38.9%	45.0%	38.7%
11 to 20	1	1	7	3	12
	33.3%	6.3%	19.4%	15.0%	16.0%
20 or More	2	...	2
	5.6%	...	2.7%
Total	3	16	36	20	75
	4.0%	21.3%	48.0%	26.7%	100%

Table 13 shows the average number of days administrators and supervisors participated in staff development programs during the 1978-79 school year. Almost 43% of all size school systems spent 1 to 5 days in staff development

during the year; 38.7% reported spending 6 to 10 days and 16% of the reporting systems spent 11 to 20 days in these programs. Only two schools, 2.7% of the total 79 systems, spent more than 20 days in staff development. With over 80% of the systems spending under 10 days in staff development programs, it is clear that the average school official does not spend long periods of time away from his/her work in order to take part in staff development.

Table 14

Instructional Techniques or Program Organization
Used in Staff Development Programs

Instructional Technique/Program Organization	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
University or College Courses	3 100%	14 87.5%	29 78.4%	20 90.9%	66 84.6%
Lectures	2 66.6%	12 75.0%	17 45.9%	13 59.1%	44 56.4%
Seminars	3 100%	11 68.7%	22 59.5%	12 54.5%	48 61.5%
Study Groups	1 33.3%	6 37.5%	14 37.8%	4 18.2%	25 32.0%

Table 14 (continued)

Instructional Technique/Program Organization	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Conferences	3 100%	14 87.5%	24 64.9%	15 68.2%	56 71.8%
Visits to Other Systems	3 100%	11 68.7%	18 48.6%	8 36.4%	40 51.3%
Institutes	1 33.3%	5 31.2%	6 16.2%	6 27.3%	18 23.1%
Sessions by Profes- sional Organizations	2 66.6%	6 37.5%	8 21.6%	2 9.1%	18 23.1%
Simulation Games	1 33.3%	4 25.0%	8 21.6%	13 16.7%
Sensitivity Training	1 33.3%	6 16.2%	1 4.5%	8 10.3%
In-state Consultants	2 66.6%	13 81.2%	25 67.6%	13 59.1%	53 67.9%
Out-of-state Consultants	2 66.6%	8 50.0%	10 27.0%	8 36.4%	28 35.9%

Table 14 (continued)

Instructional Technique/Program Organization	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Small	
Other	...	1	1	...	2
	...	6.2%	2.7%	...	2.6%
Total Respondents	3	16	40	20	79
	3.8%	20.3%	50.6%	25.3%	100%

Table 14 gives information on the types of instructional techniques or program organization used in staff development programs. The delivery systems used by 50% or more of the surveyed school systems were university courses, lectures, seminars, conferences, visits to other school districts, and in-state consultants. Least popular methods of delivery, ones reported in use by 20% or fewer systems, were simulation games and sensitivity training. A clear preference for an academic approach to instructional techniques is shown by the classroom oriented program organization.

Table 15
Participating Colleges and Universities

Colleges and Universities	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
American University	...	1	1
Christopher Newport College	...	2	2
College of William and Mary	1	4	5	6	16
George Mason University	2	1	3	1	7
George Washington University	...	1	1
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	...	1	1
James Madison University	1	1	2	5	9
Longwood College	3	...	3
Norfolk State College	1	3	1	...	5
Old Dominion University	1	4	4	4	13
Patrick Henry Community College	1	...	1
Radford College	...	2	1	1	4
University of Richmond	...	1	1
University of Virginia	3	14	23	10	50

Table 15 (continued)

Colleges and Universities	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Virginia Commonwealth University	...	3	1	3	7
Virginia Polytechnical Institute	1	5	7	2	15
Virginia State College	...	1	1	...	2
Total	17				138

Table 15 presents an alphabetized listing of those colleges and universities reported as being involved with local school systems in their administrative staff development programs. The University of Virginia is involved with the highest number of school divisions, followed in order by The College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnical Institute, and Old Dominion University. The remaining institutions are used by less than 10 systems.

Table 16
Persons Responsible for Planning Staff
Development for Administrators and Supervisors

Title	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Director of Staff Development	2 66.6%	8 57.1%	14 38.9%	9 45.0%	33 45.2%
Participants	1 33.3%	5 35.7%	20 55.6%	7 35.0%	33 45.2%
University Personnel	2 10.0%	2 2.7%
Other	...	1 7.1%	2 5.6%	2 10.0%	5 6.8%
Total	3 4.1%	14 19.2%	36 49.3%	20 27.4%	73 100%

Table 16 shows responses to the question "Who does most of the planning for your staff development programs?" A 50-50 split is shown between directors of staff development and participating administrators, each represented in 33 school systems. Only two very small systems used university personnel in their planning; five systems used some other

individual to plan their programs. These individuals, entered as "other" on the survey forms, were the assistant superintendent for instruction (four systems) and an administrative assistant. The split between directors of staff development programs and participating administrators suggests a split in the origin and direction of these programs. Where explicitly titled directors exist, one might contend that more attention is paid to structure, continuation, and growth of programs. In school systems where participating administrators plan programs, it seems possible that a more informal and changing character to the programs would be in evidence.

Table 17

Approximate Total Expenditure for Staff Development Programs
For Administrators and Supervisors for the 1977-78 School Year

Expenditure	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Less than \$1,000	...	1	8	3	12
	...	6.2%	21.1%	13.6%	15.2%
\$1,000 to \$2,499	...	1	10	12	23
	...	6.2%	26.3%	54.5%	29.1%
\$2,500 to \$4,999	1	2	11	5	19
	33.3%	12.5%	28.9%	22.7%	24.1%

Table 17 (continued)

Expenditure	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
\$5,000 to \$9,999	...	2	6	1	9
	...	12.5%	15.8%	4.5%	11.4%
\$10,000 to \$24,999	1	4	3	...	8
	33.3%	25.0%	7.9%	...	10.1%
\$25,000 to \$49,999	1	4	...	1	6
	33.3%	25.0%	...	4.6%	7.6%
\$50,000 to \$99,999	...	1	1
	...	6.3%	1.3%
\$100,000 or More	...	1	1
	...	6.3%	1.3%
Total	3	16	38	22	79
	3.8%	20.3%	48.1%	27.8%	100%

Table 17 shows the cost that school systems incurred in order to offer staff development programs for administrators and supervisors during the 1977-78 school year. Of the reporting systems, 68% fall below \$5,000 in program costs. Twenty-nine percent of the 79 school systems paid between \$1,000 and \$2,500 for programs. Only a few school systems are found scattered in the areas of greater than \$5,000

expended for programs. Surprisingly, one very small school system reported expenditures of between \$25,000 and \$59,999, while one medium size system reported spending in excess of \$100,000 for their 1977-78 staff development programs.

