6-1989

An Analysis of the Content and Methods of Instruction at Michigan Institutions that Prepare Principals

Thomas E. Engel
Western Michigan University

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENT AND METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AT MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS THAT PREPARE PRINCIPALS

by

Thomas E. Engel

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 1989

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENT AND METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AT MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS THAT PREPARE PRINCIPALS

Thomas E. Engel, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1989

The purpose of this study was to analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan. The study sought to answer three specific questions:

1. To what extent do the programs develop the generic skills required of principals?

2. To what extent do the programs develop the specific skills required of principals?

3. What are the dominant methods of instruction used in the programs?

The study was conducted using the rating exercises recommended in the NASSP's 1985 monograph Performance-Based Preparation of Principals. At each of five Michigan universities, a team of raters were asked to rate whether the classes in their program developed the generic and the specific skills required of principals at (a) the Familiarity level (the ability to discuss the course content), (b) the Understanding level (implies the capability to teach someone else the content), or (c) the Application level (denotes the facility to apply the skill in real or simulated situations). The individual raters then met for a consensus discussion and final rating. The ratings from the five universities were aggregated into a general

description of principal preparation in Michigan.

Based on the findings, the primary conclusion of this study is that programs at the institutions studied are not performance-based in objectives, outcomes, or instructional methods. The generic skills required of principals are developed generally at the Understanding level. The specific skills required of principals are developed primarily at the Familiarity level. While there is some evidence of Application level development of the generic skills, it is almost nonexistent for the specific skills. Although some institutions have introduced performance-based elements to their programs, the primary method of instruction remains Lecture-Discussion in all areas.

While programs cannot now be generally described as performance-based, each institution showed an awareness and concern for the need to develop the generic skills of the NASSP Assessment Center and to use a variety of teaching methods. A recognition of the need to move toward more performance-based preparation is evident at the universities.

Order Number 8921868

An analysis of the content and methods of instruction at Michigan institutions that prepare principals

Engel, Thomas Eugene, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1989

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The NASSP and its University Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals has since 1972 studied and promoted performance-based preparation. Their efforts provided both the impetus and the framework by which this study was conducted.

I am indebted to the university liaisons who gave of their time to organize the rating process at their institutions: Frederick Bertolaet (University of Michigan), David Blomquist (Northern Michigan University), James Clatworthy (Oakland University), David Cowden (Western Michigan University), and William Force (Grand Valley State University).

Thanks to my dissertation committee members Patrick Jenlink and George DePillo for their input and guidance. Particular thanks to Edgar A. Kelley, my advisor and committee chairperson, whose keen interest in principal preparation helped to spark this work. He continually encourages, demands, and models academic excellence.

I am grateful to Mary Rosa for her many hours transcribing my work into presentable form. Thanks also to Lee Pakko for the production of the final draft.

Finally, I acknowledge the support and patience of my wife, Lydia Lopez Engel. We share the hope that our daughter Lisa Anne's school years will be spent in schools led by principals who were well prepared to promote excellence.

Thomas E. Engel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents--Continued

Table of Contents--Continued

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Professional, university preparation of educators through departments of education began in the late 1800s with researchers fixing the birthplaces at Harvard and Johns Hopkins (Silver & Spuck, 1978). The first Ph.D. in education was granted in 1891 by Clark University, and the first Ed.D. by Harvard in 1921 (Ludlow, 1964).

Educational administration was recognized as an independent field of study in the first decade of the 1900s when the initial department was established at Teachers College, Columbia University (Silver & Spuck, 1978). Programs for the preparation of school administrators proliferated throughout the 1900s, and in 1987 over 500 institutions in the United States offered courses in school administration (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA], 1987).

The large number of institutions offering programs in educational administration might suggest that there is no need for concern about the preparation of school principals. This, however, is not the case. The NCEEA (1987) report in fact recommended that over 300 institutions should close their programs for principal preparation because the institutions lacked either the resources or the commitment to provide excellent preparation. Among several specific

concerns, the report criticized programs for their lack of relevance to the actual work of principals and for their lack of modern content and clinical experiences.

The NCEEA (1987) report was just one of many reports on education which gained attention during the 1980s. Earlier reports, from both within and outside the profession, were directed toward such elements as teacher competency, curriculum, societal factors, and economic implications; but this report focused on the preparation of educational leaders who have the capacity to affect all other elements. Major reforms were called for throughout the process of preparing and licensing school leaders of the future.

One problem an institution encounters when evaluating its own program for possible reform is the lack of an accurate, overall picture of the program in its present form. Because of this, there exists the likelihood that changes will be introduced based on minimal information, individual perceptions, or the will of particular staff members. Furthermore, this random, individual approach to evaluation and change precludes the possibility of true reform taking place across multiple institutions. What is needed is the use of a systematic approach through which institutions can gather information about the content of their programs and the instructional treatment of that content (National Association of Secondary School Principals [NASSP], 1985).

The Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan by using the rating exercises and process described in the monograph by the NASSP (1985) consortium for the performance-based preparation of principals. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do the programs develop the generic skills required of principals?

2. To what extent do the programs develop the specific skills required of principals?

3. What are the dominant methods of instruction throughout the programs?

Importance of the Study

The great call for educational reform heard during the 1980s has focused attention on programs that prepare principals. Reports by such organizations as the Southern Regional Education Board (1986) and NCEEA (1987) have called for a review of the content and methods of principal preparation programs by state agencies, professional organizations, and by the institutions themselves. Hoyle (1985) stated that it was necessary to scrutinize programs "to establish and monitor program quality. Programs should employ assessment mechanisms that use systematically derived information on both current students and graduates as the basis of modifying program content and

methods" (p. 86).

Hoyle's (1985) call to analyze the content and methods in preparation programs is made even more specific by a 1986 Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation (MAPP) project proposal which lists as one of its first-year objectives to "use the analysis system described in the NASSP publication, Performance-Based Preparation of Principals, and cross-reference content and skills to generic skills" (p. 6). This study then will help to answer the calls of Hoyle and the MAPP by systematically analyzing the content and the methods of instruction at Michigan institutions that are involved in principal preparation. With this information in hand, the institutions--individually, as well as collectively--can more accurately plan to reform their programs so that they are more relevant and effective.

Assumptions

1. The assumption was made that the rating exercises have content validity because of their development by a jury of experts.

2. The assumption was made, according to the directions given for the rating exercises, that the use of consensus discussion serves in place of reliability.

Limitations

1. Principal preparation programs in the state of Michigan only were considered for this study.

2. Not all of the institutions in the population participated in the study.

3. Differences in the way that the same courses may have been presented by different instructors may not have been recognized by the raters.

4. Graduate raters might not be aware of program changes that have occurred since they left the institution.

5. Since all responses are subjective, the integrity of the final report depends on the raters' thorough understanding of terms and their sincerity of response.

6. The accuracy of the final report from each institution can be affected by the skill of the director in bringing the raters to consensus.

7. Of the many elements involved in the study of the principalship, only preparation programs were considered in this study.

8. The rating results were unique for each institution and, although aggregated for use in this study, should not necessarily be generalized to other institutions or to other departments within the institution.

Definition of Terms

Consensus: the process through which individual ratings are consolidated into a group rating that best reflects the responses of the group.

Generic skills: those skills which are generally required in many similar roles, but are not unique to any specific role.

Liaison: the individual staff member from each institution who takes responsibility for completing the rating process at his or her

institution.

Methods of instruction: the distinct mode(s) used by the instructor to present knowledge or experiences.

Performance-based: programs that stress "doing," the practical application of knowledge and skills.

Preparation program: all structured activities provided for an individual prior to his or her initial appointment to a principalship.

Raters: individuals--faculty, students, and graduates--who were asked to describe the preparation program at a particular institution.

Specific skills: those skills that are considered unique to a particular role.

Outline of the Study

Chapter I has included background information, a statement of the purpose of the study as well as its importance, major limitations, and the definition of key terms. In Chapter II a review of the literature pertinent to the problem area is presented in order to lay the groundwork for this study. The use of the instrument chosen for this study and the organizational methods are described in Chapter III. Chapter IV includes the final reports describing the program at each institution. Finally, in Chapter V, the earlier chapters are reiterated, the survey results are summarized, conclusions are drawn, and questions are set forth for further investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan by using the rating exercises described in the monograph by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 1985) consortium for the performance-based preparation of principals. The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature pertinent to the topic with two objectives in mind.

The first objective of this review of literature is to indicate why principal preparation is an important topic in the 1980s, especially in the state of Michigan. Factors to be discussed under this objective are the development of new certification standards for principals, the need for a large number of new principals, and the principal's role in the nationwide call for excellent schools. The second objective is to indicate that there must be change in the preparation of prospective principals and to demonstrate that the change needs to be toward a more performance-based program.

The Importance of Principal Preparation

Certification Standards

The first official certification of school principals occurred in 1911 and was intended to protect the public against incompetents

(Higley, 1975). The certification mandate and the specific requirements for certification have remained within the jurisdiction of the individual states. Every state except Michigan has long had at least minimal requirements for the certification of school principals.

In surveys by Burks (1986) and Gousha, LoPresti, and Jones (1986) the typical requirements for principal certification include 3 years of teaching experience, attainment of a master's degree, and completion of an "approved program." Most often state certification departments specify content courses to be included in preparation programs. Each institution in the state is free to meet these specific requirements in its own fashion. When an institution presents its plan to the state, it is then considered to be an approved program, and all of those who complete it are considered eligible for certification (Kelley, 1986).

From 1911 to the 1980s, certification agencies often acted merely as gatekeepers, letting through everyone who had accumulated sufficient course credits. This process does not necessarily consider whether the candidate has the requisite skills and knowledge to be a competent administrator. Nor does it consider whether the approved program that the candidate completed was validly related to the real world which he or she is preparing to enter. This process simply recognizes that the candidate has been persistent enough to obtain the required number of paper credits.

Certification of principals must mean more than simply the accumulation of course credits. Certification should prove that the candidate has truly been judged to have the skills and knowledge that

will be expected of a competent administrator. Through such elements as field based experiences, internships, tests, and assessment programs, a more accurate judgment can be made. Many state agencies have recognized the need to make certification more meaningful by incorporating elements that are performance-based.

An extensive study of certification standards by Gousha et al. (1986) provided data related to performance-based elements across the United States. Twenty states defined specific competencies which are required to obtain certification. Thirteen states required some form of examination prior to certification, whether it be nationally standardized or a creation of the individual state. Some form of field experience or internship was required by 26 states. Perhaps most importantly, 9 states required a performance assessment of prospective principals; and more states were either considering or have proposed the same. Working papers from this study include the following examples of policy:

Pennsylvania: The institutions of higher learning will assess the candidate at admission to determine the potential of success and the needs of the applicant. The assessment will evaluate areas of decisiveness, judgment, leadership, oral and written communication, organizational ability, personal motivation, and problem analysis.

South Carolina: Beginning with the school year 1985-86 any person being considered for appointment as principal must be assessed for his or her instructional leadership and management capabilities by the Assessment Center of the South Carolina Department of Education.

Florida: Certification of school administrators requires successful completion of written testing, an internship, assessment of on-the-job performance, and three levels of certification.

While the number of states that had as of 1986 incorporated into their certification requirements any or all of these performance-based elements--specific competencies, examination, field experience, and assessment--was still small, in each case that number had increased during the previous year. States are actively seeking to upgrade the requirements for principal certification, and certificate-recommending institutions must commit resources and activities to realistic and relevant programs for administrative preparation (Association of Washington School Principals, 1984).

By 1961 all of the states other than Michigan had some requirements for principal certification. In Michigan there had been absolutely no requirements; in fact, it was not even legally necessary that the principal be a certified teacher. Specific requirements were left to the discretion of the hiring districts. This changed in 1988, however. The state legislature passed Public Act 163 which authorized and required the state board of education to develop certification standards for all superintendents, principals, and assistant principals which were effective July 1, 1988. The board of education determined the educational and professional requirements for certification and promulgated all the rules necessary to implement this new policy.

The Need for More Principals

Surveys (Angus, 1986) have indicated that a large number of the present administrators in Michigan's public schools would be eligible for retirement by the end of 1989. The normal aging process has been enhanced by numbers of administrators taking advantage of retirement incentives offered by the state, such as the "Rule of 80," which allows individuals to retire with a combination of age and years of service totaling 80. Another incentive available as of January 1987 was the Member Investment Plan which allowed members of the retirement system to invest personal funds in return for the opportunity to retire earlier and with larger monthly benefits.

In the spring of 1986 the Bureau of Accreditation and School Improvement Studies (BASIS) surveyed Michigan's school administrators to determine not only their retirement plans but also their plans for career changes during the next 5 years. The results were summarized by Angus (1986). In Tables 1 and 2, the rank of "other" has been eliminated from the original results. This rank was not clearly defined and many of the positions included are not universally thought of as administrators; but more importantly, the response rate from this group was too limited to be considered representative.

Table 1 shows the number of administrators in Michigan by rank as well as their response rate on this survey, which was distributed to the membership of professional organizations in the state. The totals suggest that the survey can be considered as fairly representing the future plans of present administrators.

Table 1

Comparison by Rank of Michigan Administrators With Survey Respondents

Rank	A Michigan administrators		B Survey respondents		B/A
	N	%	n	%	%
Superintendent	568	9.9	493	17.7	86.8
Assistant supt.	212	3.7	128	4.6	60.4
Other central office	783	13.7			
Secondary principal	1,050	18.4	845	30.5	80.5
Elementary principal	1,816	31.8	791	28.6	43.6
Assistant principal	1,278	22.5	517	18.6	40.5
Total	5,707	100.0		100.0	48.6

Note. From "Retirement Plans of Michigan School Administrators" by D. L. Angus, 1986, Secondary Education Today: The Journal of the MASSP, 27(3), p. 2.

Table 2 provides the most telling information from the BASIS (cited in Angus, 1986) survey. Respondents were asked if they "planned to leave the profession"--retire, leave the state, leave the profession, return to teaching--or "planned to leave the district"--retire, leave the state, leave the profession, leave the district. Nearly half of the present administrators who responded to the survey plan to leave the profession within the next 5 years and over 70% will be leaving their district.

Table 2

Five-Year Career Plans of Survey Respondents by Rank

Job title		Plan to leave the profession		Plan to leave the district	
	n	n	%	n	%
Superintendent	493	262	53.1	395	80.1
Assistant supt.	128	58	45.3	89	69.5
Secondary principal	845	404	47.8	598	70.8
Elementary principal	791	387	48.9	536	67.8
Assistant principal	517	214	41.4	340	65.8
Total	2,774	1,325	47.7	1,958	70.6

Note. From "Retirement Plans of Michigan School Administrators" by D. L. Angus, 1986, Secondary Education Today: The Journal of the MASSP, 27(3), p. 5.

A later report by the Michigan Department of Education (1987) corroborates the likely exodus of administrators from the profession. This report considered only those administrators eligible to retire between 1987 and 1991. Approximately 68% of those eligible are "very likely" to retire and another 18% "possibly" will retire. This total of 86% represents nearly 4,200 administrators, or 60% of all those serving Michigan schools in 1987.

The massive turnover suggested by these surveys has important implications for principal preparation. Over the next 5 years an unusually high number of school districts will be selecting administrators to lead their schools for the next generation. The quality

of the choices made by these districts will depend, certainly, on their selection process, but even more importantly on the quality of the preparation received by those who make up the pool of candidates. University programs designed to prepare and certify school administrators will be in great demand. This environment provides not only the opportunity but also the obligation for the directors of principal preparation programs to assess the quality and the relevance of their present offerings in order to make whatever changes are necessary to insure that the pool of candidates is filled by those who have the requisite skills to be effective leaders.

The Principal's Role in Excellent Schools

Throughout the history of American education, schools have been buffeted by criticisms and demands for change. Particularly because control of schools rests at the state and local levels, there exists a myriad of voices--often in conflict with one another--demanding that their specific interests be met. There have been calls for "back to basics" as well as problem solving, comprehensive high schools as well as alternative schools, greater discipline as well as more humanistic education, and higher standards as well as minimum competencies. Such dichotomous needs and directions as these present a considerable dilemma to school leaders--one that is intensified when the multitude of local issues and concerns are added to the picture. While attempting to be responsive to local or special interests, school leaders must also be responsible for promoting that which is best for their students.

Periodically, however, social, political, or economic events galvanize the efforts of individuals or organizations in a demand for reform that takes on nationwide importance. An example was "Education for All American Youth," a 1944 report from the Education Policies Commission (cited in National School Public Relations Association, 1984, p. 1) which encouraged that all students have some vocational education and that there be an expanded role for education for everyone through high school. Another example of reform occurred in the late 1950s following the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik I. Acting on widespread concern, Congress in 1958 passed the National Defense Education Act which provided a billion dollar commitment to making American education more effective, particularly in the areas of mathematics, science, and foreign languages. This concern for national defense and national pride created an extensive search for school effectiveness.

The study of and responsibility for developing effective schools was contradicted by the Coleman et al. (1966) report which concluded that schools did not make a difference in student achievement. Differences in achievement were said to be almost exclusively a result of family background and home environment. Coleman's et al. conclusions have been largely discredited by further study, and most researchers now agree that schools do indeed have the potential to be effective and make a difference in the achievement levels of all students.

