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Tennessee administrators were given the opportunity to respond to the questionnaire used to determine the effectiveness of the Principal’s Academy. Five research questions were answered, and seven hypotheses stated in null form were tested using the Kruskal-Wallis Nova for data involving more than two groups. The Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon Rank Sum W Test was used to determine if there was any significant difference in the respondent’s perceptions of the academy as it related to the year of attendance. All null hypotheses were retained except the hypothesis related to the year the respondents attended the academy. In years 1984 and 1985 there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents; thus, the hypothesis was rejected.

The key motivating factor, other than to meet the state mandate of attendance, is self-improvement. The collegiality and social network associated with the Principal’s Academy is valuable, and attending the Principal’s Academy is a factor in school administrators implementing school improvement strategies. Research should be conducted to develop an evaluation instrument that could be used to evaluate future principal’s academies.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Elementary and secondary school principals need to be converted to the new ideas and the details of the plans to restructure their schools. They need opportunities to witness demonstrations, to participate in panel discussions and to help formulate the details. Since they will be the teacher leaders, principals will have to learn new skills essential to the new leadership responsibilities. (Bell, 1992, p. 88)

As educators prepare youth for the 21st century, they must look at ways to prepare students, teachers, and administrators. In the future, improving the quality of instruction in the classroom for youth will require that changes be implemented to continue to improve the instructional process. The principal, according to effective schools’ research, is the key to success. Richardson (1988) described the different roles in which the principal must function to be effective. Until the last decade, the principal was viewed as a teacher with limited knowledge of administration. Today the principal is viewed as an administrative manager with limited knowledge of the technology of teaching. According to Arends (1990), recommendations made by the Holmes Group, Tomorrow’s Teachers, and the Carnegie Forum’s Teachers for the 21st
Century indicate that educators must not neglect staff development reform as they prepare for the 21st century.

Staff development is needed to help school principals and teachers to meet the 21st century challenge. The Oberlin Teacher Academy is an example of such an innovative program. The college makes its resources available to high school teachers and administrators in the Cleveland, Ohio area. The academy "offers summer institutes and week-end workshops in areas of English, biology, chemistry, computer science, French, mathematics, and other curricular areas with college credit given to the participants" (Arends, 1990, p. 62).

Since 1975, state departments of education and local universities have attempted to provide quality staff development for administrators through the formation of "academies" for school leaders. North Carolina initiated what was called the North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals in July 1979. This program was sponsored by the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction and funded by the State Department of Education of North Carolina. The institution's purpose was to blend theory into practice, concentrating mainly on the development of leadership, communication, and human relations skills among principals. The program was later referred to as the North Carolina Principal's Academy (Grier & Draughon, 1987).

Other academies started to gain popularity during the 1980s. In 1979, the state of Maine began to use the
Principal’s Academy as a way of improving principal leadership. This academy was one of the nation’s first academies for staff development for principals. A survey in 1987 confirms the potential of self-directed professional growth. A survey of 15,0 Maine academy participants found that their single greatest gain from the academy experience was feeling stimulated to do a better job and having learned specific techniques for doing so (Donaldson, 1987). For example, the Principals’ Center of Harvard University was developed to promote insight-sharing among its members. The Center works to develop, personally, and professionally, those individuals influencing the quality of schools. The Center is important because it legitimizes the idea that there are conditions under which practitioners will voluntarily engage in activities promoting leadership growth and thus school improvement (Barth, 1984).

With more than 60% of school administrators retiring by the end of the decade (Peterson, Marshall, & Grier, 1987, p. 47), the preparation of future leaders is of critical importance. In response, new approaches to administrator training have developed across the country. One of the newest ideas for increasing the pool of high quality principals is the Principal’s Academies.

A report prepared by Weeks (May 1990) and presented to the Tennessee State Board of Education highlighted the following demographic data regarding administrators in Tennessee:
In 1988-89, there were 1,561 principals and 776 assistant principals in public schools in Tennessee.

Females represented 23.9% of employed principals, 26.6% of employed assistant principals, 39.4% of new hires as principals, and 57.6% of employed educators holding the endorsement but not employed in an administrative position.

The average number of years of experience for principals was 22 years, for assistant principals 20 years, and for new hires as principals 16 years. The average number of years of experience for persons leaving the principalship over the last three years was 22 years.

In 1988-89, 35% of principals and 23% of assistant principals had more than 25 years of experience. Among principals and assistant principals, 53% hold a Masters degree plus 30 hours or a higher degree. The average number of new principals hired each year for the last three years was 136. This represents approximately 8.7% of the total number of principals (1,561) employed in 1988-89.

There were 5,766 educators employed in Tennessee in 1988-89 who held an administration/supervision endorsement who were not employed as an administrator (principal, assistant principal, supervisor, or superintendent).

Public institutions of higher education awarded
336 Masters degrees in administration/supervision, and private institutions awarded 273 Masters degrees in 1988-89. Additional persons, who already held a Masters degree, attained an endorsement in administrative/supervision.

Data presented by Weeks (1990) were found to reflect that the principalship turnover rate from 1985 until 1988 in Tennessee averaged 9.4% or 152 principals who left the principalship. Eight-and-one-half percent or 135.6 new hires or replacements entered the principalship from 1986 until 1989 (see Appendix A).

In the same year, blacks represented 11.5% of employed principals, 19.9% of employed assistant principals, and 15.7% of the employed educators holding the endorsement but not serving as an administrator.

With the high rate of turnover in Tennessee, innovative methods and strategies must be implemented to effectively train new principals coming into the profession. In the spring of 1984, the state of Tennessee enacted a new law that was established by the state legislature. Public law 49-5-5701 created and defined the Principal’s Administrator Academy as follows:

(a) There is hereby created the Tennessee principal-administrator academy under the auspices of the department of education. The academy is not a single institution, but is an organizational framework for a wide array of educational and training programs
for school leaders, conducted at several sites in the three (3) grand divisions of the state by the department of education.

(b) The academy shall be a program of the department of education and shall be under the management and control of the commissioner. (Tennessee Code Annotated, 1990, p. 284)

The purposes and duties of the Principal's Academy are defined by TCA 49-5-5702 as follows:

(a) Training opportunities for principals and appropriate supervisory and administrative staff shall be made available, through the academy, within the limits of the approved budget of the department of education. The purpose of the academy is to instill and reinforce instructional leadership for educational effectiveness. The academy will consist of, but not be limited to, seminars and symposia for provisional principals and supervisors, special topic workshops, skill-building programs, advanced leadership training, appropriate programs for central office personnel, and such other programs as may be devised by the department.

(b) The academy shall also offer training to educators in evaluation techniques and procedures consistent with the evaluation processes provided for in parts 50-55 of this chapter.

(c) The commissioner of education shall approve all training activities of the academy, which will be
provided by department staff, university-based experts, outstanding school practitioners, the professional associations, and such others as determined by the commissioner.

(d) The academy will include summer institutes especially for school principals and administrators provided at several sites in the three (3) grand divisions. (pp. 284-285)

Public law TCA 49-5-5703 defines and describes the principals and administrators who will attend the academy as follows:

(a) (1) Each principal administrator shall be required to attend the Principal’s Administrator Academy for instruction at least once every five (5) years.

(a) (2) Any principal or administrator who has not satisfied the requirements of this subsection as of April 23, 1990, shall have one (1) additional year, for a total of six (6) years, in which to fulfill these requirements. This subdivision expires on August 31, 1991.

(b) In order to provide for orderly admission of principals and administrators, within the requirements of subsection (a), the commissioner of education shall establish admission procedures for the academy.

(p. 285)

Public law TCA 49-5-5704 defines and describes the costs
of academy attendance as follows:

These institutes shall be provided without cost to those attending; however, participant travel, living and incidental costs may be at the expense of the participant, or if the local education agency so determines, it may reimburse from school funds its participants for their reasonable expenses, not exceeding amounts authorized for state employees in the comprehensive travel regulations as promulgated by the department of finance and administration and approved by the attorney general and reporter. (285)

With the advent of the Principal’s Administrator Academy, school leaders have been provided an opportunity to instill and reinforce instructional leadership for educational effectiveness (TCA, 1990, p. 284-285). Since 1984, the Tennessee State Department of Education has instituted 89 academies for principals. An evaluation component is part of the academy principal development process.

What are the characteristics, both effective and ineffective, of the Principal’s Academies of Tennessee? This study is an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the principal’s academy as it relates to the job performance of principals at their local school sites.
Statement of the Problem

Which components of the Tennessee Principal's Administrator Academy are effective and which are ineffective in influencing the principal's performance?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the effects of the Principal's Academy that influence the principal's day-to-day job performance at the local school site.

Research Questions

1. What level of knowledge and extent of implementation in the following five growth areas of planning and organization, curriculum and instruction, community relations, personnel, and school climate did respondents indicate after attending the principal's academy?

2. Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?

   A. Size of school
   B. Per pupil expenditure
   C. Number of full-time teachers
   D. Educational level
   E. School setting
   F. Years in their position
   G. Age of respondent
   H. Years attending academy
3. What were the respondent's overall opinion of the Principal's Academy?

4. What were the motivating factors in the attendance of participants in the Tennessee Principal's Academy?

5. Have the respondents implemented any planned instructional innovations or school improvement strategies as a result of attending the Principal's Academy?

**Null Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses, stated in null form, will be tested to the .05 level of significance.

1. There will be no significant difference in the ratings regarding the five growth areas between participants of differing years in their present position.

2. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas of participants of different ages.

3. There will be no significant difference in perceptions of the academy participants based on the number of times a participant has attended.

4. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas between principals with different annual per pupil expenditures for their school.

5. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas of principals with different numbers of full-time teachers (faculty size) in their schools.
6. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the Tennessee Principal's Academy based on the type of community (rural, urban, suburban) in which the principal is located.

7. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas considering the enrollment of the respondent's school.

**Significance of the Study**

The results of this study should provide a summation of the perceptions of principals about the effectiveness of the current content and learning activities introduced during the Tennessee Principal's Academy cycle. The results of this study will also indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the academy as it relates to the principal's needs in day-to-day activities.

**Limitations**

1. The data was limited to participants from 1985 to 1991.

2. The study was limited to principals who have accumulated more than 72 hours in attendance at the academies.

3. The study was limited to the professional development practices and strategies used by the organizers of the Tennessee Principal's Academy from 1984 to 1992.
Definitions

Tennessee Principal’s Academy

In this study, academy will refer to the Principal-Administrator Academy created by Tennessee Code Annotated 49-5-5701, 49-5-5702, 59-5-5703, and 49-5-5704 (Tennessee Code Annotated, Part 57, Book 9, p. 294-285).

Competencies

Competencies are specified skills and abilities which for the purpose of this study were assumed to support principal effectiveness (Good, 1973, p. 121).

Principal

The person granted the authority and responsibility to serve as the educational leader of a school is the principal (Good, 1973, p. 436).

Effectiveness

Characteristics of the principal’s academy that enable the principal to attain desired outcomes as the school leader is effectiveness (Kirk, 1989, p. 9).