Table 18

School District Funding of Staff Development Programs

Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
0	3	3	6
1-9	1	1
10-19	1	1	2
20-29	1	2	3
30-39	...	1	1	1	3
40-49	1	1	1	1	4
50-59	4	1	5
60-69	...	1	2	...	3
70-79	...	2	3	3	8
80-89	5	2	7
90-100	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>32</u>
Total	2	13	37	22	74

Table 19

State Funding of Staff Development Programs					
Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
0	2	10	20	14	52
1-9
10-19	...	3	1	1	5
20-29	...	1	3	4	8
30-39	1	...	1
40-49	...	1	2	...	3
50-59	2	2	4
60-69	1	1	1	...	3
70-79
80-89	2	...	2
90-100	1	1
Total	3	16	38	22	79

Table 20

Federal Funding of Staff Development Programs					
Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
0	2	12	31	11	56
1-9	1	2	1	0	4
10-19	...	1	1	2	4
20-29	4	3	7
30-39	...	1	...	1	2
40-49

Table 20 (continued)

Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
50-59
60-69	1	1
70-79	1	1	2
80-89
90-100	1	2	3
Total	3	16	39	21	79

Table 21

Foundation Funding of Staff Development Programs

Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
0	2	16	38	22	78
1-9	1	1
Total	3	16	38	22	79

Table 22

Participating Administrators and Supervisors Personal Expense

Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
0	3	13	31	19	66
1-9	...	1	1	...	2
10-19	...	2	2	...	4
20-29	1	1	2
30-39

Table 22 (continued)

Percent	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	Total
40-49
50-59	2	2	4
60-69
70-79
80-89
90-100	1	...	1
Total	3	16	38	22	79

Tables 18 through 22 show the sources of funding for staff development programs in the surveyed schools. By far, the greatest share of funding is from local school division funds as is shown in Table 18. Thirty-two of 79 school systems report that 90% to 100% of their funds are from this source. Only in several cases do outside sources such as state or federal funds contribute over 50% of program funds. In this instance, it is small and very small systems that draw fundings from this source. Use of foundation funding is negligible--only one large school system reported 1% to 9% funding from this source. Similarly, the charging of program costs to participants added only nominal amounts to program funding and was used only in a few systems. Only five cases were reported by small and very small systems of

charging participants above 50% of the program costs. Finally, no other sources of funding were reported, again reinforcing the observation that most funding for staff development programs comes from school district funds.

Table 23

School System Funding of College and University-based
Staff Development Programs for Administrators and Supervisors

Funding	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Full Tuition	3	9	18	10	40
	100%	56.3%	50.0%	45.5%	51.9%
Partial Tuition	...	6	14	8	28
	...	37.5%	38.8%	36.4%	36.4%
No Tuition	...	1	4	4	9
	...	6.3%	11.1%	18.2%	11.7%
Total	3	16	36	22	77
	3.9%	20.8%	46.8%	28.6%	100%

Seventy-seven school systems are shown in Table 23 as utilizing colleges and universities for at least part of their staff development programs. Most of these support partially or totally the participants' tuition costs at the

colleges and universities; 52% pay full tuition and 36% pay partial tuition. Only nine school systems, or 12% of the total, provide no tuition assistance.

Table 24

Season of Year for Staff Development Programs
For Administrators and Supervisors

Season	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Fall	2	13	30	30	65
	66.6%	86.7%	83.3%	90.9%	85.5%
Winter	2	14	29	17	62
	66.6%	87.5%	78.5%	77.3%	79.5%
Spring	2	14	30	16	62
	66.6%	87.5%	81.1%	72.7%	79.5%
Summer	3	15	31	18	67
	100%	100%	83.7%	81.8%	85.9%
Total	3	15	36	21	76
	3.9%	19.7%	47.4%	27.6%	100%

Table 24 shows the seasons in which staff development programs are offered. By a slight margin for most systems, the summer is the preferred season. For all respondents, a fairly even distribution of season's offerings suggests

uniform year-round operation of the program.

Table 25

Times of Day When Staff Development Programs Are Offered

Time of Day	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Small	
During Regular					
Working Hours	3	16	30	15	64
	100%	100%	81.1%	68.2%	82.0%
After Working					
Hours (Afternoon)	2	12	15	13	42
	66.6%	75.0%	40.5%	59.1%	53.8%
Evening or Night					
	2	10	14	13	39
	66.6%	62.5%	37.8%	59.1%	50.0%
Weekends					
	2	7	7	8	24
	<u>66.6%</u>	<u>43.7%</u>	<u>18.9%</u>	<u>38.0%</u>	<u>31.2%</u>
Total	9	45	66	49	169
	5.3%	26.6%	39.1%	28.9%	100%

Table 25 lists times of the day when school systems offer staff development programs. Eighty-two percent of the reporting systems reported offering programs during regular working hours. Approximately 50% of the systems reported offering programs during the afternoons and evenings. Slightly less

than one-third (31%) of the systems offer programs on weekends.

Table 26
Methods of Evaluating Staff Development Programs

Method of Evaluation	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Questionnaire	3	11	24	10	48
	100%	68.7%	64.9%	45.4%	61.5%
Review by Participants	2	7	6	7	22
	66.6%	43.7%	16.2%	31.8%	28.2%
Review by Program Director	2	9	21	11	43
	66.6%	56.2%	56.8%	50.0%	55.1%
Other	...	2	1	...	3
	...	12.5%	2.7%	...	3.8%
Total	7	28	52	28	116
	6.1%	24.1%	44.8%	24.1%	100%

In Table 26, methods of program evaluation are shown. Questionnaire and review of program by program directors are the most frequently cited techniques listed by 61.5% and 55.1% respectively of the reporting systems. Review by participants of the programs was used on the average in less than one-third

of the responding systems. Few other techniques were listed (only 3), suggesting that the three approaches listed contribute the whole of program evaluation of most staff development programs. Seventeen of those systems reporting have plans for changing their programs. The majority of these changes are related to expansion, more in-depth planning, attention to instructional supervision, and relationship of staff development programs to system-wide goals and objectives.