Many studies done in the 1970s and 1980s support the impact of effective schools. In parallel reviews Shoemaker and Fraser (1981)

and Sweeney (1982) discussed several well-known studies: Weber's (1971) study of inner city children was one of the first benchmarks in proving that some schools were more effective than others in educating students of similar background. An extensive study of London schools by Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Outson, and Smith (1979) also demonstrated that schools serving children of similar backgrounds, with similar intellect, in nearby neighborhoods often achieve results that are dramatically different. They concluded that considering the amount of time children spend in school, it would be irrational to suggest that this tremendous amount of time has no effect on their development. The concept that different schools do achieve their goals is further borne out in studies by Austin (1978); Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979); Edmonds (1978); Madden (1976); and others.

Few studies involving effective schools have explicitly set out to evaluate the principal's role. Typically, however, one of the items that surfaced repeatedly in differentiating between effective and less effective schools was the work of the principal. McCurdy (1983) stated that a crucial item for the "long-term health of public education is the new consensus among practitioners, researchers, and leading policy makers that the principalship holds one of the most important keys to excellence in schools" (p. 5).

While no one factor accounts for particular schools being categorized as effective or excellent, there tends to be a common and overlapping group of factors which do make a difference. The work of the principal is always included among the critical factors, and he

or she has the capacity to affect most of the others. Cohen (1981) surveyed the research and developed the following list of five characteristics of effective schools, a list which was closely duplicated by Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) in a separate survey: (a) strong administrative leadership, especially in instructional matters; (b) school climate conducive to learning, one that is safe and orderly; (c) schoolwide emphasis on basic skills instruction based on staff consensus of that approach as the primary goal; (d) teacher expectations that students are capable of reaching high levels of academic achievement; and (e) a system for monitoring and assessing pupil performance that is tied to the school's instructional objectives.

Other researchers have also spoken in support of these five characteristics: (a) Effective principals tend to be men and women with very strong personalities. They are forceful, dynamic, and have a high energy level (Egerton, 1977). Their leadership is most evident in the area of instruction. In high achieving schools, principals are able to stress teaching strategies and behaviors that are helpful in attaining academic excellence (Brookover et al., 1979). (b) The "Safe Schools" report (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978) concluded that successful schools had an order that was firm, fair, and consistent and that the principal was largely responsible for creating that order. Kelley (1980) stated that "Many principals do not realize the extent of the power they exercise and the mediating influence, for good or for bad, which their words and actions have on their faculties" (p. 53). (c) In effective schools, attainment of basic skills is considered a

priority and a conscious effort to encourage time on task is maintained. Lipham (1981) noted that "when the goals of the school are clear and perceived as important, and when the staff is committed to them, successful schools result" (p. 3). (d) Perhaps the most frequently noted characteristic of effective schools is that there exists a high expectation of achievement. All studies confirm the relationship between expectations and achievement. The principal is responsible for establishing high expectations of teachers; teachers in turn must establish high expectations for the students, and these students more often than not will then live up to these expectations. (e) It is not enough merely to have high expectations and clear goals for the students; it is also necessary to evaluate progress toward these goals. Research on effective schools shows that "in high achieving schools instructional objectives guide the programs, and testing and evaluation are given serious and deliberate attention" (Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981, p. 181).

Whereas previous research tended to focus on factors such as teaching strategies, curriculum, textbooks, and societal conditions in studying schools, more and more the spotlight is now on the role of the principal. Edmonds (1979) said that "one of the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools is strong administrative leadership" (p. 32). A report by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB, 1983) concluded that "the success or failure of a public school depends more on the principal than on any other single factor" (p. 20). A clear statement on the importance of the principalship came from the Senate Select Committee on Equal

Educational Opportunity (1970):

> In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He is the person responsible for all of the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is his leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. He is the main link between school and the community and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school. If a school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place; if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching; if students are performing to the best of their ability one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success. (p. 305)

The decade of the 1980s may prove to be one of the most dramatic times for educational reform in our country's history. Never before has there been such widespread public and political interest in the needs of education. The National School Public Relations Association (1984) stated that "the call for reform has never been broader and the needs of education have never been better documented" (p. 10). The effective schools research and several national reports and studies focused on excellence in education. The report that has most focused public attention on quality schools is A Nation at Risk sponsored by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), which stated that:

> The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people. If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. (p. 1)

Many other reports, including High School: A Report on American Secondary Education (Boyer, 1983), Action for Excellence (Education

Commission of the States, 1984), and A Place Called School (Goodlad, 1984), intensified the call for excellence to such a degree that nearly every state board of education and most local boards drafted action plans in response. Whether or not the many reports were always on target, the reform mandate they spawned has never been stronger: "The education reform movement has moved faster than any public policy reform in modern history. All the states have expanded their school improvement programs" (Odden, 1986, p. 335).

Whether it's called effectiveness or excellence, Americans clearly want something more from their schools than what has been the norm. The call for reform in the 1980s has the strength and breadth of a revolution. As indicated previously, the central figures in any such movement have to be school principals. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1983) states that "a revolution requires competent, skilled, visionary leadership as has never been available before. Revolutions occur because of, not in spite of, leadership" (p. xvi).

The Need for Change to Performance-Based Preparation

Preparation programs for principals are described as "obsolescent, stuck in a 1960's time warp" (Thompson, 1986, p. 22), "an unintegrated collection of content-oriented courses. Performance in them may or may not be predictive of on-the-job performance" (Kelley, 1986, p. 48) and as having "little direct correspondence between formal course work and on-the-job capability as an administrator" (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. 260). Colleges of education are

responsible for the preservice training of principals and continue to find themselves under fire from both the public and from practicing principals who say that their preparation was not relevant.

The level of dissatisfaction with the content and instructional methods of courses for preparing principals is exemplified by the following statements which span more than 25 years. The 1960 yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators reported:

> The mediocrity of programs of preparation comes from the sterility of methods reported. Instruction is classroom bound; administration is talked about rather than observed, felt, and in these and other ways actually experienced. Where the student should be "scared" by exposure to the facts of administrative life, he is instead bored by the tame fare of second-hand success stories. (p. 83)

In a review of principal preparation programs across the country conducted in the mid-1970s, Silver and Spuck (1978) surveyed more than 300 university-based programs offering degrees in school administration from the master's through the doctoral level. The primary mode of instruction continued to be classroom lecture and discussion with groups ranging from 10 to 30. Interviews with students indicated that other methods of instruction, such as simulations, role playing, case study, computers, etc., were not at all prevalent although the professors suggested that they were making effective use of such methods.

A survey of over 15,000 school districts was conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (1978). District superintendents were questioned to obtain their perceptions of school administrator training, particularly with regard to the need for more extensive or improved training opportunities in 14 selected areas and

to evaluate preservice training according to relevance of course content and quality of instruction.

Of the superintendents surveyed, 10% expressed an "urgent" need for more extensive or improved training opportunities in eight areas. The superintendents expressed a "moderate" need across all 14 areas. When these categories are combined, a broad range of training needs for principals is quite apparent.

When asked to judge the relevance of course content in preservice programs at universities for promoting on-the-job effectiveness, 12% of the superintendents described it as "excellent," 49% as "adequate," and 23% as "needs major improvement." When asked to judge the quality of instruction, 15% of the superintendents described it as "excellent," 50% as "adequate," and 19% as "needs major improvement." While half of the superintendents found preservice preparation programs for administrators to be "adequate," adequate is not sufficient as schools strive for excellence. Even more importantly, fewer administrators found preparation programs to be excellent than those who found such programs to be seriously deficient.

In a discussion of principal preparation programs, the SREB (1986) described one state survey in which only 25% of the graduates from preparation programs indicated that the program helped to develop needed skills while the faculty members involved overwhelmingly said that the necessary skills had been developed. Later, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) issued a report on the quality of educational leadership in the country. The Commission was troubled by aspects of principal

preparation programs, especially the "lack of programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators and the lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experiences in preparation programs" (p. xviii).

While exemplary preparation programs for principals do exist and while great change is taking place in this "dynamic field" (Gousha et al., 1986), the overriding concern is that the same complaints that were voiced 25 years ago still exist today. By and large, programs are too theoretical, are not related to nor do they enhance performance on the job, and the instructional methods used fail to incorporate all that is known about effective pedagogy. When the traditional instructional mode of lecture and discussion remains dominant, it suggests that those involved in principal preparation are not themselves demonstrating instructional leadership. Worse yet, as indicated previously, the instructors too often fail to recognize that these future principals have found their preparation to be irrelevant and the methods used to be ineffective.

If the preparation of school principals is to become relevant, then programs must be based on the recognition and the development of those skills which are required of administrators. The Southern Regional Education Board (1983) recommended that the assessment of behaviors which characterize effective principals should be used as part of the selection process for individuals in administration programs, while Goodlad (1984) stated that "we found most of the school principals of the participating schools lacked major skills and abilities required for effecting educational improvement"

(p. 306). Another SREB (1986) report stated that principal effectiveness is not related to such variables as experience, gender, style, or grade point average; but rather it is determined by the degree to which the principal has mastered a core of skills.

A discussion of skills might suggest that there exists an absolute, definitive list of skills that characterize effective principals. In fact, the literature contains many lists; most of which have at least some common elements even if the terminology differs. One of the older and better known discussions of leadership skills was formulated by Katz (1955). He said that successful administration is predicated on three basic skills: (a) Technical--the understanding of and proficiency in methods, procedures, and techniques of education; required of administrators lower in the hierarchy. (b) Human--the ability to work effectively and efficiently with people both one-to-one and in groups; required of all administrators. (c) Conceptual--the ability to see schools, district, and programs as a whole; required of administrators higher in the hierarchy. This simple explanation has proven valuable as a starting point to more detailed discussions of leadership skills.

The American Association of School Administrators (1982) stated that preparation programs must enable school leaders to demonstrate the application of the following skills:

1. To establish and maintain a positive and open learning environment.

2. To build strong local, state, and national support for curriculum.

3. To develop and deliver an effective curriculum.

4. To develop and implement effective models/modes of instructional delivery.

5. To create programs of continuous improvement, including evaluation.

6. To skillfully manage school system operations and facilities.

7. To conduct and make use of significant research.

Thornton and Byham's (1982) book on assessment centers identified the following list of common managerial dimensions:

> Oral communication, oral presentation, written communication, planning and organizing, delegation control, development of subordinates, organizational sensitivity, extra-organizational sensitivity, organizational awareness, extraorganizational awareness, sensitivity, leadership, recognition of employee safety needs, analysis, judgment, creativity, risk-taking, decisiveness, technical and professional knowledge, energy, range of interests, initiative, tolerance for stress, adaptability, integrity, work standards, resilience, and practical learning. (p. 138).

Yet another set of skills--and one consistently used in this study--comes from the NASSP's (1985) Assessment Center program. The following are considered to be "generic" skills for school administrators:

1. Problem analysis--data collection and analysis.

2. Judgment--critical evaluation and decision making.

3. Organizational ability--planning and scheduling personnel and resources.

4. Decisiveness--acting when a decision is needed.

5. Leadership--guiding others to act.

6. Sensitivity--awareness of others' needs.

7. Stress tolerance--performing under pressure.

8. Oral communication--speaking skills.

9. Written communication--writing skills.

10. Range of interests--awareness of and competence to discuss a variety of subjects.

11. Personal motivation--task and goal orientation.

12. Educational values--a consistent educational philosophy and openness to change. (p. 6)

Largely as a result of the attention being given to school improvement and to the principal's role in that improvement, more is now known about the knowledge and skills required of effective principals than ever before. Those involved in principal preparation must, therefore, use this information in creating programs that develop competency as a first priority. The concept of competence as used here was defined in a NASSP report in 1975:

> Competence can be measured only through an accumulation of evidence, over time, that an individual is able to apply knowledge and perform certain functions or skills in ways which are, more often than not, perceived positively by both the individual and his audiences. A person is not competent because of what he knows, does, or feels; he is competent when what he knows, does, or feels is evaluated as being positive in its results and is part of his consistent behavior as a human being. (p. 11).

In order to meet this definition of competence, candidates will need many opportunities to perform. Competence cannot be developed by reading about it or by hearing others speak of it. This is not to conclude that there shouldn't be an emphasis on the academic knowledge-based preparation of principals. Certainly there exists a body of knowledge, history, and theories that should be expected of all principals. Mastery of the academic presentations of the

classroom is not enough, however; school leadership is a field of action that requires competent performance. In discussing the need for programs to develop skills instead of just imparting knowledge, Griffiths (1977) stated:

> Since the purpose of the program is to prepare administrators who can act when confronted with problems or situations, the instructional program should stress "doing" rather than passive listening. This means that the substance of the program should be taught through or concurrently with appropriate cases, games, simulations, or role playing, and other activities. Teaching should be such that potential administrators constantly use what they are being taught. (p. 433).

Programs that stress "doing" are considered to be performance-based. NASSP (1985) called performance-based components "the activities or experiences that require application of knowledge and skills and explicit demonstration of performance by participation in simulations, practica, and internships" (p. 7). This list of performance-based activities is not complete--it could include assessment centers, role playing, management games, and others that validly relate to the real world of school administration; nor is the call for performance-based preparation new. Wynn (1972) described a move to "reality centered" methods in the 1960s, in part due to the example being set in other professions, an emphasis on the science of management, the growing gap between the principles and the practice of administration, and finally by the founding of the University Council for Educational Administration which was becoming very active in developing new methods and materials. Silver and Spuck (1978) discovered that one of the dominant changes in principal preparation programs that was projected to continue was the trend toward

increased use of competency based formats.

The nationwide demands for excellence in education have focused attention on the role and the preparation of administrators. Increasingly, recent reports (Daresh & LaPlant, 1983; Hoyle, 1985; NASSP, 1985; NCEEA, 1987; SREB, 1986) have called for that preparation to be performance-based. In fact, the discussion is no longer whether or not preparation should be performance-based. The questions now concern the best methods, the quality, and the intensity of performance-based preparation. Only when these questions are answered will principals for the next generation be prepared to effectively lead excellent schools.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study is to analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan. In order to analyze programs for the preparation of school administrators, particularly in determining the degree to which such programs are performance based, it is first necessary to have an accurate picture of the extant programs. The purpose of this chapter then is to outline, in narrative form, the methods used to generate a descriptive case study of the principal preparation programs at the institutions of higher education within the state of Michigan (a more detailed list of procedures is contained in Appendix A). The intent was not to evaluate the programs, but rather only to faithfully describe them.

Because of such factors as the new guidelines for certifying school administrators, the massive turnover among school administrators expected during the 1980s, and the intense public interest in renewal and excellence in education, universities that have principal preparation programs have gained attention. This attention led to a Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation (MAPP) proposal for funding to the Kellogg Foundation in 1986 which included among its objectives "to study the content, objectives, and outcomes of preparation programs. Use the analysis system described in the NASSP

publication, Performance-Based Preparation of Principals, and cross-reference content and skills to generic skills included in the NASSP Assessment Center" (p. 6). The member institutions of MAPP are Central Michigan University, Eastern Michigan University, Grand Valley State College, Northern Michigan University, Oakland University, University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and Western Michigan University.

General Procedures

The first contact with the member universities and the prospective participants in this project took place at a MAPP meeting in December 1986. At this meeting a general description of the program, its purposes, and the methods for carrying it out were discussed; and each university was asked to identify a member of the department of educational leadership who would serve as a liaison in continuing contacts with that university. An explanation of the three-step process for program analysis developed by the University Consortium (NASSP, 1985) was explained as detailed in this chapter.

In October 1987, a formal proposal (see Appendix B) was submitted to MAPP requesting its endorsement of the study. At its November meeting the MAPP Coordinating Council granted approval as well as funding for the project (see Appendix C). Following this approval, individual meetings were arranged with the liaisons from participating institutions. At these meetings the liaisons were provided with an overview of the study and their responsibilities as well as a sample packet of information for the raters (see Appendices

D and E). Along with copies of Performance-Based Preparation of Principals (NASSP, 1985), this information fully explained the process and defined performance-based activities, generic and specific skills, methods of instruction, and degrees of treatment.

The liaisons were responsible for developing a listing of the classes or activities that define the preparation program at their institutions. This listing was not intended to reflect all departmental offerings nor all classes required for a particular degree, but rather was to be those classes required or recommended for someone specifically preparing for the principalship. Course descriptions were also to be provided.

Rules enacted by the Michigan Department of Education (1988) for the certification of administrators after June 1988 required that applicants have at least 20 semester hours in an state board-approved program in school administration which included at least the following components: leadership, instructional supervision, curriculum development, school improvement, school finance, school law, personnel management, community relations, and adult and community education. In order to provide further information as to how each institution's present program would meet these requirements, liaisons were asked to list classes under the most appropriate component area.

A critical task of the liaison was the selection of the team of raters. This team consisted of two faculty members, two graduates, and two students. In all cases it is vital to select raters whose input will be most knowledgeable and relevant to the purposes of this study. The faculty members, therefore, should be familiar with the

entire program over a number of years and most particularly should be involved in classes directly related to the principalship. The graduates should have attended within the past 5 years and should now hold a position of school leadership. Graduates who have not yet had the opportunity to test their preparation against the real world of the principalship should not be selected. The students should be nearing completion so that they will be familiar with most of the program at their institution. After the team was selected, the liaisons were responsible for familiarizing them with the process and distributing the informational materials that were provided.