Value

For the purpose of this study, value refers to the helpfulness and relevance of academy content (Good, 1973, p. 636).
Procedures

The following procedures were used in the development of this study:

1. A review of current literature was conducted.
2. A preliminary survey instrument (i.e., the questionnaire) was developed and pilot tested.
3. The final questionnaire was developed from the preliminary survey instrument and the results of the pilot study.
4. The questionnaire was administered to the sample of principals over a 14 week period.
5. Data from the questionnaires were entered into the computer program called the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS/PC version 4.0) (SPSS, Inc., 1991).
6. Null hypotheses were tested by use of the computer program and the results of the study were compiled.
7. Findings and conclusions for the study were developed from the compiled results.
8. The study was concluded with recommendations for the future.

Overview of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the hypotheses to be tested, the significance of the study, the limitations of the study, the definitions, and the overview of the
study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of selected and related literature published in or since January 1975.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology by which the study was conducted.

Chapter 4 contains the statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter 5 includes the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
Review of the Literature

This chapter contains a review of the literature pertinent to the development and implementations of training programs for professional growth of school administrators. The review of literature to support this study is organized into four sections. The first section presents the literature as it relates to Effective Schools Research, that the quality of educational programming is directly related to the quality of its educational leadership. The second section is a summary of current literature on the status and critical nature of the principalship that focuses on the new demands and changing role of the school administrator. The third section reviews current approaches to inservice training and staff development for administrators and discusses programs being developed to provide quality, continuing education and professional staff development opportunities for school administrators.

School Effectiveness and the Principal

The principal is central to the attainment of better schools. School reconstruction and improvement will require a new vision and a supreme cooperative effort by enlightened citizens and professionals (Goodlad, 1979). Thomas (1982) discussed what was required of school leaders and what skills they needed to achieve success. School leaders
need a broader understanding of the basic concepts of democracy through the study of history, the political process, human behavior, sociology, and cultures. Leaders need to develop process skills for decision making.

Educational leadership requires knowledge of ethics, law, and philosophy. Educational leaders are separated from others by their ability to see beyond the current contradictions, to see how schools may be better, to accept the future as benevolent, and to know that success comes with persistence, hard work, persuasion, and faith. It is a mixture of pragmatism, prejudice, precisions, prayer, and possibility (Thomas, 1982).

Finally, school leaders should be generalists of the educational arena. They must be knowledgeable of all forms of leadership and practice various leadership styles. They must be able to adjust to changing conditions and fluctuations in expectations (p. 76).

Hodgkinson (1982) postulated the following nine theories necessary if principals are going to manage schools.

1. Principals must become more sophisticated about communicating with the public.

2. Of all the management arts, strategic planning is the one needed most.

3. Principals must develop effective techniques for motivating the best teachers to stay on the job.

4. Principals need to be more aware of the wave
of new educational programs developed by business and industry, the military, and other organizations.

5. Principals should build in greater decision making and participation for parents in decisions involving their children.

6. A collaborative working relationship between schools and businesses will be necessary.

7. Awareness of the skills of time management and reduction of stress must be practiced by principals.

8. The U.S.A. will be running a second "dual" system of public schools; private versus public and frost belt versus sunbelt will continue their present low enrollment levels through the 1980s with some additional school closings and reduction in force.

9. As traditional family patterns shift, there are more pressures on the schools to substitute for the family in terms of children's social and ethical values.

Clearly, the literature indicated that as administrators move into the 1990s they must be prepared to face a myriad of challenges that will enable our schools and students to be prepared for the 21st century.

In the last 15 years, extensive research has been focused on what characterizes an effective school, on the qualities of effective leadership, and most recently, on the examination of behaviors of principals. Edmonds (1979) described the effective school as one that brings the
children of the poor to those minimal masteries of basic school skills that now describe minimally successful pupil performance for the children of middle class.

In his 1971 study of instructionally effective inner city schools, Weber focused on the characteristics of four inner city schools in which reading achievement was clearly successful for poor children on the basis of national norms. Each school has "strong leadership" in that its principal was instrumental in setting the tone of the school; helping choose instructional strategies; and organizing and distributing the school's resources. All schools had "high expectations" for their students. The schools had an orderly, relatively quiet, and pleasant atmosphere. All four schools strongly emphasized pupil acquisition of reading skills and reinforced that emphasis by careful and frequent evaluation of pupils' progress (Edmonds, 1979).

Edmonds (1979) summarized what seems to be the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools. He stated that effective schools have strong administrative leadership. Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum levels of achievement. The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand.

Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of basic skills takes
precedence over all other activities. "When necessary, school energy and resources can be diverted from other business in furtherance of the fundamental objectives. There must be some means by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored" (Edmonds, 1979, p. 22).

Duke (1982) identified four directly related leadership functions and two functions that are indirectly related to the achievement of instructional effectiveness. The four "direct" functions include staff development, instructional support, resource acquisition, and allocation and quality control. Two additional functions, coordination and trouble shooting, make it possible for principals to engage in other functions with a minimum of wasted effort.

Effective principals traditionally have been described in terms of their personality traits, firm, but fair; decisive; sensitive, rather than functions or skills (Duke, 1982).

Giles (1988) stated that as the 21st century approaches schools and schooling will be replaced by significantly different and better New Age learning systems. Communities, homes, and special centers will become the living learning laboratories. There will not be departments of English, science, and industrial arts. There will not be career, adult, community, physical, vocational, and home economics education as they are known today. Knowledge will be interrelated, not segmented.

The merging school leader of the 90s will be a
visionary hero who understands that the role of the principal is to create, to facilitate, to encourage, to motivate, to manage by participation, to share decision making, to encourage human potential and yes, to believe that all things are possible (Wentz, 1989).

Summary of Current Literature on the Status and Nature of the Principalship

In recent years, the position of principal has taken on new meaning and responsibility. The work load has increased, accountability and other evaluative criteria have added a new dimension to the school principalship. Today's principals face a host of critical situations and, in many instances, lack the academic preparation, skills, support network, and psychological orientation to deal with them effectively.

The principal must now act as the instructional leader, budget manager, contract administrator, public relations director, human relations specialist, disciplinarian, planner, and curriculum director.

Bluford and Erlandson (1975) outline characteristics of effective inner city school principals to include:

Keeping morale high: The principal must understand the background of subcultural (and individual) behavior patterns to enable the building of self-pride and a sense of individual worth. The principal can do much through personal example, in contact with different groups, to build
respect. These principals who desire to have long-range impact, must be politically sophisticated. Political sophistication also means the realization of active participation by the principal in the community. Gone is the 9 to 3 job; principals will find themselves working many nights and sometimes weekends.

Establishing priorities: In his contact with the community, he must keep in mind his own role. He is the one person chiefly concerned with the education of all the community's youth in a given age group.

Getting students involved: The school affirms that the students are the most important organizational members. The students must be involved in the running of the school, and this involvement must not be a sham. If students are to learn to direct and control their own lives, they must be given genuine chances to practice this direction and control, not the mere appearance of it.

Going counter to the bureaucracy: This means the principal must be a risk-taking administrator, probably spending much time testing bureaucratic limits. This means that many times this new breed of principal will be at odds with the traditional bureaucratic structure.

As the role of the principal expands, especially in the area of classroom supervision, Sullivan and Wircenski (1988) recommend the use of clinical supervision as a technique to improve classroom instruction. Clinical supervision is defined as a model of supervision that is interactive rather
than directive, democratic rather than authoritarian, teacher-centered rather than supervisor-centered. Clinical supervision affords both the teacher and the principal an opportunity to engage in discussions regarding the improvement of instruction (Acheson, Keith, & Gall, 1987). Four separate but related events occur as a part of the clinical supervision process. These are instrument design, a planning conference, the observation, and a feedback conference. As the instructional leader, the principal sets the tone for quality instruction in the classroom. Recent research and legislative mandates have increased the principal's role in evaluation process. When both the teacher and the principal work together to improve instruction, clinical supervision can insure success (Giles, 1988).

Leadership styles are of greatest importance to effective school principals. Frase and Melton (1992) outline effective measures of management by walking around (MBWA) as a way to be an effective change agent in the school. This participatory leadership style requires commitment, insight into the importance of being with teachers and students, and ideas for freeing up time to be on your feet, wandering with a purpose. The most crucial underlying value of MBWA: The commitment to be with the people, and the belief that the classroom and the teachers and students are the source of diagnostic information and solutions to problems. Frase and Melton (1992) outline nine
practical ideas for starting as an effective MBWA leader.

1. Establish people as the number one priority.
2. Control time.
3. Eliminate ineffective office management practices.
4. Schedule yourself out of the office—practice MBWA.
5. Know what you’re looking for when you practice MBWA.
6. Lead by example.
7. Let the secretary help save time.
8. Do demonstration lessons.
9. Seek feedback.

Changing a principal’s orientation from manager to participatory leader takes planning, determination, and plenty of time. Practicing MBWA by being with teachers and students daily is the most effective way a principal can show he/she cares about students and teachers. The first and foremost prerequisite to successful participatory management is to give students and teachers first priority.

Dull (1981) has identified the characteristics of effective principals. Broken down into four job roles identified as traits for effective principals, they are as follows:

1. Visionary role—Comprehensive mental model of effective schooling, goal setting and sharing, communicating the school’s academic mission, becoming
an instructional change agent.

2. Facilitator role—Listening and affirming, coordinating and aligning curriculum, teaching, and assessment; grouping pupils for instruction purposes; depending on others.


4. Improver role—Coping with weakness, staff developer, problem solver, training and modeling provider and "letting go."

It is estimated that as many as 70 percent of today's school administrators will retire in the next ten years. Thus, record numbers of job opportunities will become available for aspiring principals. The challenge of finding and selecting people with skills in shared and informed decision making to fill these vacancies is great (Poston, 1992). In the book Superleadership, Manz and Sims (1990) outlined several new dimensions of leadership to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Developer—Instructor, commander, leading others to lead themselves.

Influencer—Goal setter, rewarder, motivator.

Visionary—Vision, innovator, inspiring.

Superleader—Modeler of self-leadership, encourager of self-dependence, inculcator of
self-responsibility and initiative.

There is little doubt that these characteristics are hallmarks of sound principalships. However, the challenge comes in determining how to find and recognize principals with these behaviors "built-in" before employment. Administrative leaders and superintendents must provide continued staff development for these "super leader" principals. Using these strands, to be introduced in the principal's academies, will most likely be new ways to provide growth and enrichment for principals of the 90s and beyond.

Current Approaches to Inservice Training and/or Staff Development of Principals

As a result of recent research, new demands related to accountability, school restructuring by legislative mandates, and a general refocusing of attention on the role of the principal, researchers have begun to rediscover staff development and its importance.

Barth (1984) has observed that:

Attention has shifted to the school principal, because effective principals make better schools. The able principal has the capacity to create conditions that elicit the best from the students, teachers, and parents most of the time.