Table 27

School Systems With Intern Programs

Response	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
No	1	7	27	19	54
	33.3%	43.8%	79.9%	86.4%	69.2%
Yes	2	9	10	3	24
	<u>66.6%</u>	<u>56.3%</u>	<u>27.0%</u>	<u>13.6%</u>	<u>30.7%</u>
Total	3	16	37	22	78
	3.8%	20.5%	47.4%	28.2%	100%

Table 28

Persons Eligible to Participate in Intern Programs

Participant	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
Persons Employed					
by the District	1	6	6	...	13
	24.0%	42.9%	37.5%	...	37.1%
University or					
College Students	3	8	10	1	22
	75.0%	57.1%	62.5%	100%	62.8%
Total	4	14	16	1	35
	11.4%	40.0%	45.7%	2.8%	100%

Table 29

Number of Years With Intern Programs

Years	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
0	...	1	...	2	3
	...	11.1%	...	50.0%	12.0%
1	1	1	2
	10.0%	25.0%	8.0%

Table 29 (continued)

Years	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
2	2	1	3
	20.0%	25.0%	12.0%
3	1	...	1
	10.0%	...	4.0%
4	...	2	2
	...	22.2%	8.0%
5	...	1	2	...	3
	...	11.1%	20.0%	...	12.0%
6	...	1	1
	...	11.1%	4.0%
7	1	1
	50.0%	4.0%
10	1	1	3	...	5
	50.0%	11.1%	30.0%	...	20.0%
12	...	1	1
	...	11.1%	4.0%
15	...	1	1	...	2
	...	11.1%	10.0%	...	8.0%

Table 29 (continued)

Years	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
20	...	1	1
	...	11.1%	4.0%
Total	2	9	10	4	25
	8.0%	36.0%	40.0%	16.0%	100%

Table 30

Intern Preference for Permanent Positions

Response	Size of School System				Total
	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	
No	...	7	5	1	13
	...	77.8%	62.5%	25.0%	59.1%
Yes	...	1	2	3	6
	...	11.1%	25.0%	75.0%	27.3%
Other	1	1	1	...	3
	100%	11.1%	12.5%	...	13.6%
Total	1	9	8	4	22
	4.5%	40.9%	36.4%	18.2%	100%

Tables 27 through 30 show responses to survey questions concerning internship programs. Most schools, 54 of the 79 respondents, reported no intern programs. The balance, 24 (one system did not answer this question), who have intern programs were in all four size categories. However, as the size of a system increases, the number of respondents with programs also increases from a low of 13.6% of very small systems having such programs to a high of 66.6% of large systems with programs.

In all reporting systems (Table 28) with the exception of the one very small system with an intern program, persons currently employed by the system as well as college and university students may participate in the intern programs.

Table 29 shows that the 24 school systems with intern programs have a wide range of history with these programs. Five systems, 20% of the total respondents, reported 10 years of operation of an intern program. The other 19 systems were dispersed on either side of 10 years with most falling below 10 years in intern program operation. The extreme values were 0 and 20 years. Three schools reported 0 years, an indication that this is a start-up year for intern programs in their systems. The longest operating intern program of 20 years was reported by one medium size system.

Table 30 shows that most former participants in intern programs are not given preference for positions in the school system; 13 of the 24 systems having an intern program reported this policy. Only six school systems offer their former interns preference in job positions.

Summary

A number of points can be drawn from this survey of staff development programs for administrators and supervisors in the public school systems of Virginia. First, though school systems were divided into four size categories by size of enrollment, no clear correlation was found between system size and program operation, types of staff development programs, or any other aspect of programs explored in the survey instrument. Because of this no significant differences should be expected in the opportunities for professional growth for administrators and supervisors whatever the size of their school system's enrollment.

Several other highlights of the study shed light on the scope and direction of staff development programs for school officials. Table 7 compared participation in staff development during two consecutive years and revealed increases in most systems suggesting growth of programs. Table 9, pertaining to years of experience with administrative staff development, shows that 50% of the reporting

systems have more than two years experience in program operation which suggests that programs are being well received and may be improving based on past experience. Table 11 shows that most systems offer their staff academic credit giving incentive to participation. A wide variety of programs are offered in most systems as Table 12 reveals. Consistently most popular are programs such as human relations, management, and instruction--topics central to the task of public school officials. Less centrally oriented programs such as strike management and research in education were offered by fewer systems, again suggesting that participants are seeking programs to assist them in their routine work. Table 13 shows that 80% of the responding systems devote less than 10 days per year to staff development which implies that job responsibilities of participants are not hampered by attendance at sessions.

Table 14 quite predictably shows that school personnel favor the environment with which they are most familiar, academia, in the technique and organizational approach to program operation. Classroom oriented teaching techniques were consistently more popular than what might be called psychological training approaches such as sensitivity training and simulation games.

Cost of program operation was generally shown not to

be excessive. Table 17 shows that 68% of the surveyed systems spend less than \$5,000 each year for administrative staff development. Most of these monies are from local district funds as Table 18 reveals.

Tables 24 and 25 show that staff development sessions are operated in all seasons and that most participants (82%) take advantage of these sessions during regular working hours. The year-round offering of these programs in most systems with most sessions held during regular hours should make it possible for all administrative employees to participate.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings, Observations, and Implications for Further Study

The purpose of this chapter was to summarize the findings of the study and to make observations based upon these findings and the review of the literature. The implications of the study with regard to further study were discussed.

Summary

The society which the public schools serve is changing with such rapidity that educators are often in a quandry in designing appropriate courses of action. With every major change there is a shift in public policy which has implications for most educators.

Continuing staff development programs and training are necessary if educational officials are to meet the growing challenges of their profession. These staff development programs require substantial resources in time, money, personnel, and materials. Regardless of the nature and quality of pre-service training, school systems without a staff development program for their administrative staff might well lack that vital component necessary to cope with the pressing needs generated by rapid

societal changes. The literature on staff development is extensive; however, researchers have reached many common conclusions. Present society is changing and public accountability demands that this change be reflected in the public schools. In response, innovative approaches to staff development for school officials might be implemented. The literature suggests two focal points for beginning such programs; the principal who is closest to the daily operation of the school or the superintendent and his/her immediate staff.