After the matrices were prepared and the team of raters were thoroughly informed regarding their role, the matrices were distributed and independently completed by the raters. When the individual ratings were done, the liaison and the director scheduled a meeting with the raters to discuss their responses and to arrive at a consensus rating that best represented the opinion of the group. This process resulted in a final report that faithfully described the status of each program and laid the groundwork for further investigation and analysis.

Development of Matrices

The description of the program at each university was focused through the use of three matrices. Matrix 1 included a vertical listing of each program's required courses organized around the components of the Michigan certification code. The horizontal grid consisted of those skills that are generally necessary in many roles

but are not specific to any one role. The list of "generic skills" used were those established by the NASSP (1985) Assessment Center:

> Problem analysis--Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose. . . .
>
> Judgment--Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications. . . .
>
> Organizational ability--Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time. . . .
>
> Decisiveness--Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly. . . .
>
> Leadership--Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task. . . .
>
> Sensitivity--Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom. . . .
>
> Stress tolerance--Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet. . . .
>
> Oral communication--Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas. . . .
>
> Written communication--Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al. . . .
>
> Range of interest--Competence to discuss a variety of subjects--educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events. . . .

> Personal motivation--Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing. . . .
>
> Educational values--Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change. (p. 32-35)

These skills identified in the NASSP (1985) list were part of a 3-year study (Schmitt et al., 1983) which validated the organization's assessment center project. Of the many elements considered in Schmitt's study, one of the most important was the issue of content validity--the degree to which the skills identified in the NASSP list are deemed necessary for at least satisfactory performance on the job.

A group of "experts"--practitioners and trainers--were asked to describe the degree to which the assessment center skills were "necessary" or "essential" for performance of a list of agreed upon tasks commonly associated with the principalship. A simple statistical procedure was used to determine the content validity ratio (CVR). CVRs range from +1.00 to -1.00. A CVR of +1.00 would mean that all the experts indicated that a particular skill was necessary or essential for successful completion of the task in question. At the other extreme a CVR of -1.00 would mean that none of the experts indicated that the particular skill was necessary or essential for successful completion of the task in question. A CVR of 0.50 would then mean that half of the experts indicated support for a particular skill.

Appendix F demonstrated that 9 of the 12 areas were determined to be highly related to the wide range of administrative tasks and the remaining three were related to at least one task. Schmitt's

(1982) study concluded then that the skill items list suggested by the NASSP can be defended on the basis of its content validity.

Raters (who will be discussed later) were then asked to indicate which, if any, generic skills were treated in the various courses. The rater indicated the degree of treatment as "F" = familiar with content or skill for discussion purposes, "U" = understanding of content or skill for teaching others, "A" = application of content or skill in real or simulated situations, or "N" = no emphasis.

Matrix 2 included the same vertical listing of the program content areas as in Matrix 1, but the horizontal grid this time consisted of the more specific skills that comprise the tasks and functions of school administrators. Raters were again asked to indicate which specific skills were treated in the various courses and whether that treatment was at the level of familiarity, understanding, or application.

The list of specific skills was taken from Fitzgerald, Schmitt, and Merritt's (1979) work for the validation of the NASSP Assessment Center. Their task inventory was developed by reviewing administrator job descriptions; by interviewing elementary, junior and senior high school personnel across the country in urban, suburban, and rural settings; and by then mailing the list of tasks to a randomly selected group of administrators for additions or deletions. An initial list of nearly 1,000 task statements was finally edited into a list of 160 tasks that were then sorted into one of nine specific skill dimensions (see Appendix H).

The purpose of Matrix 3 was to identify the instruction mode(s) that existed within the preparation program. Once again the vertical listing of courses was used. The raters were asked to select the primary (1) and any secondary (2) modes by which instruction took place. The nine distinct modes of instruction selected for the university consortium model were taken from the research of McCleary and McIntyre (1972). (See Figure 1.)

McCleary and McIntyre's (1972) work was an attempt to discuss the different methods of instruction and to indicate the most appropriate and effective methods for achieving the three levels of learning (F, U, and A). The various methods listed here are not universally defined or completely discrete; in fact, the NASSP (1985) list is a distillation of this group. Furthermore, there is very little valid research on the different instructional methods; and certainly the teaching and learning process is more subtle than merely selecting a method from a chart. Nonetheless, it is safe to say that certain methods tend to be (or are usually considered to be) more productive for different types and levels of learning.

The horizontal listings would be the same for each university. Using just a sample of a possible vertical column, the matrices would look like Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Individual Ratings

The matrices were first completed individually by the raters. Each rater determined if the various generic skills (Matrix 1) and specific skills (Matrix 2) had been treated in each course and, if

	Levels of learning		
	Familiarity	Understanding	Application
Reading	High	Med.	Low
Lecture	Med.	Med.	Low
Discussion	Med.	Med.	Low
Field trip	Med.	Low	Low
Case	Low	High	Low
Scenario	Low	High	Low
Individualized instructional package	Low	High	Low
Computer-assisted instruction	Low	High	Low
Tutorial	Low	Med.	Low
Student research	Low	Med.	Low
Laboratory approach	Low	High	Med.
Gaming	Low	High	Med.
Simulation	Low	High	High
Human relations training	Low	High	High
Clinical study	Low	High	High
Team research	Low	High	High
Internship	Low	Med.	High

Figure 1. Methods of Instruction.
From "Competency Development and University Methodology" by L. E. McCleary and K. E. McIntyre, 1972, NASSP Bulletin, 56(362), p. 58.

"High, Medium, Low--Extent to which the method, when competently employed, tends to be practical and effective in learning the designated skills at the levels desired" (McCleary & McIntyre, 1972, p. 58).

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic skills: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
1. Curriculum Development School curriculum													
2. School Improvement Supervision and improvement of instruction													
3. School Finance Public school finance													
4. School Law Legal aspects of education													
5. Community Relations School and community relations													

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Figure 2. Matrix 1, Generic Skills.

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
1. Curriculum Development School curriculum										
2. School Improvement Supervision and improvement of instruction										
3. School Finance Public school finance										
4. School Law Legal aspects of education										
5. Community Relations School and community relations										

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Figure 3. Matrix 2, Specific Skills.

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
1. Curriculum Development School curriculum										
2. School Improvement Supervision and improvement of instruction										
3. School Finance Public school finance										
4. School Law Legal aspects of education										
5. Community Relations School and community relations										

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

Figure 4. Matrix 3, Instructional Modes.

so, whether the treatment had been at the level of F (familiarity), U (understanding), or A (application). In similar fashion the raters then used Matrix 3 to describe the instruction mode by which each area was treated.

Consensus

This essential step in establishing an accurate description of the total program at each university took place at a meeting of all the raters. Each rater was given a summary showing the range of responses that were given during the individual rating process. Through the process of discussing the findings, clarifying definitions, and further explaining individual positions, a degree of consensus was reached. Findings that were agreed upon by at least four of the raters were retained. The final report then represented the most faithful description of the program.

In order to provide a greater depth of information, rater responses on Matrices 1 and 2 were assigned values as follows: N = 0, F = 1, U = 2, and A = 3. In this way it was possible to note any differences in strength between similar letter ratings after consensus discussions.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan. The findings are reported in this chapter and are organized around the three specific questions which the study sought to answer:

1. To what extent do the programs develop the generic skills required of principals?

2. To what extent do the programs develop the specific skills required of principals?

3. What are the dominant methods of instruction throughout the program?

In the first section of this chapter the collection of ratings is introduced from the individual universities that participated: Grand Valley State University, Northern Michigan University, Oakland University, University of Michigan, and Western Michigan University. This is followed by the presentation of the aggregated findings from the five universities.

University Findings

Through the use of exercises developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985) Consortium for the

Performance-Based Preparation of Principals, a team of raters from each university were asked to individually describe classes in the program for preparing principals at their institution and then to meet for a consensus discussion intended to arrive at a final, single rating in each area.

In consensus discussions regarding the first two questions, the following decision rules prevailed:

1. After the consensus discussion a particular rating was assigned to any skill which had been so rated by at least four of the six raters.

2. If, even after the consensus discussion, fewer than four of the six raters were in agreement, this procedure was followed:

a. Individual ratings were assigned values:

N (None) = 0

F (Familiarity) = 1

U (Understanding) = 2

A (Application) = 3

b. These individual values were then totaled for the six raters and a final rating was given according to these ranges:

N (None) = 0-3

F (Familiarity) = 4-9

U (Understanding) = 10-15

A (Application) = 16-18

3. In any instances where an individual rater was unable to rate a particular class, the rating given by that rater's counterpart was repeated.

Generic Skills--Universities

The findings with regard to generic skills from each of the five universities in the study are presented in Appendix I. The information presented includes the individual responses of the raters (listed in this order: two faculty members, two graduates, and two students), the total value given to their responses, and the consensus rating given to each area. If the consensus rating was arrived at by using Decision Rule 2, which was previously cited, it is so indicated by an asterisk (*).

Specific Skills--Universities

The findings with regard to specific skills from each of the five universities in the study are presented in Appendix J. The information is presented in the same manner as for the generic skills.

Methods of Instruction--Universities

The findings with regard to methods of instruction from each of the five universities in the study are presented in Appendix K. The method of instruction most frequently identified by the raters as the primary method is indicated by a 1. Any method of instruction identified by at least two of the raters as a secondary method is indicated by a 2.

Aggregated Findings

In order to aggregate the findings from the individual universities, an earlier decision rule, which was based on having six raters, was extended to accommodate the fact that there were now varying numbers of responses in each area. To arrive at a consensus rating at each institution, individual ratings were assigned a value from 0 to 3 (column a) and the values were added together to determine the consensus rating (column b). Dividing these ranges by 6, the number of raters, creates a range for individual ratings (column c). Based on these ranges, the total value of the ratings in any area of the matrix can be divided by the number of raters in order to have a common basis of comparison regardless of the differing number of raters.

	a. Individual rating	b. Range for six raters	c. Range ÷ 6
N (None)	0	0-3	0.00-0.57
F (Familiarity)	1	4-9	0.58-1.57
U (Understanding)	2	10-15	1.58-2.57
A (Application)	3	16-18	2.58-3.00

Generic Skills--Aggregated

The aggregated findings with regard to generic skills from the five universities in the study are presented in Table 3. These findings remain organized around the nine required components in the Michigan certification code. These aggregated findings show that

Table 3

Generic Skills--Consolidated

Matrix 1	R/E	Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership
1. Curriculum Development A-1 U-8 F-3 N-0		2.40-U	2.20-U	1.80-U	1.20-F	2.40-U
2. School Improvement A-2 U-9 F-1 N-0		2.71-A	2.14-U	2.14-U	1.71-U	2.00-U
3. School Finance A-0 U-6 F-6 N-0		2.16-U	1.83-U	1.67-U	1.33-F	1.50-F
4. School Law A-3 U-5 F-4 N-0		2.40-U	2.60-A	1.60-U	2.60-A	1.40-F
5. Community Relations A-2 U-5 F-3 N-2		2.10-U	1.60-U	1.60-U	0.80-F	1.20-F
6. Personnel Management A-4 U-4 F-4 N-0		2.67-A	2.67-A	2.00-U	1.33-F	1.67-U
7. Leadership Skills A-2 U-10 F-0 N-0		2.43-U	2.43-U	2.00-U	2.14-U	2.43-U
8. Instructional Supervision A-3 U-2 F-3 N-4		2.00-U	2.00-U	2.30-U	1.30-F	2.00-U
9. Adult and Community Education						
10. Other A-3 U-3 F-4 N-2		2.75-A	2.50-U	2.50-U	1.00-F	0.75-F
A-20 U-52 F-28 N-8						

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Table 3

Generic Skills--Consolidated

Generic skills										
Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
2.20-U	1.80-U	1.20-F	2.40-U	1.60-U	0.80-F	3.00-A	2.20-U	1.60-U	1.00-F	2.40-U
2.14-U	2.14-U	1.71-U	2.00-U	2.14-U	1.86-U	2.86-A	2.57-A	2.57-A	2.00-U	1.29-F
1.83-U	1.67-U	1.33-F	1.50-F	1.33-F	0.67-F	2.50-U	1.00-U	1.00-F	0.83-F	1.66-U
2.60-A	1.60-U	2.60-A	1.40-F	2.0-U	0.80-F	2.60-A	1.80-U	1.40-F	0.80-F	1.80-U
1.60-U	1.60-U	0.80-F	1.20-F	1.60-U	0.40-N	2.80-A	3.00-A	0.80-F	0.40-N	1.60-U
2.67-A	2.00-U	1.33-F	1.67-U	2.33-U	1.33-F	3.00-A	3.00-A	0.67-F	0.67-F	2.00-U
2.43-U	2.00-U	2.14-U	2.43-U	2.29-U	1.86-U	2.71-A	2.86-A	1.71-U	2.00-U	2.43-U
2.00-U	2.30-U	1.30-F	2.00-U	2.30-U	1.30-F	3.00-A	2.67-A	1.00-F	1.30-F	1.67-U
2.50-U	2.50-U	1.00-F	0.75-F	1.00-F	0.75-F	3.00-A	2.75-A	0.25-N	0.25-N	1.75-U

A = application

classes associated with five of the eight components (the "Adult and Community Education" component has not been considered because most universities do not presently require coursework in this area), as well as the "Other" category present the generic skills predominantly at the Understanding level. The only exceptions were "Personnel Management" and "Instructional Supervision" where the ratings were widely and evenly spread and "School Law" where the ratings were evenly divided between the Understanding and the Familiarity levels. In no instance was Application level the general response.

Of the 108 aggregated ratings in Table 3, 52 (48%) were Understanding level, 28 (26%) were at the Familiarity level, and 8 (7%) indicated No Emphasis. Only 21 (19%) were rated Application level.

In Table 4 all of the ratings associated with each generic skill from all of the universities have been aggregated without consideration for particular class titles. This information provides the most direct answer to the first question which the study sought to answer. Of the 12 generic skills, the ratings conclude that 7 have been treated at the Understanding level. "Decisiveness," "Stress Tolerance," "Range of Interests," and "Personal Motivation" have been treated at the Familiarity level. Only "Written Communication" was rated at the Application level.

Of the 540 individual ratings for generic skills, 176 (32.6%) were at the Understanding level and 180 (33.3%) were at the Application level. One hundred and eighteen (21.9%) ratings were for the Familiarity level, and 66 (12.2%) of the responses were No Emphasis.

Table 4

Analysis of Generic Skill Ratings

Generic skill	A	U	F	N	Final rating
Problem Analysis	24	16	5	0	2.42 = U
Judgment	18	18	9	0	2.20 = U
Organizational Ability	11	21	12	1	1.93 = U
Decisiveness	11	12	13	9	1.56 = F
Leadership	9	22	8	6	1.76 = U
Sensitivity	13	15	14	3	1.84 = U
Stress Tolerance	6	8	17	14	1.13 = F
Written Communication	36	9	0	0	2.80 = A
Oral Communication	30	8	7	0	2.51 = U
Range of Interests	5	15	12	13	1.27 = F
Personal Motivation	4	9	16	16	1.02 = F
Educational Values	13	23	5	4	2.00 = U

Specific Skills--Aggregated

The aggregated findings with regard to specific skills from the five universities are presented in Table 5. These findings are again organized around the required components in the Michigan certification code. These aggregated findings conclude that classes associated with four of the components were rated almost evenly between the Understanding and the Familiarity levels. Classes associated with the "School Finance," "Community Relations," "Leadership," and

Table 5

Specific Skills--Consolidated

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations
1. Curriculum Development A-1 U-4 F-3 N-1		2.60-A	1.60-U	0.80-F	1.00-F	1.60-U
2. School Improvement A-0 U-4 F-5 N-0		2.29-U	1.14-U	1.57-F	2.00-U	2.00-U
3. School Finance A-1 U-2 F-6 N-0		1.33-F	0.83-F	1.50-F	0.83-F	1.66-U
4. School Law A-0 U-5 F-4 N-0		2.00-U	2.20-U	1.20-F	2.00-U	1.60-U
5. Community Relations A-0 U-3 F-6 N-0		1.40-F	0.60-F	1.40-F	0.60-F	2.20-U
6. Personnel Management A-1 U-5 F-3 N-0		1.67-U	1.33-F	2.00-U	2.67-A	2.00-U
7. Leadership Skills A-0 U-2 F-5 N-2		1.50-F	1.00-F	1.00-F	2.00-U	1.50-F
8. Instructional Supervision A-1 U-2 F-5 N-1		2.50-U	1.50-F	1.50-F	2.50-U	1.00-F
9. Adult and Community Education						
10. Other A-0 U-2 F-7 N-0		1.75-U	1.00-F	1.00-F	1.00-F	1.00-F
A-4 U-29 F-44 N-4						

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Table 5

Specific Skills--Consolidated

Specific skills								
Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
2.60-A	1.60-U	0.80-F	1.00-F	1.60-U	1.60-U	1.00-F	0.20-N	1.60-U
2.29-U	1.14-U	1.57-F	2.00-U	2.00-U	1.43-F	1.29-F	1.14-F	2.29-U
1.33-F	0.83-F	1.50-F	0.83-F	1.66-U	1.33-F	2.66-A	1.50-F	2.00-U
2.00-U	2.20-U	1.20-F	2.00-U	1.60-U	1.00-F	1.40-F	1.40-F	1.60-U
1.40-F	0.60-F	1.40-F	0.60-F	2.20-U	1.60-U	1.20-F	0.60-F	2.00-U
1.67-U	1.33-F	2.00-U	2.67-A	2.00-U	1.67-U	1.33-F	1.00-F	2.00-U
1.50-F	1.00-F	1.00-F	2.00-U	1.50-F	1.50-F	0.50-N	0.33-N	2.00-U
2.50-U	1.50-F	1.50-F	2.50-U	1.00-F	1.50-F	1.00-F	0.00-N	2.75-A
1.75-U	1.00-F	1.00-F	1.00-F	1.00-F	1.25-F	1.25-F	1.00-F	2.00-U

tanding, A = application

"Instructional Supervision" components as well as the "Other" category were rated strongly toward the Familiarity level. References to the Application level of instruction were almost nonexistent for the specific skills.