Principals, more than anyone else, can insulate teachers from distracting, debilitating, outside
pressures so that they may devote their precious
energies to students. Principals can orchestrate the
school's constellation of unique needs and resources so
that everyone generally gets what is needed and
principals have the capacity to lead by responding
thoughtfully and purposefully to children, teachers,
and parents. (p. 55)
Daresh and Playko (1990) state:

   Somehow there has been developed an assumption
that principals, because of their position,
avoidly possess all the expertise needed to take
on new challenges and responsibilities. But before
principals will actually be able to carry out their
important duties they must have the opportunity to
learn and grow professionally. (p. 48)

During the last half decade a variety of different
associations, known by different names, but most commonly
classified as "principal centers," have appeared on the
education scene. These centers, academies, and institutes
have emerged at the same time that both popular opinion and
research were pointing to individual schools and their
principals as key elements in educational reform and renewal
(Erlandson, 1987). Benefits promised by principal centers
or academies provide chiefly training, renewal, and
collegiality. Why are they growing in popularity?
Principals' centers fail if they call attention primarily to
themselves. They are facilitators of growth and
relationships among the principals they serve. They can serve principals in conjunction with universities, professional associations, and state departments of education. They can serve as stimuli to individual principals and small groups of principals who have divergent loyalties to other bodies but a common desire for growth and renewal. Principals' centers are "of, by, and for the principals" (Bogert, 1987).

The last seven years have witnessed the birth of approximately 100 principal centers around the country. Not only are the number of centers expanding, but those attending are impressed by the personal and professional growth they have experienced at the academies. Principals are involved in writing groups, and attending and giving after school seminars on policy issues, supervision, and climate. Principals are engaged in summer institutes, exchanging visits, and even schools (Bogert, 1987).

"The Barth Report," prepared by a committee of senior faculty of Harvard University appointed to examine the relationship of the Harvard Graduate School of Education to schooling, recommended that "The Harvard Graduate School seek funds for activities that will make intellectual resources of Harvard available to school leaders and establish a principal's center." When the Harvard Principal's Center opened its doors in October 1981, there were many conditions setting the stage for the proliferation of such centers. The importance of the principal had been
recognized. A multitude of studies confirmed the principal to be an important and influential individual in any school. As people were rediscovering the principal, they were also rediscovering staff development. Researchers began shaping theories of staff development, organizations developed to address the issue, and studies were published on the importance of staff development.

As centers developed and extended to others in 1982, the Harvard Principal's Center held meetings involving leaders from other principal's centers. Key people from national principals' associations, the Harvard Principal's Center staff, the officers of the Danforth Foundation shared ideas about successful programming formats, and funding proposals. Thus, the principal center concept was born and has made a positive impact on staff development for school administrators during this past decade (Barth, p. 3).

Barth (1987) described the mission of the Harvard Principal's Center as an organization dedicated to the personal and professional development of school principals and of the many others—teachers, counselors, departmental chairpersons, house masters, and parents who influence the character and quality of a school.

At the Principal's Center, school practitioners play a major role in their own development, just as in the development of their schools. Principals carry within themselves insights into areas such as leadership, curriculum, staff development, child psychology, and parent
involvement. A major purpose of the Center is to make these resources more widely available to improve schools. The Harvard Principal’s Center attempts to improve the quality of life and learning in schools by encouraging different ways of thinking about common problems; by transforming school problems into opportunities for school improvement; by offering opportunities for shared problem solving and reflection; and by providing a context of mutual support and trust in which personal relationships may be established and developed.

Above all, the Harvard Principal’s Center is important for offering an example that legitimizes an idea—that there are conditions under which principals will voluntarily engage in activities that promote their growth as leaders in school improvement. Principals can indeed become leaders and thereby leaders in their schools.

In his report, Thompson (1987), identifies some factors that may make a difference and gives advice to state academy directors for program development. Information was sought from four successful state-level administrator inservice training organizations: the South Carolina Academy, the North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals, the Florida Academy for School Leaders, and the Maryland Professional Development Academy. Members of each academy were asked two questions: 1) What has contributed to your success and longevity? and 2) What advice do you have for the newly formed academies and institutions?
The staff of the South Carolina Academy offered the following suggestions for newer academies and institutes:

1. Make sure that goals and objectives are clearly stated, and evaluate everything you do based on whether or not it helps you accomplish your goals and objectives.

2. Build credibility and support for your programs. Hire a knowledgeable professional staff. Offer quality programs, but start with only a few that you can do exceptionally well. Whenever possible, use practicing administrators as presenters and take advantage of the talent available in your locale.

3. Put a great deal of effort into program development. Use varied training formats and varying program lengths. Encourage the development of action plans.

4. Be visible. Take advantage of every opportunity to promote your programs. Develop brochures, bulletins, and newsletters to advertise your programs.

5. Network with other inservice and training organizations.

The North Carolina Leadership Institute for Principals credited the same factors for their success as were offered for the success of the South Carolina Academy. The following "helpful hints" were presented by the North Carolina Leadership Institute:
1. Make sure that the staff represents the client group.
2. Develop long-range plans for growth.
3. Start small to ensure success. Then build on your success.
4. Offer a variety of programs and cover the level from awareness to acquisition of competency.
5. Do not underestimate the value of advertising. Keep the name of the academy/institute before the client group. Develop brochures, newsletters, and flyers that describe what you are doing.
6. Network. Do not isolate yourself. Take advantage of the resources and expertise available through other organizations.

The Maryland Academy director gave the following advice:

1. Start slowly. Develop specific goals and attack them in a specific way.
2. Focus on two or three things that you can do exceptionally well and then build upon your success.
3. Base your program on the identified inservice needs of administrators.

The director of the Florida Academy for School Leaders identified two prerequisites for a successful program:

1. Keep your system dynamic. The organization should have the ability and flexibility to change as
the needs of the client group change.

2. Model principles of effective training and adult learning in the development and implementation of inservice programs. (Thompson, 1987, pp. 12-13)

All of these academies have similar goals and objectives: to maximize the effectiveness of public school administrators by improving or refining their management and leadership skills.

Donaldson (1987) characterizes the Maine Principal's Academy as a part of a nationwide movement of principals to take charge of their own professional development. Donaldson says, "We strive to address principal's functions rather than the vast array of activities they carry out" (p. 44).

Activities are planned first to engage principals around core issues of function and role. Second, principals are urged to explore, test, and accept a practice or idea. Third, principals are encouraged to stay in touch with each other as they try to use it. Principals' centers and academies are not designed to replace principal training, evaluation, and certification practices across the nation. "We, in Maine, however have ample evidence that the academy can deeply affect principal's development in ways that, as one Maine principal put it, are far more valuable that work" (p. 45).

Erlandson, Hinojosa, and MacDonald (1987) suggested that the ultimate purpose of a principal's center, as it is
conceived at Texas A&M University, is to serve principals by providing them with the orientation, skills, and understanding that will enhance their position as instructional leaders in their schools. The primary objective of the Texas A&M summer academy was to give the participating principals the vision and skill to turn current legal mandates and social pressures into tools for their own instructional leadership.

Estes (1987) described the Baylor University Principal’s Center, as one charged with providing structure that will encourage unity and common direction for those charged with educating the youngsters of Central Texas. The Baylor Center is attempting to achieve this goal by meeting the personal and professional needs of school administrators. The Baylor Center has four functions in serving administrator needs to administrators in Central Texas. Its functions are as follows: 1) To foster a sense of collegiality and involvement on the part of members through what is called "collegial circles," 2) to provide opportunities for interaction between principals and representatives from the Texas Educational Agency, 3) to offer quality programs for state-mandated training in instructional leadership, and 4) to coordinate a series of principals’ seminars, and to encourage principals to interact with each other at meetings in what is known as collegial circles, so that principals can solve problems and learn from each other.
In July of 1964, The Bureau of Research and Service of Georgia State University established the Principal's Institute to assist in the improving of educational opportunities for administrators and students from the eleven area Atlanta school systems. This purpose is being achieved through the implementation of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center to provide relevant data for principal selection (preservice), development activities for current principals (inservice), and research and dissemination activities (service to the profession). Principals in the Atlanta area are actively involved in the development and implementation of services provided by the Principal's Institute (Richardson & Robinson, 1987).

Wimpelberg (1987) suggested some simple ground on which to build a simple evaluation structure that will make sense for most inservice providers. He defined evaluation as a process of figuring out the relative worth of something. Wimpelberg postulated that evaluators should consider at least four criteria when the researcher gathers data to evaluate programs. These were as follows: 1) Rates of participation—The simple counting of participants may be the most significant measure of program quality; 2) Comparisons of program content with what is offered in other centers—A center can, in effect, evaluate itself based on the degree to which it "models" the other programs at other established centers; 3) Gathering participant
reactions—Paper-and-pencil evaluation surveys are the most useful if they are short and give participants a chance to evaluate center activities with both a "forced choice" and an "open-ended" format; 4) Measuring the long-term effects—Most centers, academies, institutes, and staff development efforts exist because policy makers have learned the central importance of principals in effective schools. Thus, the issue of programs changing what principals do seems not only a relevant but highly appropriate criterion of evaluations. Principals can be asked to report changes in their administrative behavior that they would attribute to academy activities.

The Tennessee Teacher's Academy

According to the National Directory of Principals' Centers, there are presently 66 principal centers or academies operating in the United States. Among the 66 is one in Tennessee that has been in operation since 1984. Since the inception of the Tennessee Principals' Academy, there have been five directors. George Northern was the Academy's first director organizing the pilot academy for principals that was held on the campus of Middle Tennessee State University on July 9 through July 20, 1984. There were 35 participants with job titles as follows:

- Elementary principals 17
- High school principals 6
- Junior high/middle 1
Supervisors 9
Assistant Superintendent 2

Names and job titles can be found in Appendix B.

The Original Principal's Academy


The academy had over 72 hours of staff development activities. There were 24 presenters that included the former Tennessee Governor, Alexander, Commissioner of Education for Tennessee, McElrath, college President, Ingram, college Dean, Hodge, three college professors and other State Department and local school practitioners. The geographic-by-district breakdown of the pilot participants was as follows: First Tennessee 4, East Tennessee 4, Southeast Tennessee 3, South Central 4, Upper Cumberland 4,
Mid Cumberland 5, Northwest 4, Southwest 3, and Memphis Delta 4.

Since the beginning of the first Tennessee academy in 1984, there have been 84 academies operating concurrently through 1992. There have been 4,538 participants in the Tennessee academies through the eight-year cycle ending in 1992.

Following Northern as academy director was McCullough. McCullough served as director from 1986 to 1987. McCullough was followed by Smith in 1987 who held the director's position until December 1988. Following Smith as institute director was Gibbs. He assumed the position in August 1988. Following Gibbs was the present academy director Willers (Willers, 1992).

Based on the review of literature the learning centers or academies for school leaders are an effective staff development tools. As such they can and will affect positive change on principals as they prepare for the challenge of the 21st century.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effects of strengths and weaknesses of the principal’s academy that influence the principals' needs in day-to-day job performance at the local school site.

Summary

This review of literature examined the areas of school effectiveness and the principal. Current literature on the status and critical nature of the principal focuses on new
demands and increasing roles for school principals and current approaches to inservice training and/or staff development of school principals.

Section I reviewed school effectiveness and discussed the grouping of new skills necessary for school leaders to achieve success in the future. Skills discussed included: knowledge of law, ethics, and philosophy, the ability to see beyond the current contradictions, be knowledgeable of different forms of leadership styles, and ability to adjust to changing conditions and fluctuations in expectations.

New demands and increasing roles for school principals were discussed in section II of the literature review. The principal must act as an instructional leader, budget manager, contract administrator, public relations director, human relations specialist, disciplinarian, and curriculum director.