Whatever direction is taken for staff development for practicing school officials, this direction might best focus on objectives that will allow them to meet public demands. Only once these objectives have been determined and strategies adopted can positive changes and improvements be made. Inherent in any program must be the skills, the knowledge and experience, the frame of mind, and a team effort consistent and steady to follow through on adopted objectives which must be viewed as top priority.

A survey of the literature has shown that the public has recommended redirection for their schools. Staff development for those persons responsible for the operation of the schools is necessary if current problems are to be solved and changes effected.

The purpose of this study was to conduct a survey of each public school division in Virginia to determine the status of staff development programs for educational administrators and supervisors. Data were obtained with a 24-item questionnaire sent to 134 school divisions in the state. Information was sought to determine certain demographic data, types of programming and management, program scope and sequence, and methods of implementation of existing staff development programs for school officials. Of 134 school divisions surveyed, 122 responded, representing 91% of the total. Of the 122 that returned the survey questionnaire, 79 school systems provide administrators and supervisors with a formal staff development program. The remaining 43 systems which have no formal programs were mostly in small and very small size divisions.

As would be expected, larger school systems employ greater numbers of administrators and supervisors. Small and very small systems generally have fewer than 50 school officials, medium systems are approximately split between having 50 to 100 and having 100 or more administrators and supervisors, and the three large systems reported having more than 100 administrators and supervisors.

The most popular delivery system for staff development programs is the district-run program. The highest

level of overall participation in district-run programs was reported by small size systems. The total number of school officials in all categories is 426, higher for district-run programs than any of the other three types.

The number of employees participating in staff development programs that are college and university based is 325. Small size systems have the highest level of participation with 160 school officials forming nearly half of the total of all systems.

The third most popular approach to staff development programs with 178 participants is programs run by professional organizations. Again, small system administrators and supervisors form nearly half of the participants.

Commercial firms or private consultants rank fourth in incidence with 150 participants. A slightly higher proportion of supervisors in all size systems were reported as participants in this type program.

Seventy-seven school systems reported the utilization of colleges and universities for at least part of their staff development programs. Most of these systems support partially or totally the participants' tuition costs. Only nine school systems provide no tuition assistance.

Seventeen colleges and universities were reported as being involved with local school systems in their administrative staff development programs. Personnel from the

University of Virginia were involved with the highest number of school divisions, followed in order by The College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnical Institute, and Old Dominion University. With the exception of the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnical Institute, location of the institutions of higher education might be a factor in determining their use as most serve school systems in their near or immediate vicinity.

In comparing the number of staff development programs for school officials for the years 1977-78 and 1978-79, a slight increase is observed. This could be attributed to growth of programs or increased employee knowledge and interest in the same programs.

Nine percent of the responding school systems reported less than one year's experience with staff development programs. More than double that percentage reported extensive experience of eleven years or more. There was not a strongly defined relationship between school systems size and the length of experience with programs. Very small systems had proportionately equal experience with that of large systems.

Four types of programs were presented in the questionnaire: (a) elementary school administrative procedures; (b) secondary school administrative

procedures; (c) elementary school instructional organization; and (d) secondary school instructional programs. More than 70% of all responding systems reported participation in all of the four programs. By a narrow margin elementary school instructional organization programs were the most popular in all sizes of school systems.

The preferred type of credit for staff development participation is academic. Credit in terms of salary alone proved very rare with only one medium size school system providing this reward. Salary and academic credit combined were offered in 11 systems, over half of which were small size. Eighteen school systems (23%) offered neither salary nor academic credit for staff development participation.

The most popular staff development programs, those offered by 50% or more of the 79 reporting school systems were management techniques, instructional techniques, and human relations. Least popular programs, those offered by less than 20% of the reporting systems, were systems approach to management, negotiations and strike management, research in education, and desegregation topics. The analysis of responses showed no logical relationship between types of programs and school system size.

Almost half of the administrators and supervisors in the responding school systems spent from one to five days

in staff development sessions during the 1978-79 school year. Only two systems (2.7%) spent more than twenty days involved in professional growth activities. With over 80% of the systems investing less than ten days in staff development programs, it is clear that the average school official is not away from his/her work for extended periods to participate in staff development.

The delivery systems used by 50% or more of the reporting school divisions were university courses, lectures, seminars, conferences, visits to other school districts, and in-state consultants. Least popular methods of delivery, ones reported in use by 20% or fewer systems, were simulation games and sensitivity training. The data showed that an academic approach might be the preferred instructional technique as shown by the number of persons involved in classroom oriented programs.

The questionnaire responses revealed that 33 responding systems have a director of staff development who is responsible for planning programs of staff development for their school officials. Participating administrators have this responsibility in 33 other school divisions. Two very small systems use university personnel to plan staff development programs while four systems vest this responsibility with the assistant superintendent for instruction, and one system gives this responsibility to

an administrative assistant.

Expenditures for staff development for school officials vary. During the 1977-78 school year, 68% of the reporting systems spent less than \$5,000 in this effort. Twenty-nine percent of the 79 respondents reported having spent between \$1,000 and \$2,500 for professional growth activities. Twenty-five reporting systems spent in excess of \$5,000 for training for school administrators.

Sources of funding for staff development programs were reported as school-district funding, state funding, federal funding, foundation funding, and personnel funding by the participating administrators and supervisors. By far, the greatest funding is from local school division funds. Thirty-two of the responding divisions reported that 90% to 100% of expended funds are from this source. Only in several cases do outside sources such as state or federal funds contribute over 50% of program funds. Use of foundation funding is negligible; similarly, the charging of program costs to participants added only minimal amounts to the program and was used in only a few systems. Finally, no other sources of funding were reported.

By a slight margin, the summer is reported as being the preferred time of year for staff development sessions. However, for all respondents a fairly even distribution

of season's offerings suggests uniform year-round operation of the programs.

While the summer is reported to be the preferred time of year for staff development programs, regular working hours was reported by 82% of the respondents as being the time when most programs are held. This does not mean that this is the only time for staff development sessions. Approximately 50% of the systems reported offering programs on weekends.