Of the 81 aggregated ratings in Table 5, 44 (54%) were Familiarity level, 29 (36%) were at the Understanding level, and 4 (4%) were No Emphasis. Only 4 (5%) were rated Application level.

In Table 6 all of the ratings associated with each specific skill from all of the universities have been aggregated without consideration for particular class titles. This information provides the most direct response to the second question which the study sought to answer. Of the nine specific skills, the ratings conclude that none has been treated at the Application level. "Curriculum and Instruction"; "Staff Selection, Evaluation, and Development"; "Community Relations"; and "Structures Communication" have been treated at the Understanding level. The remaining five skills have been treated at the Familiarity level.

Of the 405 individual ratings for specific skills, 140 (34.6%) were for the Familiarity level and 139 (34.3%) were for the Understanding level. The third most frequent response was No Emphasis with 67 (16.5%), and the least mentioned rating was Application with 59 (14.6%).

Methods of Instruction--Aggregated

The findings support the conclusion that the primary method of instruction in each component area is Lecture-Discussion. The most

Table 6

Analysis of Specific Skill Ratings

Specific skill	A	U	F	N	Final rating
Curriculum and Instruction	11	20	12	2	1.89 = U
Student Activities	4	14	15	12	1.22 = F
Support Services	3	16	18	8	1.31 = F
Staff Selection, Evaluation, and Development	10	14	13	8	1.58 = U
Community Relations	5	22	15	3	1.64 = U
Coordination With District and Other Schools	3	17	21	4	1.42 = F
Fiscal Management	9	6	20	10	1.31 = F
School Plant Maintenance	2	8	15	20	0.82 = F
Structures Communication	12	22	11	0	2.02 = U

frequently cited secondary method was Individual/Team Research, followed by Gaming-Simulation and Tutorial-Seminar. The least frequently cited method of instruction was Clinical-Internship. A wide range of secondary methods was found only in classes associated with "Curriculum Development," "School Improvement," and "Leadership Skills."

The aggregated findings with regard to methods of instruction from the five universities are presented in Table 7. These findings are also organized around the required components in the Michigan certification code. The method of instruction most frequently cited

Table 7

Methods of Instruction--Consolidated

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or
1. Curriculum Development		1	2	2		2	
2. School Improvement		1	2			2	
3. School Finance		1				2	
4. School Law		1				2	
5. Community Relations		1					
6. Personnel Management		1					
7. Leadership Skills		1	2			2	
8. Instructional Supervision		1				2	
9. Adult and Community Education							
10. Other		1			2		

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

Table 7

Methods of Instruction--Consolidated

Instructional modes								
Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
1	2	2		2	2			
1	2			2	2			
1				2	2			
1				2	2			
1					2			
1					2		Group process	
1	2			2	2		2	
1				2	2			
1			2		2			

as the primary method at the individual institutions is identified by a 1. Other methods of instruction which were cited as secondary methods by at least two of the institutions are identified by a 2.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study is to systematically analyze the content and the methods of instruction of principal preparation programs in Michigan. This corresponds with one of the objectives the Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation (MAPP) listed in its proposal for funding from the Kellogg Foundation. This study, under MAPP sponsorship, answers three specific questions:

1. To what extent do the programs develop the generic skills required of principals?

2. To what extent do the programs develop the specific skills of principals?

3. What are the dominant methods of instruction throughout the program?

The framework around which the study is constructed is a set of rating exercises developed by a National Association of Secondary School Principals consortium and described in their 1985 monograph, Performance-Based Preparation of Principals. A faculty liaison from each of the five MAPP institutions participating in the study selected a team of six raters--two faculty, two graduates, and two students--to analyze the classes required at their university for those preparing for the principalship. Raters had to determine the

level--Familiarity, Understanding, or Application--to which the generic and the specific skills required of principals were emphasized in each class. Primary and secondary methods of instruction were also identified. The individual raters later convened for a meeting in order to arrive at consensus ratings. Ratings from the five universities were then consolidated to develop a general description of principal preparation in the state.

The findings show that of the generic skills required of principals, only "Written Communication" was rated at the Application level. The most frequent rating was the Understanding level. For the specific skills required of principals the most common rating was the Familiarity level. None of these skills was rated at the Application level required of a performance-based program. The primary method of instruction throughout the programs in this study is Lecture-Discussion. Individual/Team Research and Gaming-Simulation were the most frequently mentioned secondary methods of instruction.

Cautions

In evaluating the findings in this study and then in drawing conclusions based on that evaluation, several factors which emerged during the conduct of the study should be considered:

1. The rating system used in this study is intended to give only a general description of the program in question. Because the system has not been scientifically designed and tested for validity and reliability, a margin of error exists.

2. The raters must share a common definition of "Familiarity," "Understanding," and "Application" as well as of the various skills. In some consensus discussions it appeared that raters may have given the Application rating to classes or instructors that they found to be excellent or helpful regardless of whether these classes were actually performance-based.

3. Isaac and Michael (1981) described the following disadvantages to be inherent in the group consensus process: (a) "the bandwagon effect of a majority opinion, (b) the power of a persuasive or prestigious individual to shape group opinion, (c) the vulnerability of group dynamics to manipulation, and (d) the unwillingness of individuals to abandon stated opinions" (p. 114).

4. Rating the methods of instruction with only a 1 (primary method) or a 2 (secondary method) might not give a completely accurate picture. This procedure does not indicate whether the secondary methods were used quite extensively or only minimally.

5. Having only six raters may not generate enough input. This is especially true in instances where a rater did not participate because he or she had not taken a particular class, or when two or more raters had taken a class under different formats or instructors, or when a faculty member was completely unfamiliar with a class. This problem is frequently evident in situations where consensus was not reached or when extreme differences in responses can be noted.

6. In drawing conclusions it is important to note that the study represents only five member institutions of the Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation. Further, some of these

institutions are or will be developing changes in their programs, particularly in light of the Michigan certification code of 1988.

While caution must be exercised with any interpretation of the findings, as identified in the Limitations of this study, the data do permit formation of some general conclusions about both the content and the methods of instruction in programs that prepare principals in Michigan.

Conclusions and Discussion

Based on the findings of the rating exercises at the universities, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In response to the first question regarding generic skills, programs for the preparation of principals at the universities in this study do not in general develop the generic skills of students on a performance basis to a high degree.

A report by the Southern Regional Education Board (1986) states that the most important element in principal effectiveness is the degree to which that principal demonstrates mastery of a set of core skills. Unfortunately, many other studies (Goodlad, 1984; Griffith, 1977; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987) report that too often principals lack these requisite skills and that their preparation programs were devoid of clinical experiences and performance opportunities by which to develop them. The findings of this study conclude that this situation continues to exist in the principal preparation programs in Michigan. The raters reported that of the generic skills required of principals only

"Written Communication" was presented at the Application level, which suggests the demonstration of the ability to express clearly and appropriately for multiple audiences and the critique and feedback necessary to make improvement. Even in this one case raters may not always have held to this definition of Application, but rather may have merely responded to the typical need to submit written reports as a class requirement. Witters-Churchill (1988) surveyed Texas principals regarding their preparation programs. The respondents in her study indicated that for the generic skills of the NASSP Assessment Center the extent of skill development provided by their preparation ranged from "None" to "Moderate" with no skills judged to be "Highly" developed. Voit (1989) replicated this study for Michigan principals and had comparable findings.

2. In response to the second question regarding specific skills, programs for the preparation of principals at the universities in this study do not in general develop the specific skills required of principals on a performance basis to a high degree. Furthermore, the programs place considerably less emphasis on the specific skills that are required in the operation of schools than on the generic skills. Very few opportunities are provided to "perform" the practical aspects of the principalship.

In a report of principals' perceptions of their preparation, Maher (1988) found that building administrators placed greatest importance on those classes which emphasized the technical, practical skills required on a day-to-day basis. In this study the raters reported that of the nine specific skills required of principals,

none was presented at the Application level. In spite of calls for administrator preparation to be more performance-based (Hoyle, 1985; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985), it appears that the goal has yet to be achieved.

3. In response to the third question regarding instructional methods, the dominant method of instruction in programs that prepare principals is Lecture-Discussion generally across all courses, components of the Michigan certification requirements, and all universities. Performance-based elements are in evidence only secondarily. Internships, which some consider to be the preferred method of preparation and which Thompson (1988) described as "essential to the adequate preparation for the job" (p. 43), are not a required element of the programs in this study.

If preparation programs are to be made more relevant to the needs of principals, a variety of teaching methods--particularly those that stress "doing" rather than listening--must be employed. The findings in this study conclude that while some range of secondary methods of instruction is evident, the primary method remains almost exclusively Lecture-Discussion. This corresponds with earlier studies (American Association of School Administrators, 1960; Silver & Spuck, 1978) as well as Witters-Churchill's (1988) and Voit's (1989) surveys of principals which concluded that the instructional methods used most frequently for each of the generic skills except "Sensitivity" (Voit) and "Written Communication" was Lecture and Discussion. Their studies determined further that the principals found the methods of instruction used in their preparation to be

"Moderately Effective" at best and that an internship would have been the "Ideal Method" of instruction except for "Written Communication" (Witters-Churchill).

4. Based on the findings of this study and after review of data from a concurrent study (Voit, 1989), there is no evidentiary base for concluding that preparation programs in the state of Michigan are performance-based in their objectives, their outcomes, or their instructional methods. If, indeed, they are, little evidence that they are was located.

A 1988 national profile of principals (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary) concluded that new principals have received a greater amount of preparation than those in previous surveys, with the amount of formal education steadily increasing. This opportunity makes it even more critical that institutions providing the preparation insure that it is meaningful and relevant to the next generation of principals.

Recommendations

Based on the conduct of this study and the conclusions which were developed from its findings, several recommendations can be made to institutions of higher education, to professional organizations, to local school districts, to the Michigan Professional Standards Commission for School Administrators, a commission named by the State Board of Education, and to similar groups in other states.

1. The fundamental recommendation is that all institutions which prepare principals should adopt performance-based preparation

as an essential element in their program objectives. This demands "activities or experiences that require applications of knowledge and skills and explicit demonstration of performance" (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985, p. 7). Without prior knowledge on the part of the researcher and without access to information in this study or in Voit (1989), reports submitted by the Professional Standards Commission for School Administrators to the Michigan Department of Education (1989) will require such evidence for program approval of any principal preparation programs in Michigan. Despite some methodological weaknesses in this study, already acknowledged, this action by the Commission provides further validation of the findings of the study.

2. Individual course offerings should be evaluated to see if--without neglecting academic content--a greater emphasis on performance-based preparation is possible and needed. Programs should recognize and address the specific skills required of the principal.

3. Programs which endorse performance-based preparation should encourage appropriate methods of instruction, including such activities as simulations, internships, practica, case studies, and a valid and reliable assessment center.

4. Programs should assess their students' level of development with regard to the generic and specific skills required of principals throughout their preparation, and efforts should be planned to increase their skills level. When completing a degree program at a university or when seeking certification by the state, students

should face a reliable and valid assessment of both their skills and their mastery of knowledge. Such practices are already required for certification in South Carolina and Missouri and are under consideration in other states.

5. As Michigan institutions of higher education present their programs for "board approval" under the 1988 certification code, they should not only insure that all the required components are in evidence but also use this opportunity to evaluate how performance-based and effective their programs are. Such evaluations of program effectiveness are a requirement for renewal of administrator preparation program approval in Michigan as stated in the report by the Professional Standards Commission for School Administrators to the Michigan Department of Education (1989).

6. Institutions of higher education and professional organizations, as well as local school districts should commit the funds and the personnel needed to develop additional materials for simulations, computer-based instruction, role playing, and other performance-based items and to provide meaningful internships, practica, or other field-based experiences.

7. Professional organizations that represent principals should urge those agencies that provide either preservice or in-service training to administrators to make such training relevant to the daily work of the principal.

8. Although not studied, other entities which help to develop principals, such as private consultants and locally developed in-service programs, also need to be performance-based in their

approach.

9. State boards of education have the ability to impact at all levels of the educational process. These boards then should accept the obligation to monitor principal preparation programs and insure their effectiveness.

10. Since this was the first known use of this systematic rating process on a statewide basis rather than at a single university, the study is recommended for replication, after revision, in other states. Revisions needed before replication might include increasing the number of raters; offering more instruction to the raters, as well as practice opportunities in order to enhance inter-rater reliability; and developing a method to determine the extent to which secondary methods of instruction are being used.

Final Discussion

The instructors in the programs which were studied appear to have an overly optimistic view of their performance. Although there were wide differences among the universities, a look at all of the ratings reveals that the two faculty members gave the highest combined rating in any particular area nearly twice as often as did either the graduates or the students. This is consistent with earlier studies (Silver & Spuck, 1978; Southern Regional Education Board, 1986) which concluded that, while instructors stated that they had emphasized skills and used a variety of methods, the students reported the opposite to be true.

While the preparation of principals at the universities in this study generally does not yet require the development and demonstration of generic and specific skills nor do the methods of instruction generally encourage performance-based preparation, some changes in direction are evident. The findings from the individual universities demonstrate different degrees of emphasis on performance; and consensus discussions indicate that at certain institutions, programs--or at least the classes of particular instructors--are now predicated on developing the skills of the NASSP Assessment Center. All volunteered comments from instructors indicate a perceived need for innovation and program review and revision in administrator preparation programs. With such words and hints of change in evidence, what prevents the reality of complete change?

An especially strong impression which results from the study is that the critical variable is the instructor--particularly the differences among instructors. As is mentioned in the Cautions section, when the same class at a given university is taught by more than one instructor, the ratings are often quite dissimilar. The inconsistency suggested by this may be merely the normal differences in approach that would exist among instructors, but it could also demonstrate that they fail to share a common understanding of their program's purposes or that individuals have not yet made a personal commitment to performance-based preparation.

For performance-based preparation of principals to become the norm, institutions will have to make it a definite objective; institutions, professional organizations, and local school districts will

have to commit the resources for developing performance-based activities and for supporting internships; and state boards of education will have to encourage and monitor preparation programs. Even with all of these elements in place, however, change ultimately rests with the instructors. Faculty members will have to recognize a need for change and embrace the concept of performance-based preparation. For some this will entail a dramatic change in philosophy and in the way they conduct their classes. Only if instructors accept this challenge will principal preparation become more pertinent to the task.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Specific Steps in Methodology

Specific Steps in Methodology

1. Director introduced proposed project at MAPP meeting.

2. To determine the population for the study, the director requested from the Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation a list of all member institutions as well as the faculty representative from each institution (see Appendix G).

3. Director submitted a formal proposal to MAPP for endorsement and funding.

4. Director contacted each institution explaining the project and inviting their participation.

5. Institutions that accepted became the subjects of the study.

6. Director requested that each participating institution provide one staff member to serve as its liaison on this study.

7. Director met with the liaisons to explain the process; to distribute copies of the NASSP (1985) report, Performance-Based Preparation of Principals; to provide materials defining performance-based activities, generic and specific skills, methods of instruction, and degree of treatment; and to issue working copies of the three matrices.

8. Director provided the liaisons with similar materials for each rater.

9. Liaisons selected raters: 2 faculty members, 2 graduates, and 2 students.

10. Liaisons instructed raters with regard to process and explained informational materials.

11. Liaisons developed vertical columns of the matrices (description of program by class offerings), which was different for each institution.

12. Each liaison provided the raters with the matrices and instructed that they be completed independently.

13. Liaisons returned the matrices to the director to be combined and tallied.

14. Director moderated a consensus meeting of all raters at each institution. Only when a specific level of agreement was reached was any response recorded on the final form.

15. Director prepared official copies of the matrices.

16. Director distributed official copies of the report to the liaisons and/or department chairs and to the director of MAPP.

Appendix B

Project Proposal to the Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation

Research Proposal to the Michigan Academy
for Principal Preparation

(Submitted October 8, 1987)

I. Purpose

The purpose of this study is to review and analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan by using the rating exercises described in the National Association of Secondary School Principals 1985 monograph, Performance-Based Preparation of Principals. Since the Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation is specifically dedicated to improving the content and instructional methods used in principal preparation programs and since the MAPP proposal to the Kellogg Foundation includes a review of the available programs as one of its first objectives, this proposal has a direct relationship to MAPP interests.