In section III, current approaches to inservice training and staff development were reviewed with major emphasis placed on how effective principal centers and academies are used to expand the knowledge base of principals, and how performance standards by administrators will be enhanced by providing this type of staff development to school leaders.

Section IV reviewed operational principal academies now in existence throughout the United States and presented findings related to strengths and weaknesses identified by project directors and other administrative personnel.
Finally, section V is an overview of Tennessee’s first administrator’s academy with names of participants, course of study outline, and consultants and facilitators who assisted in the workshop. A brief history of the Tennessee Principal’s Academy was discussed with directors and key site officials who were involved in the goal setting and planning for academies listed and reviewed.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

Overview

The methodology of the study is included in this chapter. It encompassed the following procedures: research design, instrument development, pilot study, reliability and validity, verification, identification of participants of the study, assessments for the instrument, data analysis techniques, statistical techniques and analysis, and a summary.

The techniques of descriptive research were used throughout the collection of data to answer research questions relative to the effectiveness of the principal academies as it related to job performance of school administrators. The purpose of this study was to determine what strands or topics introduced to principals during the principal's academy were effective in affecting positive principal performance at the school site. A survey instrument was used to collect necessary data to ascertain what component parts (strands or topics) of the academy were most effective in assisting principals to be more effective school leaders at local school sites. The data collected are used to develop recommendations to the Tennessee State Department of Education to expand and focus on needed areas of staff development for school principals preparing for the
21st century challenge.

No effort was employed to manipulate the variables or influence the findings through intervention or suggestion. Principals were asked to complete a survey instrument designed to measure the perceptions of the principals as to what component parts of the staff development process of the principal’s academy affected their job performance of each principal at his/her local site. Specifically, what are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the principal’s academy?

Through the collection and analysis of data, the study was determined to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the strands and topics offered at the academy, as perceived by those who have attended the principal’s academy during the last eight years. With this information, state officials can maintain a high quality of staff development by adding, modifying, or deleting those strands as identified by principals that enabled them to be more effective school leaders at the local school site.

A search for a suitable instrument was conducted to identify one that would enable the researcher to ensure the collection of appropriate data. This instrument was developed by William Ritchie of Phoenix, Arizona. Ritchie’s (May 1986) instrument was used as part of his Doctoral Dissertation to evaluate the Arizona Principal’s Academy in 1986. After reviewing the instrument developed by Ritchie, it was determined that parts of the instrument were not
usable. It was then necessary to change and modify the Ritchie instrument thus requiring piloting of a new survey instrument designed to collect the appropriate data. The letter for permission to use the instrument can be found in Appendix D.

Criteria for Instrument Development

The following section described the development of the revised instrument. Included are criteria used in conducting the pilot study and the administration of the pilot instrument. A copy of the revised instrument can be found in Appendix E.

Through the review of literature, those areas determined to be important to the enhancement of principal’s efficiency were identified. Identified areas included: evaluation processes, time management skills, effective school discipline, organizational management skills, instructional leadership, communication and interpersonal skills. Using these general areas of interest, and a review of topic offerings at various Tennessee academies and parts of Ritchie’s instrument, questions were constructed that when completed would provide necessary information to complete the study.

The following criteria were developed to serve as a guide in the development of items for the survey instrument and its administration of the instrument.

1. Items were included to allow sufficient collection
of data to evaluate the research questions and hypotheses.

2. Items were written in clear, distinct language to eliminate as much as possible any ambiguities and/or misunderstandings.

3. The instrument was designed to allow simple marking procedures. The researcher intended to provide an instrument that provided optimum reliability without creating a cumbersome number of response options.

4. Subjects used in the pilot study were different from those randomly selected for use in the actual study.

Once the questions were determined and approved by the subject area consultants, the instrument was administered in written form to local administrators participating in doctoral programs at East Tennessee State University from the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. Feedback and suggestions from these individuals was used to improve the vocabulary and organization of the test items and final refinement of the test items.

**Pilot Instrument for Principals**

A 45 item pilot questionnaire was developed for measuring the effectiveness of the principal's academy as perceived by school administrators who have attended it since 1984 (see Appendix D). Content validity was established and questions were matched to academy content. Each question was subjected to analysis for content validity. The procedure involved interviews with academy
participants, the current director, visits to the academies, and a field test experience.

The pilot instrument contained seven demographic items and 38 items for measuring the content of what has been introduced at the principal's academy (see Appendix E).

The demographic section provided opportunities for principals to complete statements in a manner that most appropriately fit their specific situation. These sections were broken down into two parts. Part I contained information about the principal, their educational attainment, years of experience, age, and other data. Part II contained information about the school organization served by principal. Part III of the questionnaire contained 33 questions that focused on knowledge of and implementation of the 5 strands associated with the content of the principal's academy. This section was broken down into reasons for the principals attendance at the academy; the years he/she attended the academy; and the number of improvement strategies that were implemented upon completion of attendance at the academy. Five general areas that included planning and organization, curriculum and instruction, community relations, personnel, and school climate followed. The final questions asked involved the principal's rating of perceptions for the five general areas as it affected them as general practitioners at the school site.
Pilot Test

The pilot test was administered to 25 selected principal’s who were participants in the academy and who were in the Cohort II and III doctoral programs at East Tennessee State University’s Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. The purposes for administering the pilot study were as follows:

1. To ascertain clear and understandable wording for each item.

2. To identify those items on the instrument that were unsatisfactory before administration to the target sample.

3. To provide an opportunity to evaluate the instrument for ease of use, readability, and clarity.

4. To obtain sample data for use in determining the effectiveness of the instrument.

Pilot Instrument Validity

As the researcher developed the instrument, investigation was conducted into the instrument’s validity. For the purpose of this study, the investigation of the instrument was confined to content validity and face validity. Borg and Gall (1989) defined content validity as "the degree to which the sample of test items represents the content that the test is designed to measure." This was the reason the researcher carefully defined the content area. As the content area was defined, the assessment of the test items began.
Subject area specialists, who are professors at East Tennessee State University, were enlisted to determine the validity of individual items relative to their ability to assess the problem statement and/or the content area. By using this analysis, the experts were able to make recommendations regarding the items' worthiness and ability to contribute to the appropriate gathering data.

The validation process for this study consisted of six procedures:

1. The pilot instrument was administered to 25 principals chosen from Cohorts II and III programs at East Tennessee State University's Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis.

2. The instrument's performance was evaluated by conducting personal interviews with members of the pilot group. Pilot members were given opportunity to make suggestions regarding the pilot instrument.

3. From the personal interviews, comments from the pilot group were compiled and analyzed. This information was used to refine, modify, and improve the instrument.

4. A review of the pilot test responses was conducted and itemized with test questions being reconstructed or eliminated as suggested by the pilot group.

5. The total package of items on the instrument was reviewed and used to determine usability.

6. Once the instrument had been analyzed, refined, and restructured, it was reviewed a second time by a subject or
area specialists for final approval.

**Identifying Participants in the Study**

Data generated by state department officials indicated there were 4,538 principals, assistant principals, supervisors, and assistant superintendents who have completed the 72 hours of instructional staff development from 1984 to 1992 at the principal's academies across Tennessee (Kenney, 1992). Former participants were administered the instrument.

The investigator used a stratified sampling technique to provide a cross section of principals from elementary, middle or junior high, and high school levels with at least one participant from each of the 139 school systems in Tennessee. Large school systems with more than 42 school principals had 10 participants. School systems with 90 or more principals had 20 participants. School systems with 120 principals had 25 participants. The largest school system in Tennessee had 166 principals. Thirty-five participants were selected from this group. All other school systems had 6 participants selected for the study. No attempt was made to stratify in the direction of small/large schools, rural/urban, city/county principals in Tennessee.

The sample for this study was drawn from the population of 4,538 school administrators who have attended the principal's academy. The desired number for the study was
This provided the opportunity to conduct a stratified sampling of principals from the total population and to ensure proportional representation in each of the three areas.

Data Collection Procedures

An inventory along with a cover letter and a self-addressed stamped envelope requesting a reply by September 15, 1992, was mailed to those 353 principals selected through stratified sampling. Return envelopes contained an identification number on the mailing label. This provided the researcher an opportunity to monitor the return and follow-up with those members of the sample who did not respond. A careful accounting of each returned survey was maintained to provide for an analysis of those returned responses and the variety of school types which was represented.

After two weeks, a follow-up procedure was used to contact those respondents who failed to return their instruments by the requested deadline. These nonrespondents were mailed a second letter and/or telephoned to encourage their participation. Thirty-five respondents returned the questionnaire on the follow-up procedure, making a total of 234 respondents included in the study.

Upon receipt of the returned inventories, the data was compiled and analyzed. The "Statistics Package for Social Sciences, PC" (SPSS, Inc., 1991) was used to analyze the
data. The results of this analysis are found in Chapter 4.

Statistical Tests and Analysis

Data from this study were analyzed initially using descriptive statistical procedures. Specifically, summary measures including mean, median, and percentage were used to answer the research questions. These statistical procedures were computed by using the "Statistics Package for Social Sciences, PC" (SPSS, Inc., 1991). Ordinal data were tested by using the Kruskal-Wallis Nova for data involving more than two groups.

Research Questions

1. What level of knowledge and extent of implementation in the following five growth areas of planning and organization, curriculum and instruction, community relations, personnel, and school climate did respondents indicate after attending the principal's academy?

2. Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the growth areas?

   A. Size of school
   B. Per pupil expenditure
   C. Number of full-time teachers
   D. Educational level
   E. School setting
   F. Years in present position
G. Age of respondent
H. Years attending academy
3. What were the respondent's overall opinion of the Principal's Academy?
4. What were the motivating factors in the attendance of participants in the Tennessee Principal's Academy?
5. Have the respondents implemented any planned instructional innovations or school improvement strategies as a result of attending the Principal's Academy?

**Null Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses will be tested to the .05 level of significance and are stated in null form.
1. There will be no significance difference in the ratings regarding the five growth areas between participants of differing years in their present position.
2. There will be no significant differences in the ratings of the five growth areas of participants of different ages.
3. There will be no significant difference in perceptions of the academy participants based on the number of times a participant has attended.
4. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas between principals with different annual per pupil expenditures for their school.
5. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas of principals with
different numbers of full-time teachers in their schools (faculty size).

6. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the Tennessee Principal's Academy based on the type of community (rural, urban, suburban) in which the principal is located.

7. There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the five growth areas considering the year the participant attended.

Summary

This chapter described the methods used for identification of the population, selection of the sample, construction and piloting of the instrument, soliciting the final data, statistical tests, and data analysis. The instrument (Survey of School Principals) was used to provide the participants with an instrument to express their perceptions of the strands and content of the Tennessee Principal's Academy and how they were affected as a school leader. Were they able to use any part of the principal's academy content to make them a more effective school leader?
CHAPTER 4
Findings and Data Analysis

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effects of the Tennessee principal's academies, conducted from 1984 to 1992, on its participants' day-to-day job performance at the local school site.

School administrators from all 139 schools were sent a questionnaire. A total of 353 questionnaires were sent to school system administrators with a return of 234 respondents or 62% (n=234) returned. All returned responses were usable for the study other than those that were received too late to be included in the study.

This chapter includes the following topics: demographic data, statistical analysis of the research questions and hypotheses, and summary.