To evaluate these programs of professional growth, questionnaires and review by the program directors were the most frequently cited techniques. Review by participants in the programs was used in less than one third of the responding systems.

Seventeen of the reporting systems reported having plans for changing their staff development programs. The majority of these changes are related to expansion, more in-depth planning, attention to instructional supervision, and the relationship of staff development programs to system-wide goals and objectives.

Intern programs in the local school divisions of the state are meager. Only 24 of the responding systems are involved in this endeavor. These 24 systems are representative of all four size categories used in the survey; however, as the size of the system increases, the number

of systems also increases.

Persons currently employed in the school divisions reporting, as well as college and university students, may participate in these intern programs which have been in existence for as long as 20 years. In most cases, programs for interns have been in existence for less than 10 years.

Most school divisions reported that those persons involved in an intern program are not given preference in hiring. Six systems reported that these persons were given preferential treatment in regard to job openings.

Other points might be drawn from further analysis of the reported data in this study. The findings of this study suggest that those persons responsible for staff development programs for administrators and supervisors consider this as an important means of improving the quality of performance for those persons charged with the responsibility of providing a quality education for the youth of the state.

Observations

The purpose of this study was to survey each school division in Virginia to determine the status of staff development programs for school officials. The study was a modified replication of a national survey conducted by Educational Research Service, Inc. in 1974. Table 31

which follows provides a comparison of the highlights of the Educational Research Service survey and data collected from the survey conducted in Virginia.

Table 31

Comparison of Educational Research Survey and Virginia Survey

Subject	Educational Research Survey	Virginia Survey
	(598 Respondents)	(122 Respondents)
Provision of Staff	Programs were provided by	Programs were provided by
Development Programs	64% of the respondents.	65% of the respondents.
Years of Experience	Programs have been in exist-	Programs have been in exist-
With Programs	ence for six or more years in	tence for six or more years in
	41% of all responding districts;	62% of all responding districts;
	57% have had programs for less	38% have had programs for less
	than five years.	than five years.
Sponsors of Programs	Participation was highest in	Participation was highest in
	district-run programs; lower	district-run programs; lower
	levels of participation were in	levels of participation were in
	programs sponsored by profes-	programs sponsored by colleges
	sional organizations, commercial	or universities, professional

Table 31 (continued)

Subject	Educational Research Survey	Virginia Survey
Sponsors of Programs (continued)	firms, private consultants, and university based programs.	organizations, and private consultants of commercial firms.
Program Topics	<p>Topics most often reported were: management techniques, performance objectives, instructional techniques, and team management. Topics reported least often were desegregation, educational research, and competency based teacher education.</p>	<p>Topics reported were: management techniques, systems approach, MBO, PPB, performance objectives, long-range planning, school finance, teacher selection and supervision, negotiations and strike management, CBE, instructional techniques, research, and human relations.</p>

Table 31 (continued)

Subject	Educational Research Survey	Virginia Survey
Program	The four most widely used	The types of program organ-
Organization	types of program organization were: conferences, seminars, visitations to other school districts, and training by professional organizations.	izations were: university or college courses, lectures, seminars, study groups, conferences, visits to other school divisions, institutes, and sessions by professional organizations.
Salary or Academic	Neither salary nor academic	One reporting district
Credit for Participation	credit was offered in 63% of the responding districts.	offers salary credit for participation; 62% offer academic credit; 14% offer both salary and academic credit; 23% offer neither salary nor academic credit.

Table 31 (continued)

Subject	Educational Research Survey	Virginia Survey
Days Devoted to	The median number of days devoted to staff development was	Less than ten days of participation in staff development
Staff Development	voted to staff development was five.	ment was reported by over 80% of the respondents.
Time of Day and	The preferred time for sessions was reported as being	Regular working hours during the summer was reported as
Season of Year for	during regular working hours in	the preferred time for
Staff Development	the fall, winter, and spring.	sessions.
Sessions	The main source of funds was	By far the greatest share
Source of Funding	at the local level.	of funding was at the local
for Staff		level.
Development		

Table 31 (continued)

Subject	Educational Research Survey	Virginia Survey
Responsibility of Planning Staff	Over 75% of the reporting systems indicated that participants assist in planning staff development activities.	The director of staff development was reported by 45% of the respondents as responsible for planning sessions;
Development Programs	45% of the respondents indicated that participants held this responsibility.	45% of the respondents indicated that participants held this responsibility.
Methods of Evaluating Staff Development Programs	Questionnaires were used to evaluate programs in 65% of the responding districts; review by participants or program directors and planners was reported by 50% of the respondents.	Questionnaires and review of programs by program directors were methods of evaluation reported by approximately 60% of the reporting systems; review by participants was reported as a method of

Table 31 (continued)

Subject	Educational Research Survey	Virginia Survey
Methods of		
Evaluating Staff		evaluation by 33% of the
Development Programs		respondents.
(continued)		

In most instances, there was a close parallel in the findings of the two surveys. Two major differences exist: persons in Virginia tend to use colleges and universities to a greater extent than is reported nationally; and participation in planning staff development sessions is much higher at the national level than in Virginia.

Program topics reported in both surveys compare favorably with those topics receiving attention by the National Academy for School Executives. In both surveys management techniques and instructional leadership appear to be the broad topics of interest with human relations skills and desegregation receiving low priority.

Based on the review of the literature, the findings of the survey, and the comparison of this survey with the ERS survey, the following observations have been made about staff development programs for public school officials in Virginia:

1. A program of staff development for public school officials might be one method of enabling these officials to design appropriate responses to the challenges of a changing society.

2. Programs of staff development need the support of all who are responsible for public education; therefore, funding by a local governing agency for such programs might be the incentive necessary in assisting

school officials to cope with the needs generated by societal changes.

3. A program of staff development might be more holistic if objectives for these programs are based upon the results of a needs assessment reflecting input of school officials, teachers, parents, students, college and university personnel, and a diverse representation of lay public.

4. Neither the size of a school district nor the number of employed administrators and supervisors are relevant factors determining the quality of a staff development program for its school officials.

5. A two-way system of communication between local school divisions and nearby institutions of higher education might be a means of improving staff development programs for practicing school officials as well as the pre-service training of persons enrolled in programs leading to endorsement in educational administration and supervision.

6. The quality of an educational system might be improved if staff development programs for school officials placed greater emphasis on skills in administrative procedures.