II. Objectives and Timeline

1. Introduce the project to the MAPP liaison at each member institution (October-November 1987).

2. Conduct the rating exercises at each participating institution (December 1987 to January 1988).

3. Prepare summary reports (February 1988).

III. Participation by MAPP Institutions

All member institutions of MAPP will be invited to participate in this project. It is hoped that all will choose to do so. As of

this date Western Michigan University, Northern Michigan University, and Central Michigan University have been approached; and representatives from each institution have expressed their intention to be part of this program analysis.

IV. Budget

1.	Mileage (10 trips anticipated to MAPP institutions and State Department of Education = 1,930 miles x .225	$ 434	
2.	Airfare to Northern Michigan University	388	
3.	Lodging and meals	500	
4.	Telephone	100	
5.	Materials and printing	200	
6.	Miscellaneous and other	500	
	Total support requested		$2,122
7.	In-kind service (12 days x $330)	3,960	
	(Plus in-kind services from member institutions		
	Total project cost		$6,082

V. Final Report

Final reports will systematically describe the content and the methods of instruction that characterize programs at each institution. Relevant, summary data on all institutions will be reported to MAPP, and individual reports will be provided to decision makers at each institution so that they will have an accurate picture as they plan for the future.

Appendix C

Approval of Proposal by MAPP

MICHIGAN ACADEMY FOR PRINCIPAL PREPARATION

3312 Sangren Hall
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-3899
(616) 383-0234

The *Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation* is a project of the *Michigan Institute for Educational Management Leadership Academy* and is partially funded by the State Board of Education

November 18, 1987

Mr. Thom Engel
4634 Ashburton
Sterling Heights, MI 48077

Dear Thom:

I am pleased to be able to inform you that the MAPP Coordinating Council, in its meeting on November 10, approved your proposal as presented for the review and analysis of the contents and methods of principal preparation programs in Michigan.

Approval is contingent upon receipt of a revised, acceptable timeline for completion of the scheduled activites.

As requested in your proposal, the amount of the award is $2122.00. These funds are from the funds awarded to MAPP by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. It is anticipated that payment to you will be in the form of reimbursement for incurred expenses upon our receipt of invoices and receipts from you. Please contact Paul Berge or myself to make appropriate arrangements.

Sincerely,

Edgar A. Kelley
Director, MAPP

EAK/lat

CC: Paul Berge

Appendix D

Overview of Study and Responsibilities of Liaisons

To: MAPP Representative

From: Thom Engel
4634 Ashburton
Sterling Heights, MI 48310
(313) 264-2911 [w] 264-4427 [h]

Re: Research and development project

Overview of Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the content and methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan by using the rating exercises described in the monograph by the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals. The Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation is specifically dedicated to improving the content and instructional methods used in principal preparation programs in the state, and the MAPP proposal to the Kellogg Foundation includes a review of the available programs as one of its first objectives. Since this study is so directly related to MAPP interests, it was officially endorsed by MAPP and funded through the Kellogg Foundation grant in November 1987.

Specific Tasks of Liaison at Member Institutions

1. Develop description of program (vertical column for matrices).
2. Select team of raters--2 faculty members, 2 graduates, and 2 students.
3. Familiarize raters with process and definitions.
4. Conduct rating session and submit results to coordinator.
5. Arrange for consensus session.

Description of Your Program

The horizontal side of the three matrices is the same at each institution and consists of "Generic Skills" (NASSP, 1985), "Specific Skills" (Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, Fitzgerald, & Jorgensen, 1983), and "Instructional Modes" (McCleary & McIntyre, 1972). The vertical side, however, will be unique for each institution. The institutions will describe their program by indicating the classes prescribed for students preparing for the principalship. These classes--designated R for required or E for elected--are grouped under the appropriate function area from the listing suggested in the draft of the Michigan Department of Education's proposed certification code for administrators.

Selection of Raters

A critical task of the liaison is the selection of the team of raters. This team consists of two faculty members, two graduates, and two students. In all cases it is vital to select raters whose input will be most knowledgeable and relevant to the purposes of this study. The faculty members, therefore, should be familiar with the entire program over a number of years and most particularly should be involved in classes directly related to the principalship. The graduates should have attended the institution within the past 5 years and should now hold a position of school leadership. Graduates who have not yet had the opportunity to test their preparation against the real world of the principalship should not be selected.

The students should be nearing completion so that they will be familiar with most of the program at their institution. After the team is selected, the liaison is responsible for familiarizing them with the process and distributing the informational materials that are provided.

Appendix E

Information for Raters

Information for Raters

Purpose: The purpose of this project is to analyze the content and the methods of instruction of programs that prepare principals in Michigan. Rating exercises devised by the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals (1985) will be used.

This project is endorsed and funded by the Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation through a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The findings will also be included in a dissertation submitted for the degree of doctor of education.

Procedure: Each of six raters (2 faculty members, 2 graduates, and 2 students) will be asked to complete, on an individual basis, three matrices that comprise the NASSP rating exercises. After individual ratings are completed, raters will meet to discuss their ratings and to arrive at a consensus rating that best represents the opinion of the group.

Matrix 1 (yellow): The vertical section of the matrix consists of the typical classes--either required (R) or elected (E)--that comprise the program of preparation at each institution. This information will be provided by the institution. The classes will be grouped under the appropriate function area from the listing suggested in the draft of the Michigan Department of Education's proposed certification code for administrators.

The horizontal section is a list of skills which are included in the NASSP's (1985) Assessment Center and considered to be generic for

many administrative roles.

1. Problem analysis: Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.

2. Judgment: Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.

3. Organizational ability: Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.

4. Decisiveness: Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.

5. Leadership: Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively, and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.

6. Sensitivity: Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

7. Stress tolerance: Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.

8. Oral communication: Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

9. Written communication: Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al.

10. Range of interest: Competence to discuss a variety of subjects--educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.

11. Personal motivation: Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

12. Educational values: Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

Each content area will be evaluated for the degree to which these generic skills are emphasized. The possible ratings are F = familiarity with content or skill for discussion purposes, U = understanding of content or skill as basis for teaching others, or A = application of content or skill in real or simulated situations. If the skill was not emphasized at all, a rating of N is given.

Matrix 2 (green): The vertical section is the same as for Matrix 1.

The horizontal section is a list of specific skills which was developed in a principal's job analysis (Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, Fitzgerald, & Jorgensen, 1983). The many tasks were grouped into nine dimensions.

The rating procedure is the same as for Matrix 1.

Matrix 3 (pink): The vertical section is the same as for Matrix 1.

The horizontal section is a list of instructional modes adopted from McCleary and McIntyre (1972).

1. Lecture/discussion: Teacher directed instruction that emphasizes presentation of information and discussion of academic content.

2. Tutorial/seminar: A methodology that engages one or more instructors with one or more students in an examination of academic content.

3. Instructional modules: Programmed content presented sequentially on a given topic to assist learners in developing understanding and skills for later application.

4. Computer-based instruction: Use of computers for gathering data, problem solving, or engaging in application level simulations.

5. Gaming or simulation: Structured activities that require behaviors that approximate conditions faced in actual settings. Activities may be structured for problem solving through the use of case studies, in-basket experiences, and critical incidents.

6. Individual or team research: Activities directed toward investigation of a problem that require application of established research methodologies.

7. Clinical experiences: Experiences requiring the application of knowledge to the tasks and functions of a role in the field (includes practica and internships).

8. Group process training: Organized instruction involving participation in various types of groups such as human relations training groups, problem solving groups, discussion groups, or task groups.

A rating of 1 is given for the primary method of instruction in each content area. If secondary methods were also employed, a rating of 2 is given.

References

McCleary, L. E., & McIntyre, K. E. (1972). Competency development and university methodology. NASSP Bulletin, 56(362), 53-68.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1985). Performance-based preparation of principals. Reston, VA: Author.

Schmitt, N., Noe, R., Meritt, R., Fitzgerald, M., & Jorgensen, C. (1983). Criterion-related and content validity of the NASSP Assessment Center. Reston, VA: NASSP.

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic skills: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
1. Curriculum Development													
2. School Improvement													
3. School Finance													
4. School Law													
5. Community Relations													

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application,

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic skills: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
6. Personnel Management													
7. Leadership Skills													
8. Instructional Supervision													
9. Adult and Community Education													
10. Other													

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
1. Curriculum Development										
2. School Improvement										
3. School Finance										
4. School Law										
5. Community Relations										

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
6. Personnel Management										
7. Leadership Skills										
8. Instructional Supervision										
9. Adult and Community Education										
10. Other										

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes								
		Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
1. Curriculum Development										
2. School Improvement										
3. School Finance										
4. School Law										
5. Community Relations										

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
6. Personnel Management										
7. Leadership Skills										
8. Instructional Supervision										
9. Adult and Community Education										
10. Other										

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

Appendix F

Content Validity Ratios for the Assessment Center Skills Across the Major Performance Dimensions

Content Validity Ratios for the Assessment Center Skills Across the Major Performance Dimensions

Task dimension	Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Stress tolerance	Educational values	Oral communication	Written communication
1. Curriculum and instructional leadership	.88	.88	.88	.55	.88	.55	-.33	-.11	-.22	.55	.66	.66
2. Coordination of student activities	.33	.77	.88	.55	.77	.77	-.33	-.33	.22	.44	.55	.55
3. Direction of support services of the school	.66	.77	.88	.77	.77	.77	-.66	-.44	.00	-.11	.55	.77
4. Staff selection evaluation and development	.55	.88	.77	.66	.88	.88	-.11	-.44	.11	.66	.77	.66
5. Development and maintenance community relations	.88	.88	.66	.55	.88	.88	.22	.11	.55	.11	.77	.77
6. Coordination with district and other schools	.33	.55	.88	.11	.55	.44	-.66	-.44	.00	-.11	.66	.66
7. Fiscal management	.77	.88	.88	.66	.66	-.22	-.88	-.44	.11	.00	-.22	.66
8. Maintenance of school plant	.77	.88	.66	.55	.44	.33	-.77	-.33	-.11	-.44	.22	.33
9. Structure communication	.66	.88	.77	.66	.77	.88	-.11	-.22	.22	.11	.77	.88

Note. The larger the value, the greater the extent to which the skill was judged "essential" or "necessary" but not essential as other skills, for the adequate performance of tasks in the dimension.

Appendix G

Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation
Coordinating Council

Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation (MAPP)
3312 Sangren Hall
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
616-383-1997

Coordinating Council
November 1987

Director: Dr. Edgar A. Kelley, Chairman, Department of Educational Leadership, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 (616-383-1997).

CMU: Dr. Robert C. Mills, Professor, Center for Economic Education, College of Education, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859 (517-774-7171).

EMU: Dr. Jack D. Minzey Department Head, Department of Leadership and Counseling, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197 (313-487-0255).

GVSU: Dr. William Force, 113 AuSable Hall, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI 49401 (616-895-3391-W; 616-457-5922).

MAPEA: Dr. Roger Grabinski, Professor, President, Michigan Association of Professors of Educational Administration. School of Education, 214 Rowe Hall, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859 (517-774-7170).

MASSP: Mr. Jack Bittle, Executive Director, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, 2339 School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 (313-769-5497).

MDE: Mr. C. Danford Austin, Director, Teacher Preparation and Certification Services, Michigan Department of Education, Ottawa Street Office Building, South Tower, Second Floor, Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909 (517-373-1924).

MEMSPA: Mr. Bill Mays, Executive Director, Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association, Room 9, Manly Building, 1405 South Harrison, East Lansing, MI 48812 (517-371-5250).

MIEM: Mr. Dave Kahn, Director, Michigan Institute for Educational Management and Associate Director, Michigan Association of School Administrators, 421 West Kalamazoo Street, Lansing, MI 48933 (517-371-5250).

MIEMAC: Ms. Janice I. Blanck, Director, MIEM Assessment Center, Genesee Intermediate School District, 2413 Maple Avenue, Flint, MI 48507 (313-768-4537).

NASSP: Dr. Paul W. Hersey, Director of Professional Assistance, National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091 (703-860-0200).

NMU: Dr. David Blomquist, Associate Professor, College of Education, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI 49855 (906-227-2728).

OU: Dr. Gerald Pine, Dean, School of Human and Educational Services, 544 O'Dowd Hall, Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48063 (W-313-370-3050; H-313-652-8965).

Dr. James Clatworthy, Acting Associate Dean, School of Human and Educational Services, 544 O'Dowd Hall, Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48063 (313-370-3052).

UofM: Dr. LeVerne (Lee) Collet, Professor, Educational Foundations and Policy Administration, 4218 School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 (313-747-2449).

WSU: Dr. Joella Gipson-Simpson, Professor, 361 Education Building, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202 (313-577-1691).

Dr. Burnis Hall, Associate Professor, 365 Education Building, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202 (313-577-1633).

WMU: Dr. David J. Cowden, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Leadership, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 (616-383-1997).

Information

MSU: Dr. Philip A. Cusick, Chair, Department of Educational Administration, Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034.

KF: Dr. Peter Ellis, The Kellogg Foundation, 400 North Avenue, Battle Creek, MI 49017.

Appendix H

School Administrator Task Inventory

School Administrator Task Inventory

Dimension 1: Curriculum and instructional leadership

1. Implements program to provide additional instruction to students who do not pass minimal competency tests.
2. Monitors staff to determine the extent to which curriculum goals and objectives are being met.
3. Plans, develops, and implements a process for student teacher, and parent involvement in determining curriculum goals and objectives.
4. Determines student interest in new courses and encourages their development.
5. Reviews and monitors educational programs to insure that they meet different students' needs.
6. Implements and refines what is developed by central office in the area of curriculum.
7. Coordinates with local vocational education groups for co-operative programs.
8. Organizes programs to evaluate student competencies.
9. Encourages staff to search for and implement new programs.
10. Seeks the input of local employers to make vocational programs sensitive to employers' needs.
11. Monitors and encourages individual student progress.
12. Meets with students to explain academic requirements and availability of various programs.
13. Assigns teachers/professional staff to classes.
14. Organizes bilingual curriculum for foreign students.
15. Evaluates curriculum in terms of objectives set by school or district.
16. Reviews use of instructional materials (books, audiovisual equipment, etc.) in the school.

Dimension 2: Coordination of student activities

1. Attends various student extracurricular events.
2. Approves, oversees, and works with student fund-raising efforts/ exercises.
3. Arranges transportation of students to extracurricular events.
4. Meets with leaders of student organizations.
5. Supervises or provides for supervision of bus trips to special events or extracurricular activities.
6. Elicits staff participation in extracurricular activities.
7. Trains student leaders to be more effective student leaders.
8. Develops and coordinates student activities (athletics, debates, etc.) with other schools in and out of the district.
9. Attends banquets or special events to honor outstanding students and/or athletes.
10. Reviews the number and nature of student activities or establishes a system to review and eliminate or add activities.
11. Confers with coaches and other activity leaders to insure space, time, and resource requirements for various activities.
12. Elicits student participation in student government.
13. Plans student assemblies and cultural productions.
14. Encourages and secures parent involvement in student activities as participants and chaperones.
15. Selects and assigns staff to direct extracurricular activities.
16. Authorizes and supervises field trips.
17. Provides for supervision at student activities.
18. Determines, communicates, and maintains standards for participation in student activities.

Dimension 3: Direction of support services of the school

1. Coordinates with fire department and traffic personnel for smooth operation of school and provisions for emergencies.

2. Communicates with nurses, health officials, parents, etc. so that students' special health problems (e.g., allergies, epilepsy, etc.) can be recognized.

3. Produces student handbook to explain students' rights and responsibilities.

4. Trains and monitors students to keep them in line with the prescribed traffic and cafeteria flow charts.

5. Establishes procedure to use teacher aides and to evaluate them.

6. Organizes activities and provides space for school psychologists, speech pathologist, and similar professionals.

7. Coordinates with local police to insure smooth functioning of school both during school hours and after school at extracurricular activities.

8. Monitors keeping of records about students (i.e., medical needs, registration, tardiness, absenteeism, etc.).

9. Organizes system whereby discipline problems are dealt with.

10. Selects and supervises safety patrols.

11. Monitors the enforcement of various health regulations involving immunizations, health standards in cafeteria, etc.

12. Establishes orientation activities for incoming students.

13. Resolves conflicts in class schedules, works with data processing and teachers to effect solutions.

14. Provides teachers with uniform procedures for keeping and reporting attendance.

15. Coordinates testing programs required by the state or otherwise requested of the school.

16. Patrols parking lots.

17. Ensures that fire and tornado drills are carried out and reports their conduct to appropriate authorities.

Dimension 3 (continued)

18. Structures a cafeteria schedule and traffic flow chart.

19. Solicits substitute teachers and supervises their classes.

20. Defines and implements the objectives and standards for an effective library/media center.

21. Finds and develops programs to reduce absenteeism, tardiness, and/or behavioral problems.

22. Supervises the transportation of students.

23. Monitors or oversees free lunch program to insure that appropriate students receive lunches.

24. Monitors disciplinary actions involving students to insure due process is followed.

25. Supervises the lunchroom.

26. Writes faculty handbook to describe school policies, procedures, and attendance.

27. Arranges to have parents called or otherwise notified when child is tardy or absent from school.

28. Monitors the racial/sexual composition of student groups and the compliance of the school with the provisions of Title IX.