Demographic Data

Tables 1 through 5 report the compiled demographic data from school administrators. The numbers and percentages of the school administrators related to sex (Table 1), age (Table 2), job title (Table 3), years in present position (Table 4), and highest academic degree attained (Table 5) are presented.

Respondents by gender include 174 males (74.4%) and 60 females (25.6%). The summary of data presented in Table 1
describes the gender make up of the participants in the study.

Table 1

Sex of Academy Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Respondent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age of the respondents indicates that no participants in the study were from the age group of 20-40 years of age. Most respondents, 136 or 59.6%, were from the age grouping of 41-50. Following this age category was 51-60 with 64 respondents or 27.4% of the population. The third highest age category was the 31-40 age group with 18 respondents or 7.7%. The last category included the 61 and over category with 6 respondents or 2.6% of the group making up this category. The age distribution of academy participants are shown in Table 2.
Table 2

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 234 participants, 110 or 47% were elementary principals, 52 or 22.2% were high school principals, 24 or 10.3% were supervisors, 20 or 8.5% were middle school assistant principals, 14 participants or 6% were categorized as other, and 8 or 3.4% were high school assistant principals. There were 3 or 1.3% middle school assistant principals and 3 or 1.3% assistant superintendents. The jcb title distributions for academy participants are shown in Table 3.
**Table 3**

*Frequencies and Percentages for Academy Participants by Job Title*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary principal</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school assistant principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school principal</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school assistant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school principal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The years of experience of academy participants are shown in Table 4. The years of experience range of 0 to 5 years contained the largest number, 69 (33%), participants. The smallest percentage was the 21+ years group with 13 participants (6.2%).
Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Academy Participants by the Years of Experience in Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.321
Standard Deviation 6.3
Median 2.000

The educational levels of academy participants are shown in Table 5. The largest number of academy participants, 100 (42.7%), had a Masters degree + 45 hours followed by those with Masters degrees, 70 (29.9%). The smallest group were those in the other category numbering 3 (1.3%).
Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages for Academy Participants by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters + 45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.077
Standard Deviation: 1.054
Median: 3.000

The school enrollment of pupils at schools of academy participants is shown in Table 6. For the purpose of clarification, pupil enrollment was broken down into intervals of 200. Eleven participants had pupil enrollments of 0-200 (5.2%) comprising the smallest interval group, and 61 participants (29%) had pupil enrollments of 401-600 which was the largest interval group of academy participants.
Table 6

Frequencies and Percentages of Academy Participants by School Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Enrollment</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-800</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 234

Mean 3.510
Standard Deviation 1.455
Median 3.000

The per pupil expenditure of schools of academy participants is shown in Table 7. The largest range group of respondents regarding per pupil expenditure was in the 3001 to 4000 dollar range. There were 76 respondents or 53.9% of the respondents in this category. The 1001-2000 range of dollars spent per pupil expenditure consisted of 11 or 7.8% of respondents which made up the smallest range group. There were 93 respondents who failed to list the per pupil expenditure in their district on the questionnaire. Data related to frequencies and percentages of ranges of
system per pupil expenditures by respondents can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7

**Frequencies and Percentages of Ranges of System Per Pupil Expenditure (in Dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressed in Dollars</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 100-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1001-2000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2001-3000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3001-4000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4001-5000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of teachers employed in the participant’s school are shown in Table 8. The lowest percentage (4%) of number of teachers was in 76 through 300 range (8), the highest percentage (37.6%) of number of teachers employed in the participant’s school was in the 16-30 range (76).
Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of Academy Participants by Number of Teachers in the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 232 100.0

The setting in which the academy participants was located is shown in Table 9. The lowest number of participants, 11 (4.7%), were from the other category. The largest number, 25 (53.4%), were located in rural settings.
Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages for Academy Participants by School Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Setting</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose in Attending the Academy

Ranking by participant's purpose in attending the academies are shown in Table 10. The largest group of participants, 123, attended the academy to satisfy the state mandated requirement as prescribed by the state law. The largest second ranking of participants, 75, were respondents who ranked self-improvement highest. The largest third ranking of participants, 74, was the category of contact with other administrators. The largest fourth ranking of participants, 57, was contact with other state officials. The largest fifth ranking of participants, 48, was contact with other state officials. The largest sixth ranking of participants, 47, was also contact with other state officials. The largest seventh ranking by participants, 91, was in the category of observer. The largest eighth ranking of participants, 66, was in the category of other.
Table 10

Academy Participants' Purpose in Attending Academies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Rank by Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Mandate</td>
<td>123 32 26 14 11 11 9 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Improvement</td>
<td>104 75 24 7 7 3 4 3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>1 7 3 10 16 43 91 37 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Other Administrators</td>
<td>24 51 74 46 19 7 2 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 2 1 2 3 8 11 66 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with State Officials</td>
<td>4 7 26 57 49 47 19 14 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5 12 17 39 46 46 32 21 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed by Other Supervisor</td>
<td>9 29 37 35 46 31 17 15 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Years Attending the Academy

Frequencies, years, and percentages for academy participants by the year of attending the academy are shown in Table 11. The largest number of participants, 126 or 55%, who were identified in the study attended the academy in 1984. The smallest number, 1 or .4%, of the participants attended the academy in 1989. The majority of participants numbered 219 who attended the academy during the first three years of operation.
in 1984. The smallest number, 1 or .4%, of the participants attended the academy in 1989. The majority of participants numbered 219 who attended the academy during the first three years of operation.

Table 11

Frequencies, Years, and Percentages for Academy Participants by Number of Years Attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Attended</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 229 100.0

Innovations and Strategies from Attending the Academy

Frequencies and percentages for academy participants by innovations and strategies implemented at their school after attending the academy is shown in Table 12.

The largest number of participants, 58 (25.3%), implemented at least three innovations or strategies as a
result of attending the academy. Fifty-one, or 22.3%, of the respondents implemented at least two innovations as a result of attending the academy. Sixteen, or 7%, of the participants in the study implemented no innovations or strategies as a result of attending the academy. Nine, or 3.9%, of the participants had at least 10 or more innovations and strategies as a result of attending the academy.

Findings Related to Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

Data to answer the five research questions and to test the seven null hypotheses were obtained from the completed questionnaires. Information about each question and null hypotheses will be presented in the tables found in this chapter.

Research Question 1

What level of knowledge and extent of implementation in the following five growth areas of planning and organization, curriculum and instruction, community relations, and personnel and school climate did respondents indicate growth after attending the Principal's Academy?
Table 12

Frequencies and Percentages for Academy Participants by Innovations and Strategies Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovations and Strategies Implemented</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 228 100.0

Mean and standard deviation scores of respondents in the five growth areas of both knowledge and implementation are shown in Table 13. The greatest mean score by the respondents was in both the knowledge (mean 3.82) and implementation (mean 3.62) in the strand area of planning and organization.

The lowest of the five strand areas of knowledge was community relationships (mean 3.69). The lowest strand area of the five strands in the implementation category was
curriculum and instruction (mean 3.47). Total mean scores for both knowledge and implementation was 3.07. The researcher indicates there was only a slight difference in the five knowledge strands (.85) from highest to lowest mean scores, and even less difference with the five implementation strands of mean scores high to low, difference of .39.

Research Question 2A: Size of School

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?

The means of the knowledge and implementation strands in relation to the respondent's school enrollment is shown in Table 14. The highest mean score (115.26) of the respondents in the knowledge category was the 401-600 enrollment range in planning and organization. The lowest mean score (88.70) of the respondents in the knowledge category was the 1001-5000 enrollment range in the curriculum and instruction category.

The highest mean score (113.10) of the respondents in the implementation category was the 1001-5000 enrollment range in community relations. The lowest mean score (88.23) of the respondents in the implementation category was the 0-200 enrollment range in the planning and organization category.
Table 13

Means of Respondents in the Relation to the Five Knowledge and Five Implementation Growth Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

**Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between School Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>0-200</th>
<th>201-400</th>
<th>401-600</th>
<th>601-800</th>
<th>801-1000</th>
<th>1001-5000</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>93.73</td>
<td>101.50</td>
<td>115.26</td>
<td>105.51</td>
<td>110.08</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.5867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>97.23</td>
<td>103.84</td>
<td>110.33</td>
<td>110.81</td>
<td>104.82</td>
<td>88.70</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.6661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>105.82</td>
<td>104.01</td>
<td>105.97</td>
<td>110.46</td>
<td>102.38</td>
<td>99.93</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.9884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>108.73</td>
<td>106.97</td>
<td>111.55</td>
<td>107.65</td>
<td>94.84</td>
<td>96.02</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.8176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>101.65</td>
<td>100.11</td>
<td>107.93</td>
<td>105.69</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>103.40</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.9252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>0-200</th>
<th>201-400</th>
<th>401-600</th>
<th>601-800</th>
<th>801-1000</th>
<th>1001-5000</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>88.23</td>
<td>102.06</td>
<td>112.28</td>
<td>101.31</td>
<td>103.83</td>
<td>93.35</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.0772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>90.41</td>
<td>108.03</td>
<td>105.13</td>
<td>110.16</td>
<td>100.12</td>
<td>96.60</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.3834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>101.89</td>
<td>102.07</td>
<td>108.68</td>
<td>103.66</td>
<td>113.10</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.9285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>108.86</td>
<td>107.69</td>
<td>102.93</td>
<td>106.76</td>
<td>98.19</td>
<td>96.40</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.9579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>102.45</td>
<td>104.64</td>
<td>107.62</td>
<td>104.34</td>
<td>95.60</td>
<td>92.93</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.3893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>108.09</td>
<td>98.47</td>
<td>114.28</td>
<td>111.33</td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>91.03</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.5270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only a slight difference in the mean scores was obtained. The difference for the school enrollment ranges was not significant at the .05 level.

Research Question 2B: Per Pupil Expenditure

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?

Null Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant differences in the ratings of the five growth areas between principals with different annual per pupil expenditures for their schools?

The respondent's level of knowledge and the extent of implementation of the growth areas in relation to the system per pupil expenditure is shown in Table 15. There was no significant difference in any of the growth areas for the per pupil expenditure ranges of 100-1000, 1001-2000, 2001-3000, 3001-4000, and 4001-5000. Since no significant difference could be found in knowledge or implementation of the growth areas, the null hypothesis is retained.

Research Question 2C: Number of Full-Time Teachers

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?
Table 15

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between Per Pupil Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>100-1000</th>
<th>1001-2000</th>
<th>2001-3000</th>
<th>3001-4000</th>
<th>4001-5000</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>72.96</td>
<td>67.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.7276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>114.75</td>
<td>84.82</td>
<td>65.69</td>
<td>71.32</td>
<td>74.42</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.3899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>68.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.7643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>77.36</td>
<td>72.47</td>
<td>70.14</td>
<td>69.86</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.4121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td>72.61</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.3757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>108.25</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>67.43</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>72.17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>70.96</td>
<td>74.71</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.4292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>62.41</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td>69.95</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>66.16</td>
<td>71.53</td>
<td>67.87</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.7279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>118.25</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>67.11</td>
<td>71.84</td>
<td>71.18</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.4613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>76.16</td>
<td>58.58</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>.1626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 5

The respondent's level of knowledge and the extent of implementation of the five growth areas in relation to the number of full-time teachers is shown in Table 16. There was no significant difference in any of the growth areas for the number of full-time teachers in the ranges of 0-15, 16-30, 31-45, 46-60, 61-75, and greater than 75. Since no significant difference could be found in the number of teachers in the respondent's school, Null Hypothesis 5 was retained.