7. A commitment to personal improvement by public school officials might be strengthened by offering some

type of credit incentive.

8. School divisions employing one person responsible for staff development programs for administrators and supervisors might provide programs that are more systematic and continuous.

Implications

The present study reveals that 65% of the school divisions responding to the questionnaire provide programs of staff development for their school officials. The findings of this study and the conclusions drawn suggest that further investigation into the competencies required of school administrators and/or supervisors might improve the effectiveness and efficiency of these school officials. In addition, further study is needed to determine which behaviors result in observable practices of these competencies. Other areas suggesting further study are program evaluation and program change.

According to the findings of this study, participation in planning programs of staff development by those to be involved was reported by 45% of the respondents.

Every school division should determine the competencies required of all administrative and supervisory positions in that unit. Staff development programs could then be implemented that would be based upon these required competencies. Local school divisions might

profit by modeling intern programs conducted by institutions of higher education since most administrative positions in a school system are filled from within. There is a need to explore methods of combining theory and practice and actual on the job performance.

The evaluation process as it relates to school officials deserves further study. Once the necessary skills and competencies of an administrative and/or supervisory position have been agreed upon, then specific behaviors necessary to measure these competencies could be determined. These factors can serve as criteria for determining effectiveness.

Seventeen of the responding school divisions reported plans for changing their staff development programs. These changes include program expansion, more in-depth planning, attention to instructional supervision, and the relationship of staff development programs to systemwide goals and objectives. Further study might determine why these changes are being made and if these changes improve the quality of performance and the instructional program.

Any staff development program might ideally include an evaluation component. This evaluation might be based upon program evaluation by the participants as well as an evaluation of behavioral changes of the participants.

These and other suggestions might upgrade the staff development programs for school administrators and supervisors. The continued improvement of school administration might be the best hope for improved schools.

Appendix

An Investigation of Staff Development

Programs Designed for

Virginia School Officials

SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS

Name of School District _____
 Address _____ Zip Code _____
 Name of Person Responding _____
 Official Position _____ Phone (____) _____

For the purpose of this study, "staff development for administrators and supervisors" includes all programs for which the school district plans, coordinates, and/or provides full or partial funding. Courses and other programs that are completely independent of district direction or financial support are not included in this study, nor is sabbatical leave.

1. What was the enrollment of your school system as of October 1, 1978? _____
2. How many administrators and supervisors does your school system currently employ? _____
3. Does your school system provide administrators and supervisors with staff development training for which the school system plans, coordinates, and/or provides full or partial funding? _____ yes _____ no

NOTE: IF YOUR ANSWER TO QUESTION 3 WAS "YES," PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE BEFORE RETURNING IT. IF YOUR ANSWER TO QUESTION 3 WAS "NO," PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

4. In what type of program(s) have one or more persons from the following categories of administrators participated within the current and preceding school years (1977-78 to date)?

	District-run programs	University or college-based programs	Programs run by professional organizations	Programs run by commercial firms or private consultants
Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
Asst. Superintendent	_____	_____	_____	_____
Business & Budget	_____	_____	_____	_____
Curriculum	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____	_____	_____
Supervisors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Principals	_____	_____	_____	_____
Asst. Principals	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (Please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

5. Approximately how many administrators and supervisors have participated in staff development programs per year during the current and preceding school years?

1978-79 _____ (number to date)
 1977-78 _____ (number)

6. Approximately how long has your district had a staff development program for administrators and supervisors? (Check ONE)

_____ 1 year or less
 _____ 2 - 3 years
 _____ 4 - 5 years
 _____ 6 - 10 years
 _____ 11 years or more

7. Are any of the following programs offered to administrators in particular job categories? (Check ALL that apply)

_____ elementary school administrative procedures
 _____ secondary school administrative procedures
 _____ elementary school instructional organization
 _____ secondary school instructional organization

8. Do any of your staff development programs carry salary or academic credit? (Check ONE)

_____ yes, salary credit
 _____ yes, academic credit
 _____ yes, both salary and academic credit
 _____ no salary or academic credit

9. Which of the following types of programs have been offered in the current and past school years (1977 to date)? (Check ALL that apply)

_____ management techniques
 _____ team management
 _____ systems approach to management
 _____ management by objectives (MBO)
 _____ planning, programming, budgeting (PPB)
 _____ writing performance objectives
 _____ long-range planning
 _____ school finances and budgets
 _____ teacher selection and supervision
 _____ negotiations and strike management
 _____ competency based teacher education (CBTE)
 _____ instructional techniques
 _____ research in education
 _____ human relations
 _____ drugs and their effect on schools
 _____ desegregation
 _____ other (Please specify)

10. What was the approximate average number of days devoted to staff development training by administrators and supervisors last year? (Average number of days per individual administrator or supervisor)

_____ days

11. Which of the following types of instructional techniques or program organization have been used in your staff development program in the current and preceding school years? (Check ALL that apply)

university or college courses (Please give name(s) of university or college)

- lectures
- seminars
- study groups
- conferences
- visitation to an outside district
- institutes
- training sessions or courses offered professional organizations
- simulation games
- sensitivity training
- consultants (Please check below)
 - in state
 - out of state
- other (Please specify)

12. What is the title of the staff member who is responsible for the direction of the staff development program for administrators and supervisors in your school system? (Please give exact title)

13. Who does most of the planning for your staff development program for administrators and supervisors?

- director of staff development program
- participating administrators
- university or college personnel
- other (Please specify)

14. What was the approximate total expenditure for your school system's staff development program for administrators and supervisors for 1977-78? (Include costs for outside consultants, transportation, etc.)

\$ _____

15. Approximately what portions of the cost designated in your response to question 14 came from the following sources? (Please give approximate percentages)

- school district funds
- state funds
- federal funds
- foundation funds
- participating administrators and supervisors
- other (Please specify)

16. If a part of your staff development program for administrators and supervisors is university-based, what portion of the tuition costs does the district pay? (Check ONE)

- full tuition costs
- partial tuition costs
- no tuition costs

17. When are staff development programs for administrators and supervisors offered? (Check ALL that apply)

- fall
- winter
- spring
- summer

18. At what times are your staff development programs for administrators and supervisors offered? (Check ALL that apply)

- during regular working hours
- after working hours (afternoon)
- evening or night
- weekends

19. What methods are used to evaluate your school system's staff development programs for administrators and supervisors?