29. Schedules work hours of support staff.

30. Sets up procedures to deal with ill or injured students.

31. Coordinates programs with various agencies employing students in co-ops.

32. Constructs a class schedule.

33. Develops procedures for efficient office routine.

34. Oversees the activities of the guidance counselor.

35. Develops standards, objectives, and procedures to maintain counseling services.

Dimension 4: Staff selection, evaluation, and development

1. Establishes orientation for new teachers/staff.
2. Maintains current knowledge of union-management contracts so as to develop personnel policies consistent with their provisions.
3. Provides training for staff to enable them to deal with parents and community.
4. Communicates the various roles of resource personnel (nurses, psychologists, curriculum experts, etc.) to staff and teachers.
5. Provides in-service training for teachers to increase effectiveness.
6. Involves current staff in the selection of new staff.
7. Confers with other principals and/or district personnel to coordinate educational programs across schools.
8. Interviews personnel to select people and/or provide input into the selection decision.
9. Helps staff members set professional goals.
10. Observes teachers' classroom performance for the purpose of evaluation and/or feedback to teacher.
11. Recruits applicants for staff positions.
12. Provides for meetings or training sessions in which people can share ideas they picked up from professional associations.
13. Provides feedback to teachers concerning their performance.
14. Encourages involvement of staff in professional organizations and supports involvement in workshops and classes.
15. Surveys various segments of the school to assess how he/she is perceived.
16. Provides feedback to custodial, secretarial, and other support staff as to job performance.
17. Evaluates the job performance of custodial, secretarial, and other support staff.
18. Supervises job performance of custodial, secretarial, or other support staff.

Dimension 4 (continued)

19. Encourages and helps faculty to develop innovative teaching methods.

20. Keeps oneself informed about new techniques (computer technology, human relations, etc.) and how they might affect various staff elements and encourages appropriate educational effort.

21. Provides resources and/or training to help staff in recognizing and dealing with student behavior problems.

22. Teaches class to serve as a model.

23. Encourages teachers to get certified in areas for which expertise is lacking.

24. Participates in professional growth activities: attends professional meetings, reads professional journals, takes classes or attends seminars on relevant topics.

25. Meets with other colleagues to discuss problems, their solutions, and new developments in education.

Dimension 5: Development and maintenance of community relations

1. Responds to requests for input or ideas on various community programs and activities not directly involving the school.

2. Works with booster clubs to raise money for various school needs or activities.

3. Elicits community sponsorship of school programs.

4. Develops communication channels for minorities to voice concerns.

5. Seeks to know the parents and to interpret the school's programs to them.

6. Conducts orientation session for parents, develops special programs for parents new to the school.

7. Oversees and contributes to newsletter to parents and public to keep them informed of school policies and activities.

8. Prepares community for educational innovation.

9. Responds to requests for information or help from various community groups, agencies, etc.

10. Works to convince the community to pass bond issues.

11. Participates in various community agencies and concerns, not solely academic (Kiwanis, churches, Chamber of Commerce, Lion's Club, senior citizens groups, etc.).

12. Attends parent-teacher organization meetings and otherwise supports similar groups.

13. Provides structure for dialogue and cooperation between faculty and community groups.

14. Coordinates and oversees use of school facilities by community groups (for example, church, recreation, or other purposes).

15. Works with community to develop student activities.

16. Organizes community advisory groups consisting of parents, teachers, and administrators and meets with them.

17. Organizes community members to lobby for support for programs in which he/she/the community have a special interest.

Dimension 5 (continued)

18. Writes and/or presents reports of school activities to community groups.

19. Aids the community to raise money for the United Fund and other charitable or service organizations.

20. Communicates with public the nature and rationale of various school programs.

21. Develops relationships with local media to insure exposure of school activities and needs.

Dimension 6: Coordination with district and other schools

1. Coordinates with district to procure equipment to render services for transportation needs.

2. Sets up strategies to implement activities, priorities, and programs set at district level.

3. Responds to requests for information, paper work, annual reports, etc. from district.

4. Attends district budgetary meetings and provides needed input.

5. Counsels teachers, students, and staff on personal problems and refers them to appropriate groups.

6. Establishes communication lines with other principals in the district.

7. Confers with district to determine how best to fulfill legal requirements of various programs.

8. Explains reasons for district-level and federal rules and regulations to staff, students, and community.

9. Defends budget needs to board of education or district personnel.

10. Serves on district-level curriculum and policy committees.

Dimension 7: Fiscal management

1. Monitors the expenditure of funds raised by booster clubs, other community groups, or student activities.

2. Involves staff and/or community in process to refine annual budget.

3. Accounts for and monitors expenditure of school funds in accordance with existing laws and regulations.

4. Insures that approved budget monies are received.

5. Seeks resource alternatives within and outside district if original proposals are not accepted.

6. Sets priorities for provision of materials and resources according to financial limitations.

7. Supervises ordering, receipt, and distribution of supplies.

8. Provides information to financial auditors on expenditure of school funds.

9. Writes grant proposals to seek money from district, county, and federal sources.

Dimension 8: Maintenance of school plant

1. Sets standards; communicates and monitors standards for orderly maintenance of school facilities.

2. Follows established district procedures for selection of new staff members.

3. Establishes procedures and techniques for adequate plant security.

4. Assesses physical plant and equipment needs in terms of school goals and objectives.

5. Reports on nature and cleanliness of the building and its maintenance to district.

6. Requests and pursues district or central resources for maintenance and repair of school plant.

7. Attempts to instill pride in school facilities and equipment so as to control vandalism.

8. Requests and follows up requests for maintenance, repair, and equipment (people and material needed).

9. Develops a comprehensive plan for the orderly improvement of school plant facilities and equipment.

10. Involves professional and custodial staff in school maintenance problems which affect them.

Dimension 9: Structures communication which provides for cooperation among various groups in the school

1. Deals with conflicts that arise among teacher-student-parent-support staff relationships.
2. Meets with union officials as specified by union contract.
3. Solicits and coordinates parent volunteers and cooperation in school committees, tutor pool, health services, etc. and other school activities.
4. Confers with parents when they visit the school.
5. Exercises responsibility for teacher and parent meetings when a parent requests such a meeting.
6. Meets with and informs parents and health officials regarding various school problems including nutrition and immunizations.
7. Meets with faculty representatives to discuss faculty problems.
8. Evaluates new students to facilitate their integration into the school.
9. Strives to know and understand students and considers requests.
10. Communicates his/her priorities regarding resources and material to staff, community, and students.
11. Informs parents of any disciplinary action involving students.
12. Explains disciplinary code to students, parents, and staff in accordance with student bill of rights.
13. Exercises leadership role in developing mechanisms for integration of various cultural groups in the school.
14. Insures appropriate use of community agencies and refers students with special needs.
15. Meets with various parties involved (teachers, parents, students, and professional people) in accordance with legal requirements.
16. Maintains accessibility to students, parents, teachers, and other groups interested in school activities.

Appendix I

Generic Skills--Universities

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic skil: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress
1. Curriculum Development								
Curriculum	R	F*-8 UUFUFN	U-11 UUFUUU	F*-7 UUUFNN	U-8 UUUUNN	U-9 UUFUUN	F*-6 UUFFNN	F*- UU
2. School Improvement								
Supervision and improvement of instruction	R	A-15 AUFAAA	F-10 AAFFFF	A-14 AAFFAA	A-16 AAFAAA	U-14 UUUUAA	A-14 AAFFAA	F*- UU
3. School Finance								
School finance	E	U-13 AUUUUU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-13 AUUFAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-13 AUFUAU	F*-7 UFFNUF	F- FF
School business administration	E	U-14 AUUUAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U-14 AUUUAU	F*-8 AFNNAF	F- FF
4. School Law								
School law	E	U-14 AUUUAU	U-16 AAUUAA	U-12 UUUUUU	U*-15 AUUAAU	U-10 UFUUUF	U-10 UFUUUF	F- FF
5. Community Relations								
School and community relations	E	U*-15 AUUUAA	F*-9 FUUUFF	U-12 UUUUUU	U*-15 AAUUAU	U-13 UAUUUU	A-18 AAAAAA	F*- FU
6. Personnel Management								
School personnel admin.	E	A-16 AAFAAA	A-15 AAFUAA	U-13 UAUUUU	7-13 UAUUUU	U-13 UAUUUU	U-13 UAUUUU	F*- FU
7. Leadership Skills								
Educational administration	R	U-14 UAUUUA	U-14 UAUUUA	U-12 UAUUUF	U-12 UUFUUA	U-12 UUFUUA	F-8 UUFFFF	F- UU
Principalship	R	A-17 AAUAAA	A-17 AAUAAA	U-14 UAUAUU	A-18 AAAAAA	A-17 AAUAAA	U*-15 AAUUAU	U- UA
8. Instructional Supervision								
Staff evaluation	E	U-14 UUAAUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U- UU
9. Adult and Community Education								

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Generic skills									
Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
F*-7 UUUFNN	U-8 UUUUNN	U-9 UUFUUN	F*-6 UUFFNN	F*-5 UUFNNN	A-15 AAFUAA	F*-6 UUUNNN	U-13 UUUAUU	F*-6 UUFFNN	U-13 UUUAUU
A-14 AAFFAA	A-16 AAFAAA	U-14 UUUUAA	A-14 AAFFAA	F*-6 UUNNFF	U-9 UUNFUU	A-14 AAFFAA	U-10 UUNUUU	U*-11 AAFUFF	U-14 UUUUAA
U*-13 AUUFAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-13 AUFUAU	F*-7 UFFNUF	F-4 FFNNFF	U*-12 AUFFAN	F-10 AFFFAF	N*-3 NFFNNF	F*-7 UFFNUF	U*-13 AUFUAU
U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	U-14 AUUUAU	F*-8 AFNNAF	F-4 FFNNFF	U*-12 AUFFAU	U*-12 AUFFAU	N-2 NFNNNF	F*-6 UFNNUF	U-14 AUUUAU
U-12 UUUUUU	U*-15 AUUAAU	U-10 UFUUUF	U-10 UFUUUF	F-6 FFFFFF	U-11 UUFUUU	U*-15 AUUAAU	U-10 UFUUUF	U-10 UFUUF	U-12 UUUUUU
U-12 UUUUUU	U*-15 AAUUAU	U-13 UAUUUU	A-18 AAAAAA	F*-7 FUFFNU	U*-15 AUUUAA	A-18 AAAAAA	F*-9 UFUUFF	F-7 FUFFFF	U-14 AUUUUA
U-13 UAUUUU	7-13 UAUUUU	U-13 UAUUUU	U-13 UAUUUU	F*-9 FUFFUU	A-14 AAFFAA	A-16 AAUUAA	F-8 FUFUFF	F-8 FUFUFF	U-11 UUFUUN
U-12 UAUUUF	U-12 UUFUUA	U-12 UUFUUA	F-8 UUFFFF	F-8 UUFFFF	U*-13 AUFFAA	U*-15 AUUUAA	F-7 FUFFFF	F-8 UUFFFF	U-10 UUFUUF
U-14 UAUAUU	A-18 AAAAAA	A-17 AAUAAA	U*-15 AAUUAU	U-14 UAUUUA	A-16 AAUAUA	A-18 AAAAAA	U-10 UUUUFF	U*-11 UUUAFF	U-14 UAUAUU
U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	A-16 AAUUAA	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU

application

Matrix 1	R/E	Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Generic sk
1. Curriculum Development								
Curriculum development	R	A-15 AAAAUF	U*-15 AAUUAU	U*-15 AAUUAU	U*-10 AANFAN	A-16 AAAFAA	U*-11 AANFAF	F A
2. School Improvement								
Current issues	R	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	F*-6 NNUFUF	N-4 NNUNUN	N N
3. School Finance								
School finance	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 UUUUUU	F-6 FFFFFF	U-12 UUUUUU	F-6 FFFFFF	N N
4. School Law								
School law	R	U-12 UUUUUU	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 UUUUUU	A-18 AAAAAA	N*-3 NFNFNF	U-12 UUUUUU	N N
5. Community Relations								
6. Personnel Management								
Personnel management	R	A-16 AAAUAU	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFUFUF	F-10 FFAFAF	A-18 AAAAAA	F F
7. Leadership Skills								
Fundamentals of public school administration	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-17 AAAUAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A A
8. Instructional Supervision								
Administration and supervision in education	R							
9. Adult and Community Education								

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

	Generic skills									
	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
)	U*-15	U*-10	A-16	U*-11	F*-9	A-18	F*-9	U-12	U*-11	A-16
\U	AAUUAU	AANFAN	AAAFAA	AANFAF	AANNAN	AAAAAA	AANANN	UUUUUU	AANFAF	AAUAUA
	N-0	N-0	F*-6	N-4	N-0	A-12	A-18	A-16	N-0	A-18
JU	NNNNNN	NNNNNN	NNUFUF	NNUNUN	NNNNNN	AANANA	AAAAAA	UUAAAA	NNNNNN	AAAAAA
	U-12	F-6	U-12	F-6	N-0	A-18	A-18	U-12	N-0	U-12
\A	UUUUUU	FFFFFF	UUUUUU	FFFFFF	NNNNNN	AAAAAA	AAAAAA	UUUUUU	NNNNNN	UUUUUU
	U-12	A-18	N*-3	U-12	N*-3	A-18	F-6	A-18	N-0	N-0
\A	UUUUUU	AAAAAA	NFNFNF	UUUUUU	NFNFNF	AAAAAA	FFFFFF	AAAAAA	NNNNNN	NNNNNN
	U-12	F-8	F-10	A-18	F-6	A-18	A-18	F-8	F-8	U-12
AA	UUUUUU	FFUFUF	FFAFAF	AAAAAA	FFFFFF	AAAAAA	AAAAAA	FFUFUF	FFUFUF	UUUUUU
	A-18	A-17	A-18	A-18	A-18	A-18	A-18	U-13	A-18	A-18
AA	AAAAAA	AAAUAA	AAAAAA	AAAAAA	AAAAAA	AAAAAA	AAAAAA	UUUUAU	AAAAAA	AAAAAA

A = application

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic skills: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress
1. Curriculum Development								
Curriculum development	R	A-17 AAAAUA	A-17 AAAAUA	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFFFUU	A-16 AAAAUU	F-7 FFFFUF	N-4 NNN
2. School Improvement								
Long-range planning	R	A-17 AAAAUA	A-16 AAAAUU	A-17 AAAAUA	F-8 FFFFUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-17 AAAAUA	U-1 AAU
Program evaluation	R	A-14 AAAAFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-1 AAA
Internship/practicum	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-1 AAA
3. School Finance								
Educational finance	R	U*-13 AUAAFF	U*-12 AUAANF	U-14 UUAAUU	U*-11 AUAANN	U-8 UUUUNN	U-8 UUUUNN	U*- AUA
4. School Law								
Educational law	R	U*-13 AUAAFF	U-14 UUAAUU	U*-12 AUAAFN	A-13 AAAAFN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*- UUA
5. Community Relations								
School as a formal organization	R	A-14 AAAAFF	A-14 AAAAFF	A-18 AAAAFA	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFF
Seminar	R	A-18 AAAAAA	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNN
6. Personnel Management								
7. Leadership Skills								
Admin. leadership skills	R	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	U-12 UUUUUU	A-17 AAAAUA	A-16 AAAAUU	A-15 AAAAUF	U-1 UUU
8. Instructional Supervision								
Supervision and staff eval.	R							
9. Adult and Community Education								

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Generic skills										
Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
A-17 AAAAUA	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFFFUU	A-16 AAAAUU	F-7 FFFFUF	N-4 NNNNUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-17 AAAAUA	F-7 FFFFUF	F-8 FFFFUU	F-8 FFFFUU
A-16 AAAAUU	A-17 AAAAUA	F-8 FFFFUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-17 AAAAUA	U-14 AAUUUU	A-17 AAAAUA	U-12 UUUUUU	A-17 AAAAUA	U-12 UUUUUU	A-16 AAAAUU
F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	F-6 FFFFFF	U-12 UUUUUU	F*-7 FFFNUU	F-6 FFFFFF
A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA
U*-12 AUAANF	U-14 UUAAUU	U*-11 AUAANN	U-8 UUUUNN	U-8 UUUUNN	U*-10 AUAUNN	U-14 UUAAUU	U-8 UUUUNN	U-12 UFUAUU	U*-11 AUAANN	F*-9 UUUANN
U-14 UUAAUU	U*-12 AUAAFN	A-13 AAAAFN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-11 UUAAFN	U*-11 AUAANN	U*-11 AUAANN	U*-12 AUAAFN	U*-12 AUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN
A-14 AAAAFF	A-18 AAAAFA	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-16 AAAAFA	A-16 AAAAFA	U-12 UUUAFU	F-6 FFFFFF	U-10 UUUUFF
F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	U-12 UUUUUU
A-16 AAAAUU	U-12 UUUUUU	A-17 AAAAUA	A-16 AAAAUU	A-15 AAAAUF	U-12 UUUUUU	A-17 AAAAUA	A-17 AAAAUA	U-11 UUUUUF	A-16 AAAAUU	A-17 AAAAUA

ing, A = application

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic s: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity
1. Curriculum Development							
Organization, control and mgt. of American schools	R	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UFFUUU	U-10 UFUFUU	F-4 FNNFFF	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UUFFUU.
2. School Improvement							
Admin. and mgt. of schools: Support programs	R	U-12 UUFAUU	U-10 UFFUUU	U-10 UFFUUU	F*-8 FFNUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU
3. School Finance							
Public school finance	R	A-14 AAFAFA	F-8 UUFFFF	F-7 UFFFFF	N-2 FFNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	U-8 UUNUNU
4. School Law							
Legal aspects of education	R	A-16 AAAUAU	U-10 UUFUFU	F-6 FFFFFF	U-8 UUNUNU	F-6 FFFFFF	A-12 AANANA
5. Community Relations							
Politics of education	R	U-12 UUUUUU	U-10 UUFUFU	F-7 UFFFFF	F-4 FFNFNF	U-10 UUFUFU	U-12 UUUUUU
6. Personnel Management							
Personnel administration and supervision	R	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	F*-5 UFNFNF	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU
7. Leadership Skills							
Theories of administrative organization and leadership	R	F*-9 UFFUFU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	U-10 UUFUFU	A-14 AAFAFA
8. Instructional Supervision							
Admin. and mgt. of schools: The instructional program	R	F*-9 UFFFUU	F-6 FFFFFF	U-10 UFFUUU	N*-3 FNNNFF	U-10 UUFFUU	A-12 AANNAA