Research Question 2D: Educational Level

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?

The respondent's educational level ranging from the BS degree to the ED.D. or Ph.D. degree is shown in Table 17. The means, chi square, and statistical significance are calculated to show that there is no significance difference in either the knowledge or implementation of respondents in relation to the educational level of the participants in the study.

Research Question 2E: School Setting

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?
Table 16

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between Number of Full-Time Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>0-15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>46-60</th>
<th>61-75</th>
<th>Greater Than 75</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>101.62</td>
<td>105.52</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>106.92</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.6595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>84.29</td>
<td>101.03</td>
<td>104.49</td>
<td>102.76</td>
<td>98.46</td>
<td>71.19</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.5818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>89.72</td>
<td>100.99</td>
<td>103.53</td>
<td>92.94</td>
<td>108.04</td>
<td>97.31</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.9160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>87.25</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>86.58</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.6454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>94.15</td>
<td>98.35</td>
<td>102.59</td>
<td>90.92</td>
<td>116.08</td>
<td>74.31</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.6161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>0-15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>46-60</th>
<th>61-75</th>
<th>Greater Than 75</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>87.08</td>
<td>100.30</td>
<td>101.60</td>
<td>93.88</td>
<td>98.13</td>
<td>82.31</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.3694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td>101.11</td>
<td>100.43</td>
<td>100.04</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>89.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.9570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>81.75</td>
<td>98.47</td>
<td>102.33</td>
<td>97.54</td>
<td>126.08</td>
<td>94.56</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.4641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>87.67</td>
<td>109.96</td>
<td>100.56</td>
<td>89.15</td>
<td>107.50</td>
<td>80.13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.6680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>103.90</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td>97.96</td>
<td>61.94</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.4945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>101.11</td>
<td>103.30</td>
<td>102.65</td>
<td>89.77</td>
<td>101.29</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.7451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>BS Mean</th>
<th>MA Mean</th>
<th>MA+45 Mean</th>
<th>Ed.s Mean</th>
<th>Ed.D/Ph.D. Mean</th>
<th>Other Mean</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>98.63</td>
<td>117.53</td>
<td>115.57</td>
<td>130.13</td>
<td>114.80</td>
<td>119.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.9255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>87.25</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>115.28</td>
<td>120.59</td>
<td>122.77</td>
<td>130.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.9322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>91.13</td>
<td>124.79</td>
<td>114.74</td>
<td>127.96</td>
<td>107.75</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.5045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>117.77</td>
<td>117.47</td>
<td>120.28</td>
<td>116.07</td>
<td>130.83</td>
<td>.6027</td>
<td>.9879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>113.78</td>
<td>118.92</td>
<td>128.70</td>
<td>93.30</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.3826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>94.75</td>
<td>111.98</td>
<td>112.51</td>
<td>131.04</td>
<td>115.16</td>
<td>81.17</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>92.88</td>
<td>116.45</td>
<td>115.29</td>
<td>111.31</td>
<td>123.02</td>
<td>96.17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.9432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>68.13</td>
<td>123.79</td>
<td>113.86</td>
<td>118.30</td>
<td>115.88</td>
<td>87.17</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.5945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>117.44</td>
<td>116.35</td>
<td>113.87</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>84.33</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>105.13</td>
<td>110.59</td>
<td>117.07</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>94.53</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.2766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>98.38</td>
<td>114.96</td>
<td>118.12</td>
<td>120.81</td>
<td>113.77</td>
<td>150.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.5934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference in the ratings of the Tennessee Principal’s Academy based on the type of community (rural, urban, suburban) in which the administrator is located.

The respondent’s school setting is defined as rural, urban, suburban, and other. The null hypothesis is retained.

Research Question 2F: Years in Present Position

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent’s level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?

Null Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference in the ratings regarding the five growth areas between participants of differing years in their present position.

The respondent’s level of knowledge and implementation of the growth areas in relation to differing years in their present position is shown in Table 19. There is no significant difference in any of the growth areas related to years in their present position; therefore, the null hypothesis is retained.

Research Question 2G: Age of Respondent

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent’s level of knowledge and extent of implementation
### Table 18

**Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between School Setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>Rural Mean</th>
<th>Urban Mean</th>
<th>Suburban Mean</th>
<th>Other Mean</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>117.80</td>
<td>116.26</td>
<td>120.06</td>
<td>95.05</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.7265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>112.89</td>
<td>124.66</td>
<td>120.68</td>
<td>95.77</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.5237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>117.09</td>
<td>126.65</td>
<td>104.91</td>
<td>.5803</td>
<td>.9009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>116.41</td>
<td>119.51</td>
<td>119.34</td>
<td>102.45</td>
<td>.6503</td>
<td>.8848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>116.36</td>
<td>114.57</td>
<td>112.59</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.7190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>112.24</td>
<td>121.97</td>
<td>113.49</td>
<td>97.59</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.7135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>113.31</td>
<td>118.05</td>
<td>120.35</td>
<td>96.55</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.7085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>112.34</td>
<td>120.67</td>
<td>120.26</td>
<td>119.23</td>
<td>.8297</td>
<td>.3424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>113.28</td>
<td>128.53</td>
<td>108.36</td>
<td>108.64</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.4589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>115.57</td>
<td>119.63</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>102.14</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.6945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>121.47</td>
<td>120.35</td>
<td>105.54</td>
<td>100.45</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.4012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between Years in Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5 Mean</td>
<td>6-10 Mean</td>
<td>11-15 Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>98.28</td>
<td>109.34</td>
<td>101.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>103.54</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>112.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>93.37</td>
<td>104.43</td>
<td>123.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>102.66</td>
<td>100.27</td>
<td>118.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>103.14</td>
<td>97.89</td>
<td>108.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>105.38</td>
<td>110.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>106.70</td>
<td>104.07</td>
<td>111.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>92.95</td>
<td>107.42</td>
<td>123.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>103.30</td>
<td>102.65</td>
<td>113.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>107.37</td>
<td>100.84</td>
<td>107.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.92</td>
<td>103.06</td>
<td>117.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the five growth areas?

**Null Hypothesis 2**

There will be no significance difference in the ratings regarding the five growth areas between participants of differing years in their present position.

The respondent's level of knowledge and implementation of the growth areas in relation to the age of respondent is shown in Table 20. There is no significant difference in any of the growth areas related to the age of the respondents; therefore, the null hypothesis is retained.

**Research Question 2H: Years Attending Academy**

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the five growth areas?

**Null Hypothesis 3**

There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of the academy participants based on the number of times a participant has attended.

The respondent's perceptions of the academy related to the number of years a participant has attended the academy is presented in Table 21.

A Kruskal-Wallis one-way anova indicated a significant difference in the mean total scores by year attended, a Mann Whitney U-Wilcoxon Rank Sum W Test was used to compare total mean scores for each year attended. A significant
Table 20

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between Age of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>30-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>&gt;60</th>
<th>Approx. Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>106.36</td>
<td>112.36</td>
<td>124.75</td>
<td>92.65</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.3805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>121.31</td>
<td>106.86</td>
<td>127.67</td>
<td>99.11</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>84.14</td>
<td>112.76</td>
<td>126.92</td>
<td>101.80</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.0818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>94.22</td>
<td>111.87</td>
<td>127.17</td>
<td>105.65</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>119.82</td>
<td>109.08</td>
<td>117.41</td>
<td>90.22</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.5627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>115.47</td>
<td>111.32</td>
<td>112.40</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.7634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>128.86</td>
<td>108.46</td>
<td>120.43</td>
<td>87.78</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.2755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>107.69</td>
<td>112.82</td>
<td>117.98</td>
<td>104.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>107.89</td>
<td>109.15</td>
<td>121.16</td>
<td>101.70</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.6086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>122.61</td>
<td>110.27</td>
<td>112.42</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.5270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>113.24</td>
<td>123.71</td>
<td>91.75</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.2932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21

**Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance of Difference Between Number of Years Attending**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>105.62</td>
<td>118.84</td>
<td>125.57</td>
<td>141.10</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.2699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>105.99</td>
<td>121.65</td>
<td>114.35</td>
<td>91.70</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.3529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>105.79</td>
<td>123.94</td>
<td>116.79</td>
<td>76.10</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>105.51</td>
<td>126.66</td>
<td>112.75</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>106.42</td>
<td>115.45</td>
<td>113.95</td>
<td>84.10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.5989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>103.54</td>
<td>113.27</td>
<td>125.93</td>
<td>110.80</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.4385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>185.55</td>
<td>119.36</td>
<td>115.75</td>
<td>83.60</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>109.46</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>126.58</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.5592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>103.40</td>
<td>121.10</td>
<td>115.53</td>
<td>89.10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>106.14</td>
<td>113.36</td>
<td>114.80</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.7385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>102.04</td>
<td>126.68</td>
<td>127.18</td>
<td>85.90</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>.0323*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
difference $2=2.62 \ p=.0090$ was found for years 1984 ($\bar{x}=91.40$) and 1985 ($\bar{x}=113.8$); therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Research Question 3**

What was the respondent's overall opinion of the Principal's Academy? The respondent's perceptions of the overall value of attending the academy can be seen in Table 22. Eighty-nine respondents, or 38%, ranked the academy training as highly valuable. One-hundred-thirteen, or 48.3%, gave the academy training a ranking of valuable. Over 86.3% of the respondents gave the academy training a rating of valuable or highly valuable. Nine, or 3.8%, rated the academy training as of no value. Twenty-three, or 9.8%, rated the academy of little value.

**Research Question 4**

What were the motivating factors in the attendance of participants in the Tennessee Principal's Academy?

Frequencies and percentages, mean, median, and standard deviation for academy participant's purpose in attending the academies are presented in Table 10 (see page 62). The largest group of participants, 123 (53.5%), attended the academy to satisfy the state mandated requirement. The second most popular motivation by respondents for attending the academy was 104, or 45.8%, of respondents who attended the academy for self-improvement. Two groups consisted of
the smallest number of respondents, 46 (21.1%), attending the academy. The two smallest groups came from both the social and directed by supervisor categories.

Table 22

Respondent’s Opinion of Academy Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>No Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Of Limited Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>Highly Valuable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 234 100.0

Mean 3.205 Median 3.000 Standard Deviation .770

When ranked by mean, median, and standard deviation, Table 10 shows that self-improvement (mean 2.022) was the lowest of the eight categories. The other category (mean 7.082) had the highest mean ranking.

Research Question 5

Have the respondents implemented any planned instructional innovations or school improvement strategies as a result of attending the Principal’s Academy?

Frequencies and percentages for academy participants by innovations and strategies implemented at their school after attending the academy is shown in Table 23.
The largest number of participants, 58 (25.3\%), implemented at least three innovations or strategies as a result of attending the academy. Sixteen, or 7\%, of the participants in the study implemented no innovations or strategies as a result of attending the academy. Nine, or 3.9\%, of the participants had at least 10 or more innovations and strategies as a result of attending the academy.