- questionnaire given to participants
- review by committee of participants
- review by program director and/or planners
- other (Please specify)

20. What plans exist for changing the program?

21. Does your district have an administrative intern program?

yes no

22. If "yes" to question 21, who is eligible to participate in the administrative intern program? (Check ALL that apply)

- persons currently employed by the district
- university or college students
- other (Please specify)

23. How long has your district had an administrative intern program?

_____ years

24. Are interns given preference for positions with the district if their work as interns is satisfactory?

- yes
- no
- other (Please specify)

Please return in the enclosed envelope to:

Bob L. Sigson, Director
Elementary Administration
Richmond Public Schools
301 S. Ninth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

References

- American Association of School Administrators. In-service Education for School Administrators. Forty-fifth Yearbook. Washington: The Association, 1963.
- American Association of School Administrators. National Academy for School Executives. Pamphlet. Washington: The Association, 1979.
- Bellon, J., & Jones, R. "Renewal for School Administrators: A Systematic Approach," Journal of Secondary Education, 1970, 45, 3-8.
- Bishop, L. Staff Development and Professional Improvement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.
- Campbell, R., Cunningham, L., & McPhee, R. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1965, 208.
- Comfort, R., & Bowen, L. "Supervision vs. Institutional Constraints on Professional Growth," Educational Leadership, 1974, 31, 627-629.
- Conrad, M., Brooks, K., & Fisher, G. "A Model for Comprehensive Educational Planning," Planning and Changing, 1973, 4, 3-14.
- Crawford, J. "Educational Demands on Public Administrators in Rural Missouri and Needed In-service Preparation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1974.

- Creamer, D., & Feld, B. Some Innovations in the Training of Educational Leaders. New York: Conference Board Report No. 576, 1972.
- Culbertson, J., Henson, C., & Morrison, R. Performance Objectives for School Principals: Concepts and Instruments. California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.
- Curtis, W., & Others. The Further Development of the Conceptual Model and Operational Dimensions of the AASA National Academy for School Executives: Final Report. Arlington, Virginia: National Academy for School Executives, American Association of School Administrators, 1972.
- Davison, R. "Better In-Service Programs for School Administrators," Clearing House, 1973, 47, 498-501.
- Drachler, N. How Can a School District Launch a Meaningful Training Program for Its Administrative Staff? Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, 1973.
- Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. Administrator's Guide to New Programs for Faculty Management and Evaluation. New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1977.
- Edmonds, F., Ogleetree, J., & Wear, P. In-Service Education: Crucial Process in Educational Change.

- Lexington, Kentucky: Bulletin of the Bureau of Services, University of Kentucky, 1966.
- Ellena, W., & Redfern, G. Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership. University of Illinois, 1970.
- Etzioni, A. "Human Beings Are Not Very Easy to Change After All," Saturday Review, 1972, 3, 47.
- Eye, G., & Netzer, L. Supervision of Instruction: A Phase of Administration. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Fiedler, F. "Responses to Sergiovanni," Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 394-396.
- Finnegan, H. "Into Thy Hands--Staff Development," Theory Into Practice, 1972, 11, 215-224.
- Flemming, A. Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Flemming, A. Statement of Metropolitan School Desegregation. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Flemming, A. Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools: A Status Report. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Forehand, G., & Ragosta, M. A Handbook for Integrated Schooling. New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

- Frymier, J., ed. "Models of Staff Development," Theory Into Practice, 1972, 11, 205-206.
- Gappert, G. "Administrator Training: Principals Need It Most." Education USA, 1979, 21, 289.
- Gardner, J. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper, 1963.
- Gish, E., & Saxe, R. "Public Participation in Educational Policy Making: Trends and Portents," in Mosher, E., & Wagoner, J., eds. The Changing Politics of Education: Prospects for the 1980's. Berkeley, California: McCutchen Press, 1978.
- Goldhammer, K. "Notes on Institutional Relationships in the In-Service Education of the Professional Educator," in Lynch, P., & Blackstone, P., eds. Institutional Roles for In-Service Education of School Administrators. Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.
- Good, C., ed. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1959.
- Goodlad, J. "Staff Development: The League Model," Theory Into Practice, 1972, 11, 207-214.
- Goor, J., et al. Training Needs of Public School Administrations: A Survey of Local School Districts, Summer 1978. FRSS Report No.5. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1978.

- Granger, R. Educational Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Intext Educational Publishers, 1971.
- Gross, N., & Herriott, R. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: Wiley, 1965.
- Harris, B. "In-Service Growth - The Essential Requirements," Educational Leadership, 1966, 24, 257-60.
- Henry, N., ed. In-Service Education for Supervisors and Administrators. Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Howsam, R. "In-Service Education of School Administrators: Background, Present Status, and Problems," in Lynch, P., and Blackstone, P., eds. Institutional Roles for In-Service Education of School Administrators. Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.
- Hunt, D. "In-Service Training as Persons-in-Relations." Theory Into Practice, 1978, 17, 239-244.
- Hutson, H. "PAR in In-Service." Practical Applications to Research, 1979, 1, 1.
- In-Service Institute in Human Relations. Evansville, Indiana: Indiana State University, 1972.

- Jerrems, R. "Sensitivity Training: The Affective Dimension of In-Service Training," The National Elementary Principal, 1971, 50, 63-69.
- Kimple, J. "Sensitivity: A Superintendent's View," Educational Leadership, 1970, 28, 266-270.
- King, J., Hayes, P., & Newman, I. "Some Requirements for Successful In-Service Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 58, 686-687.
- Klopf, G. "The Principal and Staff Development in the Elementary School." Occasional Paper No. 4, New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1974.
- Koch, M. "A Description of the Effects of a Staff Development Project on the Attitudes and Commitment of a Selected Group of Administrators Towards Implementing Management-By-Objectives in an Urban College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1977.
- Lansky, L., & Others. The Effects of Human Relations Training on Diagnosing Skills and Planning for Change. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.
- Lutz, F., & Ferrante, R. Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators. Ohio: University Council for Education Administration, 1972.