Generic skills									
Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
U-10 UFUFUU	F-4 FNNFFF	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UUFFUU	F-6 FUFNFF	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	F*-4 FNNUNF	N-2 FNNNNF	U-10 UUFFUU
U-10 UFFUUU	F*-8 FFNUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	F-6 FUNFFF	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N*-3 FNNFNF	N-2 FNNNNF	U-10 UUFFUU
F-7 UFFFFF	N-2 FFNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	U-8 UUNUNU	N-0 NNNNNN	A-14 AAFAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	F-4 FFNFNF	N-1 FNNNNN	A-14 AAFAFA
F-6 FFFFFF	U-8 UUNUNU	F-6 FFFFFF	A-12 AANANA	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N-1 FNNNNN	N-1 FNNNNN	A-14 AAFAFA
F-7 UFFFFF	F-4 FFNFNF	U-10 UUFUFU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-2 NNNFNF	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N*-3 FNNFNF	N*-3 FNNFNF	U-10 UUFUFU
U-10 UUFUFU	F*-5 UFNFNF	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-8 UUNUNU	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N-1 FNNNNN	N*-3 FNNFNF	U-10 UUFUFU
F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	U-10 UUFUFU	A-14 AAFAFA	F-6 FFFFFF	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N-2 NNFNFN	F-5 FNFFFF	A-14 AAFAFA
U-10 UFFUUU	N*-3 FNNNFF	U-10 UUFFUU	A-12 AANNAA	N-2 NNNNFF	A-18 AAAAAA	A-16 AAAFAA	N*-3 FNNFNF	N-1 FNNNNN	F-6 FUNFFF

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic skills: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance
9. Adult and Community Education								
10. Other								
Education policy analysis	R	U-14 UUAAUU	U-10 UUFFUU	F-5 FNFFFF	F-4 FFNNFF	N*-3 FNNNFF	F-5 FNFFFF	N-0 NNNNN
Research and educational practice	R	A-18 AAAAAA	U-10 UUFUFU	A-14 AAFAFA	N-1 NFNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNN
Practicum: Educational administration	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAF

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

	Generic skills									
	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
U	F-5 FNFFFF	F-4 FFNNFF	N*-3 FNNNFF	F-5 FNFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N*-3 FNNNFF	N*-3 FNNNFF	U-8 UUNNUU
U	A-14 AAFAFA	N-1 NFNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-16 AAAUAU	N-2 NNNFNF	N-1 FNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN
A	A-18 AAAAAA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N-2 NNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	A-14 AAFAFA

A = application

Matrix 1	R/E	Generic: Problem analysis	Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity
1. Curriculum Development							
EDLD 664 Curriculum development	R	A-16 AAAAUU	U-12 UAUFUU	U-9 FUNUUU	N*-3 FFFNNN	U-15 AAAUUU	U*-11 AAAUNN
2. School Improvement							
EDLD 660 Principalship	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-16 AAAAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 FUAUUU	A-17 AUAAAA
3. School Finance							
EDLD 662 School business management	R	F-8 FFUUFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-4 FFFFNN	N-4 NNUUNN	F*-6 NNUUFF
4. School Law							
EDLD 661 School law	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-17 AAAAUA	F-7 FFFANF	A-17 AAAAUA	U*-11 AFNAFA	F-9 FFFAUF
5. Community Relations							
EDLD 674 School-Community relations	R	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F*-9 UFUFUF	N-0 NNNNNN	N*-3 FNFNFN	F-6 FFFFFF
6. Leadership Skills							
EDLD 602 Educational leadership	R	U-13 UUUAUU	U-13 UUUAUU	F-8 FFFAFF	F-8 FFFAFF	F-9 FUFAFF	F-9 FFFAFU
7. Instructional Supervision							
EDLD 673 Supervision	R	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-17 UAAAAA	U*-12 FFAAFA	U-14 UUAUUA	U*-12 FFAUAU
8. Adult and Community Education							
9. Other							
EDLD 640 Intro. to research	R	A-17 AAAUAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-13 AANAFA	N-3 NFNUNN	N-2 NNNUNN	N-3 NNNUFN

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Generic skills										
Judgment	Organizational ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Sensitivity	Stress tolerance	Written communication	Oral communication	Range of interests	Personal motivation	Educational values
-12 AUFUU	U-9 FUNUUU	N*-3 FFFNNN	U-15 AAAUUU	U*-11 AAAUNN	F*-7 NNANUU	A-17 AAAUAA	A-17 AAAUAA	U*-11 NANUAA	F*-7 NFNUUU	A-17 AAAUAA
-18 AAAAA	A-16 AAAAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 FUAUUU	A-17 AUAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-17 AAAAUA	F-5 FFFFFN	F-7 FFFFUF	A-18 AAAAAA
-6 'FFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-4 FFFFNN	N-4 NNUUNN	F*-6 NNUUEF	N-2 NNNNFF	A-16 AAUUAA	F-8 FFUUFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-5 NFFFFF	N-4 NNUUNN
-17 AAAUA	F-7 FFFANF	A-17 AAAAUA	U*-11 AFNAFA	F-9 FFFAUF	F*-9 ANNANA	A-17 AAAAUA	F*-9 FNNAUA	N-2 NFNNFN	N-1 UNNNFN	U*-10 ANNAFA
-6 'FFFFF	F*-9 UFUFUF	N-0 NNNNNN	N*-3 FNFNFN	F-6 FFFFFF	N*-3 FNFNFN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN
-13 UUAUU	F-8 FFFAFF	F-8 FFFAFF	F-9 FUFAFF	F-9 FFFAFU	F*-8 NFFANA	U*-12 FAFAFA	A-16 AAAAFA	U*-10 FFUAFU	F-7 NFFAFF	F*-9 NFUAFU
-18 AAAAA	A-17 UAAAAA	U*-12 FFAAFA	U-14 UUAUUA	U*-12 FFAUAU	U*-10 NNAUAU	A-18 AAAAAA	U*-14 FAAUAU	F*-7 NFFUUF	U*-11 NFAUAU	U*-11 NFAUUA
-18 AAAAA	A-13 AANAFA	N-3 NFNUNN	N-2 NNNUNN	N-3 NNNUFN	N-6 NANNNA	A-18 AAAAAA	U*-10 FAFANU	F-6 FFNUFF	F*-7 FFFUUN	U*-12 FAFAUU

ing, A = application

Appendix J

Specific Skills--Universities

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools
1. Curriculum Development							
Curriculum	R	U-12 UUFAUU	U-11 UUFUUU	F-5 FFFFFN	F*-6 UUUNNN	F-5 FFFFFN	F-8 UUFFFF
2. School Improvement							
Supervision & improvement of instruction	R	A-16 AAFAAA	N-1 NFNNNN	F-4 FFFFNN	U*-12 UANFAA	F-4 FFFFNN	F-5 FFNFFF
3. School Finance							
School finance	E	U-10 UUFFUU	F*-7 FUNFFU	U-10 UUFFUU	F*-6 FUNNFU	U-9 UUNFUU	F*-7 FUNFFU
School business administration	E	F-8 FUFFFU	F-8 FUFFFU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-12 UUUUUU
4. School Law							
School law	E	U-12 UUUUUU	U*-12 AFFAAF	F-8 UFFFUF	F-8 UFFFUF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-8 FUFFFU
5. Community Relations							
School and community relations	E	F*-6 NFUUNF	F*-9 UFUUFF	U-10 UFUUFU	F-7 FFFFFU	A-16 AAUUAA	U-10 UUFFUU
6. Personnel Management							
School personnel admin.	E	U-11 UUUFUU	F*-5 FUFFNN	U-10 UUFFUU	A-14 AAFFAA	U-9 UUFNUU	U-9 UUFNUU
7. Leadership Skills							
Educational administration	R	F*-9 FUFUFU	F-6 FUFFFN	F-6 FUFFFN	U-10 UUFFUU	F-8 FUFFFU	F-6 FUFFNF
Principalship	R	U-12 UUUUUU	U-13 UUUUUA	F*-9 FUFUFU	F-7 FFUFFF	U*-15 AUUAUA	U-10 UUFUUF
8. Instructional Supervision							
Staff evaluation	E	U-12 UUUUUU	U-10 UUFFUU	N-4 NUNNNU	U-14 UAUUUA	F-8 FUFFFU	N-4 NUNNNU
9. Adult and Community Education							

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

	Specific skills								
R/E	Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
R	U-12 UUFAUU	U-11 UUFUUU	F-5 FFFFFN	F*-6 UUUNNN	F-5 FFFFFN	F-8 UUFFFF	F*-5 UUNNFN	N-0 NNNNNN	F*-9 UUFFFU
R	A-16 AAFAAA	N-1 NFNNNN	F-4 FFFFNN	U*-12 UANFAA	F-4 FFFFNN	F-5 FFNFFF	N-2 FFNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	U-11 UUFUUU
E	U-10 UUFFUU	F*-7 FUNFFU	U-10 UUFFUU	F*-6 FUNNFU	U-9 UUNFUU	F*-7 FUNFFU	A-15 AAFUAA	F-8 FUFFFU	U-10 UUFFUU
E	F-8 FUFFFU	F-8 FUFFFU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-12 UUUUUU	A-16 AAUUAA	U-10 UUFFUU	U-12 UUUUUU
E	U-12 UUUUUU	U*-12 AFFAAF	F-8 UFFFUF	F-8 UFFFUF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-8 FUFFFU	F-6 FFFFFF	F*-9 UFFUUF	F*-9 UFFUUF
E	F*-6 NFUUNF	F*-9 UFUUFF	U-10 UFUUFU	F-7 FFFFFU	A-16 AAUUAA	U-10 UUFFUU	F-7 FFFFFU	U-11 UFUUUU	U-10 UUUUUN
E	U-11 UUUFUU	F*-5 FUFFNN	U-10 UUFFUU	A-14 AAFFAA	U-9 UUFNUU	U-9 UUFNUU	U*-11 AFNFAA	F-8 FFFFUU	U*-13 AUFFAA
R	F*-9 FUFUFU	F-6 FUFFFN	F-6 FUFFFN	U-10 UUFFUU	F-8 FUFFFU	F-6 FUFFNF	F-6 FUFFFN	N-3 NUNFNN	U-10 UUFFUU
R	U-12 UUUUUU	U-13 UUUUUA	F*-9 FUFUFU	F-7 FFUFFF	U*-15 AUUAUA	U-10 UUFUUF	F-8 FUFFFU	F*-7 FUFUNF	U*-13 AUFFAA
E	U-12 UUUUUU	U-10 UUFFUU	N-4 NUNNNU	U-14 UAUUUA	F-8 FUFFFU	N-4 NUNNNU	N-4 NUNNNU	N-2 NFNNNF	U-12 UUUUUU

U = understanding, A = application

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skil: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations
1. Curriculum Development		A-18	A-16	N-0	N-5	U*-15
Curriculum development	R	AAAAAA	AAAUAU	NNNNNN	NNNNAU	AAUUAU
2. School Improvement		U-12	N-2	N-0	U-12	U-12
Current issues	R	UUUUUU	NNNFNF	NNNNNN	UUUUUU	UUUUUU
3. School Finance		N-0	N-0	N-0	N-0	U-12
School finance	R	NNNNNN	NNNNNN	NNNNNN	NNNNNN	UUUUUU
4. School Law		F-6	U-12	N-0	U-12	U-12
School law	R	FFFFFF	UUUUUU	NNNNNN	UUUUUU	UUUUUU
5. Community Relations						
6. Personnel Management		F-4	F-4	U-12	A-18	U-12
Personnel management	R	FFNFNF	FFNFNF	UUUUUU	AAAAAA	UUUUUU
7. Leadership Skills						
Fundamentals of public school administration	R	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFUFUF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-18 AAAAAA	U-13 UUUUAU
Practicum in educational administration	R	A-18 AAAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-12 AAANAN	N-0 NNNNNN
8. Instructional Supervision						
Administration and supervision in education	R					
9. Adult and Community Education						

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Specific skills								
Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
A-18 AAAAAA	A-16 AAAUAU	N-0 NNNNNN	N-5 NNNNAU	U*-15 AAUUAU	U-12 UUUUUU	F-5 FFFFFN	N-0 NNNNNN	U*-15 AAUUAU
U-12 UUUUUU	N-2 NNNFNF	N-0 NNNNNN	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	F-8 FFUFUF	N-0 NNNNNN	U-10 UUUFUF
N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	A-18 AAAAAA	F*-9 UFUFUF	F-6 FFFFFF
F-6 FFFFFF	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-18 AAAAAA
F-4 FFNFNF	F-4 FFNFNF	U-12 UUUUUU	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFUFUF	F-4 FFNFNF	U-12 UUUUUU
U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFUFUF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-18 AAAAAA	U-13 UUUUAU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	N-1 NNNNFN	A-18 AAAAAA
A-18 AAAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-12 AAANAN	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA

nderstanding, A = application

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district
1. Curriculum Development							
Curriculum development	R	A-17 AAAAUA	N-4 NNNNUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFFFUU	U-1 UUA
2. School Improvement							
Long-range planning	R	A-14 UUAAUU	N-3 NNNNUF	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-1 UUA
Program evaluation	R	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	F-6 FFF
Internship/practicum	R	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-18 AAAAAA	A-1 AAA
3. School Finance							
Educational finance	R	U-9 UUUUNF	N-3 FUNNNN	U-9 UUUUNF	F-5 FFFFNF	U-12 UUUUUU	F*- UFU
4. School Law							
Educational law	R	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U-8 UUUUNN	F*- UUN
5. Community Relations							
School as a formal organization	R	F-4 FFFFNN	N-1 NNNNNF	F-4 FFFFNN	F-6 FFFFFF	U-10 UUUUFF	F-6 FFF
Seminar	R	A-16 UUAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	F-8 UUFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	F-8 UUFFFF	F-8 UUF
6. Personnel Management							
7. Leadership Skills							
Admin. leadership skills	R	U*-13 UUAAUF	F-8 UUFFFF	F-6 FFUFNF	A-13 AAAANF	U-10 UUUUNU	U-9 UUU
8. Instructional Supervision							
Supervision and staff eval.	R						
9. Adult and Community Education							

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

/E	Specific skills								
	Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
R	A-17 AAAAUA	N-4 NNNNUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	F-8 FFFFUU	U-14 UUAAUU	F-4 FFNNFF	N-2 NNNNFF	U-10 UUUUFF
R	A-14 UUAAUU	N-3 NNNNUF	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-14 UUAAUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	A-17 AAAAUA
R	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF
R	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-16 AAAAUU	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-18 AAAAAA	A-14 AAAAFF	A-18 AAAAAA
R	U-9 UUUUNF	N-3 FUNNNN	U-9 UUUUNF	F-5 FFFFNF	U-12 UUUUUU	F*-7 UFUUNN	A-16 UUAAAA	U-9 UUUUNF	U-9 UUUUNF
R	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U*-10 UUAANN	U-8 UUUUNN	F*-6 UUNUNN	U-8 UUUUNN	U*-11 UUAANF	F*-9 UFAANN
R	F-4 FFFFNN	N-1 NNNNNF	F-4 FFFFNN	F-6 FFFFFF	U-10 UUUUFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-1 NNNNNF	N-2 FFNNNN	U-9 UUUUNF
R	A-16 UUAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	F-8 UUFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	F-8 UUFFFF	F-8 UUFFFF	A-16 UUAAAA	N-0 NNNNNN	U-12 UUUUUU
R	U*-13 UUAAUF	F-8 UUFFFF	F-6 FFUFNF	A-13 AAAANF	U-10 UUUUNU	U-9 UUUUNF	N-1 NNNNNF	F-5 FFFFNF	A-13 AAAANF
R									