Table 23

Frequencies and Percentages for Academy Participants by Innovations and Strategies Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovations and Strategies Implemented</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 228 100.0
Summary

The responses to the questionnaire were analyzed both from the number of responses and the contents of the responses. The demographic data (i.e. sex, age, job title, number of years in present position, and highest academic degree held), were presented in Tables 1-5 of this chapter. Part two of the respondent's questionnaire contained data related to organization of the school (i.e. school enrollment, estimated per pupil expenditure in the respondent's school district, number of full-time teachers on the respondent's staff, and the community setting the school). These data were presented in Tables 6-9.

Part three of the respondent's questionnaire contained data related to the purpose for which the respondents attended the academy. Respondents were given eight choices to determine the reason they attended the academy and were asked to rank the eight choices from 1 to 8. Respondents were then asked to indicate the years they attended the academy beginning with the year 1984 running through 1991. Respondents were then asked to indicate the number of planned instructional innovations or school improvement strategies which were implemented at their respective schools as a result of their attending the Principal's Academy. Part three contained eight questions in the area of planning and organization that the respondents were asked to respond to from both the knowledge and implementation categories as a result of attending the academy. Part 3C
contained five questions in the area of curriculum and instruction that respondents were asked to respond to from both the knowledge and implementation categories as a result of attending the academy. Part 3D contained four questions in the area of community relations that respondents were asked to respond to from both knowledge and implementation categories as a result of attending the academy.

Part three contained six questions in the area of personnel management that respondents were asked to respond to both in the knowledge and implementation categories as a result of attending the academy. Part 3F contained three questions in the area of school climate that respondents were asked to respond to both in the knowledge and implementation categories as a result of attending the academy.

Part four of the questionnaire contained seven questions in the areas of: planning and managing, curriculum and instruction, community relations, personnel management, school climate, time management activities for administrators and in general the academy training in their opinion. Respondents were given four choices to rank their perceptions of these seven questions. The highest choice was 4, highly valuable; choice 3, valuable; choice 2, of limited value; and choice 1, of no value.

Two-hundred-thirty-four administrators were given the opportunity to respond to the questionnaire used to determine the effectiveness of the Principal's Academy.
Five research questions were answered, and seven hypotheses stated in the alternate form were tested for the null through the use of the Kruskal-Wallis Anova for data involving more than two groups. The Mann-Whitney U-Wilcoxon Rank Sum W Test was used to determine if there was any significant difference in the respondent's perceptions of the academy as it related to the year that they attended. Data obtained from responses to the questionnaire indicated that there were few significant differences in the attitudes of school administrators regarding the effectiveness from both knowledge and implementation of the five strands of the Principal’s Academy.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of the Principal's Academy that influence the principal's day-to-day job performance at the local school site. The study also attempted to determine if factors such as age, size of school, per pupil expenditure, number of teachers on the respondent's staff, educational level, school setting, years in present position, and years attending the academy had any effect on the administrator's perceptions of the academy.

An attempt was also made to determine the administrator's overall opinion of the academy. Additionally, an attempt was made to determine what factors motivated the administrators to attend the academy and what innovating instructional or improvement strategies were implemented back at their schools as a result of attending the academy.

A review of literature indicated that school reconstruction and improvement will require new vision and a cooperative effort by school administrators in the future. Leaders need to develop process skills for decision making. Administrators need a broader understanding of the basic concepts of democracy through the study of history, the
political process, human behavior, sociology, and cultures.

Based on the review of literature, academies for school leaders are an effective staff development means that can and will affect positive change on principals as they prepare for the challenge of the 21st century.

School administrators from 139 public school systems in Tennessee were surveyed over a six-week period using a questionnaire that contained five demographic items, four questions related to school organization, a ranking question with eight possible responses as to what motivated the administrators to attend the academy, a question that asked respondents to indicate the year they attended the academy, and a question asking administrators to indicate the number of innovations or school improvement strategies which were implemented at their schools as a result of attending the academy. Administrators were asked 33 questions in five strand areas (planning and organization, curriculum and instruction, community relations, personnel, and school climate) about their knowledge and implementation as a result of attending the academy.

Responses were received from 234 administrators. Responses were keyed into the computer and statistical calculations were performed using SPSS/PC+ software.
Findings

Demographic Data

There were 234 respondents included in the study consisting of 174 males and 60 females. No respondents were in the age category of 20-30, 18 respondents were in the age category of 31-40, 136 respondents were in the age category of 41-50, 64 respondents were in the age category of 51-60, 10 respondents were in the age category of over 61 years of age, and 10 respondents failed to list their age.

One-hundred-ten respondents were classified as elementary principals, 8 respondents were high school assistant principals, 52 respondents were high school principals, 3 respondents were middle school assistant principals, 20 respondents were middle school principals, 24 respondents were supervisors of instruction, 3 respondents were assistant superintendents, and 14 respondents were classified as other.

In regard to years of experience, 69 respondents had 0-5 years, 56 respondents had 6-10 years, 45 respondents had 11-15 years, 26 respondents had 16-20 years, and 13 respondents had 21 or more years of experience.

Four respondents had a Bachelor's degree, 70 respondents had a Master's degree, 100 respondents had a Master's plus 45 hours of educational training, 21 respondents had a specialist's degree, and 30 respondents had the Ed.D/Ph.D. degree.
Eleven respondents had a school enrollment classified between 0-200, 47 respondents had enrollment of 201-400, 61 respondents had enrollment of 401-600, 36 respondents had enrollment of 601-800, 25 respondents had enrollment of 801-1000, and 30 respondents had a school enrollment of greater than 1000.

Eighteen respondents had 1-15 teachers in their schools, 26 respondents had 16-30 teachers, 61 respondents had 31-45 teachers, 25 respondents had 46-60 teachers, 12 respondents had 61-75 teachers in their schools, and 8 respondents had 76-300 teachers in their schools.

**Research Questions**

Five research questions were asked respondents.

**Research Question 1**

What level of knowledge and extent of implementation in the five growth areas of planning and organization, curriculum and instruction, community relations, personnel, and school climate did the respondents choose? In the knowledge category, school climate (mean 3.94) was the highest ranking of the five strands by respondents. In the implementation category, school climate (mean 3.76) was also ranked highest by the respondents. In the knowledge category, community relations (mean 3.69) was ranked lowest by the respondents. In the implementation category, curriculum and instruction was ranked lowest by the respondents.
Research Question 2

Do any of the following variables affect the respondent's level of knowledge and extent of implementation of the growth areas? There was no significant difference between size of school, per pupil expenditure, number of full-time teachers, educational level, school setting, years in the position, and age of respondent as to how it affected the knowledge and implementation of the five strand areas. There was a slight significant difference in respondents' perceptions of the five strand areas related to years attending. The years 1984 and 1985 showed a slight significant difference.

Research Question 3

What were the respondents' overall opinion of the Principal's Academy? Eighty-nine (38%) of the respondents rated the academy training as highly valuable. One-hundred-thirteen (48.3%) of the respondents gave the academy training a rating of valuable. Twenty-three (9.8%) rated the academy training as of limited value. Only 9 respondents (3.8%) rated the academy training as of no value.

Research Question 4

What were the motivating factors that influenced the respondents to attend the academy? The largest group of participants, 123, attended the academy to satisfy the state mandate requirement as prescribed by the state law. The
largest second ranking of participants, 75, were respondents who ranked self-improvement highest. The largest third ranking of participants, 74, was in the category of contact with other administrators. The largest fourth ranking of participants, 57, was contact with other state officials. The largest fifth ranking of participants, 48, was contact with other state officials. The largest sixth ranking of participants, 47, was also contact with other state officials. The largest seventh ranking by participants, 91, was in the category of observer. The largest eighth ranking of participants, 66, was in the category of other.

Research Question 5

Have the respondents implemented any planned instructional innovations of school improvement strategies as a result of attending the Principal's Academy?

Fifty-eight (25.3%) of the respondents implemented 3 innovations of improvement strategies as a result of attending the academy. Nine (3.9%) implemented 10 or more innovations or improvement strategies as a result of the academy. Sixteen (7%) indicated they took "0" innovations or strategies back to their school as a result of attending the academy.
Hypotheses

The seven hypotheses were written in null form and tested at the .05 level of significance. All null hypotheses (1-6) were retained, except hypothesis 7 which showed that there was a slight difference in the perceptions of the respondents regarding the five growth areas in the years 1984 and 1985. This was significant as it related to the perception of the respondents.

Conclusions

Based upon the results of the perceptions of school administrators in Tennessee toward the evaluation of the Principal's Academy, the following conclusions were made:

1. The Principal's Academy Staff Development Program is important to the participants surveyed.
2. The collegiality and social network associated with the Principal's Academy is valuable.
3. The key motivating factor other than to meet the state mandate of attendance is self-improvement.
4. The Principal's Academy is a factor in school administrators implementing school improvement strategies.
5. All knowledge and implementation strands that were surveyed by participants are construed to be valuable.
6. The administrators with more advanced degrees of Ed.D./Ph.D. rank curriculum and instruction as the highest strand.
7. Administrators in rural areas perceive planning and
organization highest in the knowledge strand and school climate highest in the implementation strand.

8. Administrators over 60 perceive personnel management highest in the knowledge strand and community relations highest in the implementation strand.

9. Administrators between the ages of 30-40 perceive instruction highest in both the knowledge and implementation strands.

**Recommendations**

1. Research similar to that presented in this study should be conducted with other administrators who attended the academy in 1991-92 and beyond.

2. Research should be conducted to develop an evaluation instrument that would be used to evaluate future principal academies.

3. Funding needs to continue to be appropriated by the Tennessee General Assembly to expand and continue the Tennessee Principal’s Academy.

4. Funding needs to be appropriated to expand the staff at the state level for the continued success of the Principal’s Academy.

5. Further research should be conducted to answer the question of appropriate intrinsic and extrinsic reward systems for participating principals.

6. Further research should be conducted to determine the impact of networking and any change in the effectiveness
of the participating principal.

7. From the five strands of knowledge as based on mean scores of the respondents, community relationships were the lowest. Academy leadership should evaluate to improve this strand.

8. From the five strands based on implementation, means scores indicate that curriculum and instruction was the lowest strand that administrators used to implement new strategies. This area should be given renewed emphasis as a part of the academy training.

9. More emphasis should be placed on course content that can be implemented in the schools by the academy directors.

10. More emphasis should be placed on community relations activities in the knowledge strand.

11. More emphasis should be placed on curriculum and instruction strand in the implementation growth area.

12. Administrators in small schools (0-15 teachers) need more emphasis in curriculum and instruction in the knowledge strand and community relations in the implementation strand.

13. Administrators in large schools (greater than 75 teachers) need more emphasis on curriculum and instruction in the knowledge growth area and school climate in the implementation growth area.

14. Administrators from the rural setting need more emphasis placed on curriculum and instruction in the
knowledge strand and more emphasis on planning and organization in the implementation growth area.

15. Administrators in the 30-40 age category need more emphasis on community relations in both knowledge and implementation growth areas.

16. Administrators that are greater than 60 years of age need more knowledge in the school climate strand and more emphasis on curriculum and instruction in the implementation strand.