- Management by Objectives and Results: A Guidebook for Today's School Executive. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.
- Mangers, D. "Need for Administrative Training Voiced by Legislative Task Force," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 1979, 8, 4-8.
- Martin, E. "Programs for the Principal: A Survey," NASSP Bulletin, 1972, 56, 21-23.
- Mason, T., & Rhode, F. "In-Service Education in White Bear Lake," Theory Into Practice, 1972, 11, 236-238.
- McDonald, J. "Scene and Context: American Society Today," in Beegle, C., & Edelfelt, R., eds. Staff Development: Staff Liberation. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Morrow, J., Foster, R., & Estes, N. "Networking: A White Paper on the Preparation of School Administrators." The National Elementary Principal, 1974, 53, 8-18.
- Mial, D. "Laboratory Training in Planned Change," The National Elementary Principal, 1971, 50, 46-51.
- Miklos, E. Training-in-Common for Educational, Public, and Business Administration. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.
- Miller, W. "Helping Professionals To Grow," Educational Leadership, 1974, 31, 489-511.

- Moore, H. Studies in School Administration. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators 1957.
- Olivero, J. "Reducing Battle Fatigue--Or: Staff Development for School Principals." The Developer, 1979, 1.
- Peterson, L., Rosmiller, R., & Volz, M. The Law and Public School Operation. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Pharis W. "Look Over Your Shoulder: The Need for Continuing Education in a Changing Society." The National Elementary Principal, 1968, 47, 43-46.
- Pinkney, H. "Decentralization and Staff Development," in Beegle, C., & Edelfelt, R., eds. Staff Development: Staff Liberation. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Quander, N. "Administrator Training: Principals Need It Most." Education USA, 1979, 21, 289.
- Robinson, D. In-Service Programs for Educational Administrators and Supervisors, Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1974.
- Ruben, A. "Humanizing School Principals," National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin, 1972, 56, 20-25.
- Ryan, K., Newman, K., & Johnston, J. "An Interview With Lawrence A. Cremin," Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 60, 115.

- Sanders, J. "Analysis of an In-Service Education Seminar for a New Position of Counselor/Supervisor," doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1975.
- Sarason, S. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Sergiovanni, T. "Is Leadership the Next Great Train Robbery?" Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 388-394.
- Sexton, M., & Switzer, K. "Educational Leadership: No Longer a Potpourri." Educational Leadership, 1977, 35, 19-24.
- Shingleton, C. "Accountability and Staff Development" in Beegle, C., & Edelfelt, R., eds. Staff Development: Staff Liberation. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Small, J. "Initiating and Responding to Social Change," in Culbertson, J., Henson, C., & Morrison, R., eds. Performance Objectives for School Principals. California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.
- Spillman, R. "Management by Objectives (or) I'll Try to Find More Time to Observe More Teachers Next Year." Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 58, 624-626.
- Steige, B. "Perceived In-Service Education Needs of Selected Administrators Employed by Institutions in the Pittsburgh Council on Higher Education," doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1977.

- Taylor, B., & McKean R. "News Notes." Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 447-448.
- Thomas, T. "Human Relations Training for Elementary Principals," The National Elementary Principal, 1971, 50, 59-62.
- Ward, V. "Staff Development Through Lifetime Education," in Beegle, C., & Edelfelt, R., eds. Staff Development: Staff Liberation. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.
- Willis, B. "Continuing Education for Present Administrators," in Culbertson, J., & Heneley, S., eds. Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives. Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.
- Wolfe, W. "A Study of a Laboratory Approach to In-Service Development Programs for School Administrators and Supervisors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas, 1965.
- Wynn, R. "Preparation Programs and Professional Development for School Administrators-AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration." Paper presented at American Association of School Administrators annual conference, San Francisco, March, 1973.

AN INVESTIGATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS DESIGNED FOR VIRGINIA SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Bob L. Sigmon

The College of William and Mary, 1980

Chairman: Dr. Robert Maidment

Problem

The purpose of this study was to conduct a survey of each school division in Virginia to determine the status of staff development programs for educational administrators and supervisors.

Design of the Study

The sample population for the study consisted of 134 school divisions in Virginia. The respondents were the superintendents of schools or persons designated as key instructional leaders. A 24-item questionnaire was sent to each school division in the state. The questionnaire was structured so that demographic data, program planning and management data, program scope and sequence data, and program implementation data could be obtained. A response of 91% was received.

Findings

Sixty-five percent of the respondents provide a program of staff development for school officials. Significant data were obtained in the following areas: (a) the delivery system for staff development; (b) level of participation in these programs; (c) colleges and universities involved in local programs; (d) types and topics of programs; (e) expenditures for staff development programs; (f) evaluation of programs and plans for changes.

Observations and Implications

Based on the review of the literature and the findings of the study, the following observations were made: A program of staff development for public school officials might be one method of enabling these officials to design appropriate responses to the challenges of a changing society. A program of staff development might be more holistic if objectives for these programs are based upon the results of a needs assessment reflecting input of school officials, teachers, parents, students, college and university personnel, and a diverse representation of lay public. A two-way system of communication between local school divisions and nearby institutions of higher education might be a means of improving staff development programs for practicing school officials as well as the pre-service training of persons enrolled in programs leading to endorsement in educational administration and supervision. The quality of an educational system might be improved if staff development programs for school officials placed greater emphasis on skills in administrative procedures. Implications for future research were included.

Vita

Bob L. Sigmon

Born in Catawba, North Carolina, October 2, 1934. Attended Appalachian State Teachers College, 1952-1956. Awarded Bachelor of Science degree in Grammar Grade Education, 1956. Attended East Carolina College, 1958-59. Awarded Master of Arts degree in Educational Administration and Supervision, 1959. Post Graduate work at East Carolina College, The University of North Carolina, and Duke University. Attended The College of William and Mary, 1976-1979. Awarded Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Administration, 1978. Attained status of Candidate for Doctor of Education degree, 1979.

Elementary teacher, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1957-58. Elementary teacher, Greenville, North Carolina, 1958-59. Middle school teacher, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1959-65. Teacher of social studies and reading, North Carolina Advancement School, 1965-65. Elementary teacher and Adult Education Coordinator, Daytona Beach, Florida, 1965-66. Middle school teacher and Director of Secondary Education, Greenville, North Carolina, 1966-72. Curriculum specialist, Richmond, Virginia, 1972-73. Coordinator of Instruction, Richmond, Virginia, 1973-76. Director of Elementary Administration, Richmond, Virginia, 1976.