= understanding, A = application

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools
1. Curriculum Development							
Organization, control and mgt. of American schools	R	U-10 UUFFUU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-7 FFFFUF	U-10 UUFFUU	F-8 FFFFUU
2. School Improvement							
Admin. and mgt. of schools: Support programs	R	F-5 FNFFFF	U-10 UUFUFU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UUFUFU
3. School Finance							
Public school finance	R	F-4 FFNFNF	U-8 UUNUNU	U-8 UUNUNU	F-4 FFNFNF	F-5 FNFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF
4. School Law							
Legal aspects of education	R	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU
5. Community Relations							
Politics of education	R	U-10 UUFUFU	F-8 UUFFFF	U-10 UUFUFU	F-6 FFFFFF	U-14 UUAUAU	U-10 UUFUFU
6. Personnel Management							
Personnel administration and supervision	R	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-14 UUAUAU	U-10 UUFUFU	F-6 FFFFFF
7. Leadership Skills							
Theories of acministrative organization and leadership	R	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	U-14 UUAUAU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF
8. Instructional Supervision							
Admin. and mgt. of schools: The instructional program	R	U-12 UUAUFU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-9 UUFNUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UUFUFU

/E	Specific skills								
	Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
R	U-10 UUFFUU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-7 FFFFUF	U-10 UUFFUU	F-8 FFFFUU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-5 FFFNFF
R	F-5 FNFFFF	U-10 UUFUFU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-11 UUFUUU
R	F-4 FFNFNF	U-8 UUNUNU	U-8 UUNUNU	F-4 FFNFNF	F-5 FNFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	A-18 AAAAAA	U-8 UUNUNU	U-8 UUNUNU
R	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU
R	U-10 UUFUFU	F-8 UUFFFF	U-10 UUFUFU	F-6 FFFFFF	U-14 UUAUAU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	F-4 FFFNFN	U-10 UUFUFU
R	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-10 UUFUFU	U-14 UUAUAU	U-10 UUFUFU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-4 FFFNFN	F-4 FFFNFN	U-10 UUFUFU
R	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	U-14 UUAUAU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-2 NNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	F-6 FFFFFF
R	U-12 UUAUFU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-10 UUFFUU	U-9 UUFNUU	U-11 UUFUUU	U-10 UUFUFU	N-1 FNNNNN	N-1 FNNNNN	A-12 AANNAA

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skills: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district &
9. Adult and Community Education							
10. Other							
		U-10	F-6	F-6	F-6	F-6	F-6
Education policy analysis	R	UUFFUU	FFFFFF	FFFFFF	FFFFFF	FFFFFF	FFFF
Research and educational practice	R	F-6 FFFFFF	N*-3 FNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	F-6 FFFF
Practicum: Educational administration	R	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFA

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

Specific skills								
instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
0 FUU	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF
FFF	N*-3 FNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	N-2 NNFNFN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-2 NNFNFN	F-6 FFFFFF
4 AFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA	A-14 AAFAFA

standing, A = application

Matrix 2	R/E	Specific skill: Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations
1. Curriculum Development						
EDLD 664 Curriculum development	R	A-17 AAAUAA	U*-11 FAFNAA	N-1 NNFNNN	F*-6 NNNUUU	U-10 FUFUUU
2. School Improvement						
EDLD 660 Principalship	R	A-18 AAAAAA	F-9 FUFAFF	F-9 FUFAFF	A-17 AAAAUA	F-9 FFFAFU
3. School Finance						
EDLD 662 School business management	R	U-10 UUUUFF	F*-8 NUUUFF	F*-9 FUUUFF	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF
4. School Law						
EDLD 661 School law	R	A-16 AAAUUA	A-16 AAAUUA	F*-6 NUNUUN	A-14 AFAAFA	F-8 FFFUFU
5. Community Relations						
EDLD 674 School-community relations	R	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA
6. Personnel Management						
7. Leadership Skills						
EDLD 602 Educational leadership	R	F-6 NFFFFU	N-1 NNNNFN	F-4 NFFFFN	F-9 FFFAFU	F-8 FFFUFU
8. Instructional Supervision						
EDLD 673 Supervision	R	A-18 AAAAAA	U*-12 FFAAAF	F-10 FFFAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	F-10 FFFAFA
9. Adult and Community Education						
10. Other						
EDLD 640 Intro. to research	R	F*-8 NNNAUA	N-5 NNNUNA	N-6 NNNANA	N-5 NNNUNA	N-4 NNNUNU

N = no emphasis, F = familiarity, U = understanding, A = application

/E	Specific skills								
	Curriculum and instruction	Student activities	Support services	Staff selection, evaluation, and development	Community relations	Coordination with district & other schools	Fiscal management	School plant maintenance	Structures communication
	A-17 AAAUAA	U*-11 FAFNAA	N-1 NNFNNN	F*-6 NNNUUU	U-10 FUFUUU	U-9 FUUNUU	F*-8 NFFNAA	N-2 NNNUNN	U-10 FUFUUU
	A-18 AAAAAA	F-9 FUFAFF	F-9 FUFAFF	A-17 AAAAUA	F-9 FFFAFU	F-9 FFFAFU	F-8 FFFAFF	F-8 FFFAFF	A-18 AAAAAA
	U-10 UUUUFF	F*-8 NUUUFF	F*-9 FUUUFF	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	F-8 FFUUFF	F-8 FFUUFF	A-18 AAAAAA
	A-16 AAAUUA	A-16 AAAUUA	F*-6 NUNUUN	A-14 AFAAFA	F-8 FFFUFU	F-8 FFFAFF	F-7 FFFUFF	F-8 FFFAFF	F-8 FFFAFF
	N-0 NNNNNN	F-6 FFFFFF	F-6 FFFFFF	N-0 NNNNNN	A-18 AAAAAA	U-12 UUUUUU	N-0 NNNNNN	N-0 NNNNNN	U-12 UUUUUU
	F-6 NFFFFU	N-1 NNNNFN	F-4 NFFFFN	F-9 FFFAFU	F-8 FFFUFU	F-6 FFFUFN	F-4 NFFFFN	N-2 NFNNFN	F-8 FFFAFF
	A-18 AAAAAA	U*-12 FFAAAF	F-10 FFFAFA	A-18 AAAAAA	F-10 FFFAFA	F-10 FFFAFA	F-4 NNFFFF	N-6 NNANAN	A-18 AAAAAA
	F*-8 NNNAUA	N-5 NNNUNA	N-6 NNNANA	N-5 NNNUNA	N-4 NNNUNU	N-4 NNNUNU	N-1 NNNFNN	N-1 NNNFNN	A-13 AAAFAN

: understanding, A = application

Appendix K

Methods of Instruction--Universities

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship
1. Curriculum Development								
Curriculum	R	1		2			2	
2. School Improvement								
Supervision and improvement of instruction	R	1					2	
3. School Finance								
School finance	E	1				2	2	
School business administration	E	1				2	2	
4. School Law								
School law	E	1					2	
5. Community Relations								
School and community relations	E	1					1	
6. Personnel Management								
School personnel admin.	E	1					2	
7. Leadership Skills								
Education administration	R	1					2	
Principalship	R	2				1	2	
8. Instructional Supervision								
Staff evaluation	E	1					2	
9. Adult and Community Education								

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

		Instructional modes								
	R/E	Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
									Group process	
	R	1		2			2		2	
rement	R	1					2			
	E	1				2	2			
	E	1				2	2			
	E	1					2		2	
	E	1					1		2	
ı.	E	1					2			
ion	R	1					2		2	
	R	2				1	2		1	
sion	E	1					2			
ducation										

ndary mode

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other
1. Curriculum Development									
Curriculum development	R	1	2			2	2		
2. School Improvement									
Current issues	R	1				2	2		
3. School Finance									
School finance	R	1					2		
4. School Law									
School law	R	1				2	2		
5. Community Relations									
6. Personnel Management									
Personnel management	R	1	2			2	2		
7. Leadership Skills									Grou proce
Fundamentals of public school administration	R	1				2	2		2
Practicum in educational administration	R						2	1	
8. Instructional Supervision									
Administration and supervision in education	R								
9. Adult and Community Education									

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

		Instructional modes								
	R/E	Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
nent										
nent	R	1	2			2	2			
	R	1				2	2			
	R	1					2			
	R	1				2	2			
t										
t	R	1	2			2	2			
									Group process	
lic on	R	1				2	2		2	
ional	R						2	1		
vision										
super-	R									
Education										

condary mode

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-
1. Curriculum Development								
Curriculum development	R	1	2	2		2	2	
2. School Improvement								
Long-range planning	R	1	2		2		2	
Program evaluation	R	1					2	
Internship/practicum	R	2						1
3. School Finance								
Educational finance	R	1					2	
4. School Law								
Educational law	R	1					2	
5. Community Relations								
School as a formal organization	R	1					2	
Seminar	R	1					1	
6. Personnel Management								
7. Leadership Skills								
Admin. leadership skills	R	1	2			2	2	
8. Instructional Supervision								
Supervision and staff eval.	R							
9. Adult and Community Education								

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

		Instructional modes								
	R/E	Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
	R	1	2	2		2	2			
	R	1	2		2		2			
	R	1					2			
	R	2						1		
	R	1					2			
	R	1					2			
	R	1					2			
	R	1					1			
s	R	1	2			2	2			
on										
val.	R									
cation										

ary mode

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other
1. Curriculum Development									
Organization, control and mgt. of American schools	R	1	2			2			
2. School Improvement									
Admin. and mgt. of schools: Support programs	R	1	2			2			
3. School Finance									
Public school finance	R	1			2				
4. School Law									
Legal aspects of education	R	1					2		
5. Community Relations									
Politics of education	R	1							
6. Personnel Management									
Personnel administration and supervision	R	1							
7. Leadership Skills									
Theories of administrative organization and leadership	R	1	2						
8. Instructional Supervision									
Admin. and mgt. of schools: The instructional program	R	1				1	2		

		Instructional modes								
	R/E	Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
ent										
ol and hools	R	1	2			2				
schools:	R	1	2			2				
e	R	1			2					
cation	R	1					2			
n	R	1								
tion	R	1								
rative dership	R	1	2							
ision										
chools: ogram	R	1				1	2			

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship
9. Adult and Community Education								
10. Other								
Education policy analysis	R	1						
Research and educational practice	R	1			2		2	
Practicum: Educational administration	R	1	2					

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

		Instructional modes								
	R/E	Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
ucation										
sis	R	1								
al	R	1			2		2			
l	R	1	2							

dary mode

Matrix 3	R/E	Instructional modes: Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	
1. Curriculum Development								
EDLD 664 Curriculum development	R	1	2	2		2	2	
2. School Improvement								
EDLD 660 Principalship	R	1	2	2		2	2	
3. School Finance								
EDLD 662 School business management	R	1					2	
4. School Law								
EDLD 661 School law	R	1		2		2	2	
5. Community Relations								
EDLD 674 School-community relations	R	1				2	2	
6. Personnel Management								
7. Leadership Skills								
EDLD 602 Educational leadership	R	1		2		2	2	
8. Instructional Supervision								
EDLD 673 Supervision	R	1		2		2	2	
9. Adult and Community Education								
10. Other								
EDLD 640 Intro. to research	R	1			2	2	2	

1 = primary mode, 2 = secondary mode

		Instructional modes								
	R/E	Lecture-discussion	Tutorial-seminar	Instructional module	Computer-based	Gaming-simulation	Individual or team research	Clinical-internship	Other	Other
	R	1	2	2		2	2		Group process	
ip	R	1	2	2		2	2		2	
ness	R	1					2			
	R	1		2		2	2			
unity	R	1				2	2			
	R	1		2		2	2		Group process 2	
sion	R	1		2		2	2			
ducation	R	1			2	2	2			

ndary mode

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achilles, C. (1984). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. Issues in Education, 2, 127-135.

American Association of School Administrators. (1960). Professional administrators for America's schools (38th yearbook). Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of School Administrators. (1982). Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators. Arlington, VA: Author.

Angus, D. L. (1986). Retirement plans of Michigan school administrators. Secondary Education Today: The Journal of the MASSP, 27(3), 2-7.

Association of Washington School Principals. (1984). An administrative intern program. Tacoma, WA: Author.

Austin, G. R. (1978). Process evaluation: A comprehensive study of outliers. College Park: Maryland State Department of Education and the University of Maryland, Center for Educational Research and Development.

Barth, R. S. (1984). Professional development of principals. Educational Leadership, 42(2), 93-94.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. D. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on American secondary education. New York: Harper and Row.

Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. New York: Praeger.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezette, L. W. (1977). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.

Burks, M. P. (1986). Requirements for certification. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, M. (1981). Effective schools: What the research says. Today's Education, 70(2), 58-61.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Cornett, L. M. (1983). The preparation and selection of school principals. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Daresh, J. C., & LaPlant, J. C. (1983). In-service for school principals: A status report. The Executive Review, 3(7), 1-5.

Edmonds, R. R. (1978, July). A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schools. Paper presented at the National Conference of Urban Education, St. Louis, Mo.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 9(5), 28-32.

Education Commission of the States. (1984). Action for excellence: Task force on education for economic growth. Denver, CO: Author.

Egerton, J. (1977). Education and desegregation in eight schools. Amherst, NJ: Center for Equal Education.

Fitzgerald, M., Schmitt, N., & Meritt, R. (1979). Analysis of school administrator task inventory. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gousha, R. P., LoPresti, P. L., & Jones, A. H. (1986). Mapping a dynamic field: Results from the second annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken.

Griffiths, D. E. (1977). Preparation programs for administrators. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. D. Nystron (Eds.), Education administration: The developing decades (pp. 401-437). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Gulbertson, J., Farquhar, R. H., Fogarty, B. M., Shibles, M. R. (1973). Social science content for preparing educational leaders. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Higley, J. (1975). Training and certification of principals: School leadership digest (No. 12 of series). Arlington, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Hoyle, J. R. (1985). Programs in educational administration and the AASA preparation guidelines. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(1), 71-93.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: Edits.

Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 33(1), 33-42.

Kelley, E. A. (1980). Improving school climate. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Kelley, E. A. (1986). Defining the mission of university involvement. NASSP Bulletin, 70(486), 47-50.

Lipham, J. M. (1981). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Ludlow, H. G. (1964). The doctorate in American education: Vol. 4. Follow-up study. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Madden, J. V. (1976). School effectiveness study: State of California. Sacramento: State of California Department of Education.

Maher, R. (1988). Are graduate schools preparing tomorrow's administrators? NASSP Bulletin, 72(508), 30-34.

Manasse, A. L. (1982). Effective principals: Effective at what? Principal, 61(4), 10-15.

Mangieri, J. N. (1985). Excellence in education. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

McCleary, L. E., & McIntyre, K. E. (1972). Competency development and university methodology. NASSP Bulletin, 56(362), 53-68.

McCurdy, J. (1983). The role of the principal in effective schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Michigan Academy for Principal Preparation. (1986). Project proposal submitted to the Kellogg Foundation. Kalamazoo, MI: Author.

Michigan Department of Education. (1987). 1987 report on survey of Michigan staff eligible to retire. Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan Department of Education. (1988). Administrator certification code. Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan Department of Education. (1989). Application to request state board approval of new or amended administrator education programs. Lansing, MI: Author.

Millward, R., & Cronk, C. (1987, February). A performance based training program for principals. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, San Antonio, TX.

Mulhauser, F. (1983). Recent research on the principalship: A view from NIE (Summary paper). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1986). Proficiencies for principals. Arlington, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1975). Continuing the search: Preservice and inservice education. Reston, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1982). The effective principal. Reston, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1985). Performance-based preparation of principals. Reston, VA: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1978). Training needs of public school administrators (Contract No. 300-76-0009). Washington, DC: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for school reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

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

National School Public Relations Association. (1984). Excellence: Your guide to action now. Arlington, VA: Author.

Odden, A. (1986). Sources of funding for education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 335-340.

Pellicer, L., Anderson, L., Keefe, J., Kelley, E., & McCleary, L. (1988). High school leaders and their schools. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Pitner, N. J. (1982). Training of the school administrator: State of the art (Occasional paper). Eugene: Oregon University, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1982). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 64-69.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Outson, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schmitt, N., Noe, R., Meritt, R., Fitzgerald, M., & Jorgenson, C. (1983). Criterion-related and content validity of the NASSP Assessment Center. Reston, VA: NASSP.

Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. (1970). Toward equal educational opportunity: The report of the Senate select committee on equal educational opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 178-182.

Silver, P. F., & Spuck, D. W. (1978). Preparatory programs for educational administrators in the United States. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1983). Meeting the need for quality: Action in the South. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1986). Effective school principals. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Squires, D. A., Huitt, W. G., & Segars, J. K. (1983). Effective schools and classrooms: A research-based perspective. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 349-352.

Thompson, S. D. (1986, May 28). Strengthen, don't diffuse, school leadership. Education Week, pp. 22, 28.

Thomson, S. D. (1988). The principalship: Ingredients of programs to prepare effective leaders. NASSP Bulletin, 72(508), 39-46.

Thornton, G. C., & Byham, W. C. (1982). Assessment centers and managerial performance. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1978). Violent schools--safe schools: The safe school study report to the Congress. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Voit, L. (1989). Perceptions and evaluations of practicing public school principals in the state of Michigan regarding their university preparation program. Unpublished manuscript, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Weber, G. (1971). Inner city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Witters-Churchill, L. J. (1988). University preparation of the school administrator: Evaluations by Texas principals (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1342A.

Wynn, D. R. (1972). Unconventional methods and materials for preparing educational administrators. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Wynne, E. (1981). Looking at schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 377-381.