Summary

Staff development for principals is a broad concept that addresses the professional and personal needs of practicing principals. With a changing society with ever-increasing needs, it seems only appropriate that one in a leadership role must assume that continuous learning is necessary. To be an active learner is a way of modeling behaviors that would be inherent in our school systems. Principal’s academies offer one model of learning to the principal, but more importantly, offer an idea of professional growth and renewal that has been long overdue.
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PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS:

THE CURRENT WORK FORCE, SUPPLY, AND DEMAND
PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS:

THE CURRENT WORK FORCE, SUPPLY, AND DEMAND

I. Characteristics of the Current Work Force

A. Demographic Data--Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Male</th>
<th>White Female</th>
<th>Black Male</th>
<th>Black Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Years of Experience: 20 Years

E. Although assistant principals are not required to hold an endorsement in administration/supervision, 690 out of 776 (88.9%) do hold the endorsement.

F. The education level of principals and assistant principals is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Assistant Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters + 30</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Specialist</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the principals (86.3%) and assistant principals (87.2%) obtained their highest degree at an institution of higher education in Tennessee.

Average Years of Experience: 22 Years
II. Demand

A. Turnover (individuals employed as a principal in Tennessee in a given year but not employed as a principal in Tennessee the following year.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. New Hires (individuals employed as a principal in Tennessee in a given year who were not employed as a principal in Tennessee the previous year.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Supply

A. Educators employed in Tennessee who have administration/supervision endorsement but who are not employed as an administrator (principal, assistant principal, supervisor, or superintendent).
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PARTICIPANTS FOR THE FIRST SESSION OF

THE TENNESSEE ACADEMY FOR SCHOOL LEADERS
PARTICIPANTS FOR THE FIRST SESSION OF
THE TENNESSEE ACADEMY FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

First Tennessee—4

1. Ken Grubb, Principal
   Tusculum View Elementary School

2. Thomas S. Little, Principal
   Keenburg Elementary School

3. Dr. Barbara Lawson, Assistant Superintendent
   Washington County Schools

4. Ann M. Hampton, Supervisor
   Johnson County Schools

East Tennessee—4

5. Michael Richardson, Principal
   Gatlinburg Pittman High School

6. Pat Robinette, Principal
   Bonny Kate School

7. Dr. William O. Burris, Assistant Superintendent
   Oak Ridge Schools

8. Dr. Jane Qualls, Supervisor
   Alcoa City Schools

Southeast Tennessee—3

9. J. D. Carnes, Principal
   Red Bank High School

10. Jo Dean Shaffer, Supervisor
    Marion County Schools

11. Herbert G. Cannon, Supervisor
    Cleveland City Schools

South Central—4

12. Sylvia S. Jones, Principal
    Farrar Elementary School
13. Barbara June Baldwin, Principal
   Hohenwald Elementary West

14. Mike Bone, Principal
   Central High School

15. Douglas Burton, Supervisor
   Maury County Schools

Upper Cumberland--4

16. Richard Norton, Principal
    Gainesboro Elementary School

17. Robby D. Richardson, Principal
    Carthage Elementary School

18. Virgil Duggin, Principal
    Cannon County High School

19. Deborah W. Gregory, Supervisor
    Macon County Schools

Mid-Cumberland--5

20. Andy E. Brummett, Principal
    Walter J. Baird School

21. Lew B. Wallace, Principal
    Woodlawn School

22. James C. Parker, Principal
    Brentwood High School

23. Nelda Harrison, Principal
    Smyrna West Elementary

24. George Northern, Principal
    Scales Elementary

Northwest--4

25. Betty Jo Douglas, Supervisor
    Benton County Schools

26. Carlton Cherry, Principal
    Newbern Grammar School

27. Howard Todd, Principal
    Lara Kendall School
28. Darrell Keith Chilcutt, Principal
   Atkin Porter School

Southwest Tennessee--3

29. Luzell Hughes, Principal
   Adamsville Elementary School

30. Joyce B. Smith, Supervisor
    Hardeman County Schools

31. Richard E. Anderson, Supervisor
    Hardin County Schools

Memphis Delta--4

32. Patsy Smith, Principal
    Dogwood School

33. William J. Hawkins, Principal
    Fairley High School

34. Raybon M. Hawkins, Principal
    Hamilton Junior High School

35. William Weddle, Principal
    Central Elementary
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AGENDA FOR TENNESSEE ACADEMY FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

SUMMER 1984
TENNESSEE ACADEMY FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

SUMMER 1984

Middle Tennessee State University

July 9, 1984

9:30-10:00  Registration
10:00-10:30  Overview, Charles Carrick
10:30-10:45  Welcome, Dean Harry Hodge
10:45-12:15  The Comprehensive Education Reform Act, JoLeta Reynolds
12:15-12:30  Break
12:30-2:30  Tennessee Career Ladder and the School Leader's Role, Russ French
2:30-3:45  Legal Relationships Under the Career Ladder Plan, Robert Sharp
3:45-4:30  The Academy Process, Charles Carrick
4:30-4:45  Questions, Charles Carrick

July 10, 1984

8:30-4:30  Local Evaluation and the State Evaluation Process, Carol Furtwengler

July 11, 1984

8:30  Overview of TIM (Tennessee Instructional Model), Suzanne Wilkes
     Break
11:30  Lunch
1:00  Parts of Objective, Marjorie Argo
2:30  Break
2:45  Teaching to an Objective, Cindi Chance
3:45  Feedback, Marjorie Argo

July 12, 1984

8:30  Reporting and Feedback, Ruth Clapp
8:45  Task Analysis, Nawasa Jonas
10:15  Break
10:30  Monitor and Adjust, Nawasa Jonas
11:30  Lunch
1:00  Active Participation, Nawasa Jonas
1:45  Break
2:00  Instruction, Hilda Nason
3:45  Feedback, Nawasa Jonas
July 13, 1984

8:30 Reporting and Feedback, Hilda Nason  
8:45 Motivation, Nawasa Jonas  
10:45 Set, Ruth Clapp  
11:30 Lunch  
1:00 Closure, Ruth Clapp  
2:15 Feedback, Ruth Clapp

July 16, 1984

10:00 Reporting and Feedback, Cindi Chance  
10:15 Review, Cindi Chance  
10:45 Process of Supervision, Marjorie Argo  
11:30 Lunch  
1:00 Process of Supervision, Marjorie Argo  
2:15 Break  
2:30 Implementation, Cindi Chance, Marjorie Argo  
3:30 Ticket Give Away, Cindi Chance, Marjorie Argo

July 17, 1984

8:30-9:45 The School Leader and The Career Ladder:  
A Conversation, Kay Awalt, Janice Faulk, Jim Greeson, Mark Massey, Gene Trotter  
9:45-10:00 Break  
10:00-11:00 Expectations, Kay Awalt  
11:00-12:00 The Question of Morale, Jim Greeson  
12:00-1:30 Lunch  
1:30-2:30 Morale (Continued), Jim Greeson  
2:30-3:00 The Question of Time, Mark Massey  
3:00-3:15 Break  
3:15-4:30 Time (Continued)  
4:30-4:45 Questions, Charles Carrick

July 18, 1984

8:30-10:00 Goal Setting, Janice Faulk  
10:00-10:15 Break  
10:15-10:45 Goal Setting (Continued), Janice Faulk  
10:45-11:45 Skills of Evaluation, Janice Faulk  
11:45-1:15 Lunch  
1:15-2:45 Interviewing, Gene Trotter  
2:45-3:00 Break  
3:00-4:00 Questions and Comments, Kay Awalt, Janice Faulk, Jim Greeson, Mark Massey, Gene Trotter, Charlene Becker
July 19, 1984

9:00-10:10  An Overview of the State Department of Education, Commissioner Robert L. McElrath
10:30-11:00 Remarks, Lamar Alexander
11:00-12:00 Services Available from the District Office, Mike Barker
12:00-1:00 Lunch
1:30-3:30 The Tennessee Administrator Supervisor Evaluation System, Fran Trusty
3:30-3:45 Questions, Charles Carrick
3:45-5:00 Enroute to Murfreesboro

July 20, 1984

8:30-9:30 A Legal Review, Robert Sharp
9:30-11:30 Computer Skills Next, James Kelley
11:30-12:30 The School Discipline Program and the Alternative School, Joel Walton
12:45-2:15 Lunch, Dr. Sam Ingram, (Speaker), MTSU President
2:30 Dismissal
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CONSENT LETTER
Dear Dr. Ritchie:

I am currently a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. I am doing a research project on the evaluation of the Tennessee Principal's Academy as a part of my doctoral requirements.

In reviewing the literature, I discovered your dissertation and the work you did evaluating the Arizona Principals' Academy in 1986. I am asking your permission to use your survey instrument of school principals as a part of my studies at East Tennessee State University. Please fill out the enclosed permission document if you will be so kind as to allow me the privilege to use your instrument as a part of my study. Should you desire, I will be happy to forward to you upon completion a copy of my study done here in Tennessee.

Thank you for your generosity and time in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

David E. Wetzel
Doctoral Student
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee
August 3, 1992

Mr. David Wetzel, Superintendent
Elizabethton, Tennessee

Mr. Wetzel, I hereby authorize you to utilize the survey developed for my doctoral dissertation entitled "Survey of School Principals - June, 1985."

Good luck on your dissertation!

Sincerely,

Jim Ritchie, Ed.D.
Superintendent

JR:ch
APPENDIX E

SURVEY OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
Dear Principal:

As part of my research for the doctor of education degree at East Tennessee State University, I am randomly sampling principals across the state. Each of you has attended the Principal’s Academy and I am asking you to take a few moments to evaluate the Principal’s Academy Staff Development Program.

The enclosed questionnaire contains five parts. Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will be kept confidential.

If you would like a copy of the results of the survey, contact me at the above address or call (615) 542-4631.

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

David E. Wetzel
Doctoral Student
East Tennessee State University
Survey of School Principals
September 1992

This survey is intended for the school administrators to evaluate elements of the Principal's Academy. Part I focuses on demographic data. Part II relates to school organization. Parts III, IV, and V consist of questions related to the course content.

PART I. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Your sex: _____Male _____Female

2. Your age: ___

3. Your job title:
   A. ____Principal, 9-12
   B. ____Assistant Principal, 9-12
   C. ____Elementary Principal
   D. ____Elementary Assistant Principal
   E. ____Middle/Jr. High Principal
   F. ____Assistant Middle/Jr. High Principal
   G. ____Supervisor
   H. ____Assistant Superintendent
   I. ____Other (specify)

4. Number of years in your present position: _________

5. Check the highest academic degree you hold:
   A. ____B.S.
   B. ____M.A.
   C. ____M.A. + 45
   D. ____Ed.S.
   E. ____Edd. or Ph.D.
   F. ____Other (specify)
PART II. SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

6. The enrollment in your school: ________________________

7. What is the estimated annual per pupil expenditure in your school district?
   $________________________

8. The number of full-time teachers (include all staff, for example art, music, etc.): __________________________

9. The school in which you are employed is:
   A. ___Rural                        C. ___Suburban
   B. ___Urban                        D. ___Other

PART III. (A.) PURPOSE IN ATTENDING ACADEMY

10. Using numbers 1-8 (1--being highest), please rank the following in order of priority for your motivation to participate in the Tennessee Principal's Academy.

   A. ___Self-improvement
   B. ___Encouraged and directed by supervisors
   C. ___Desire to make contact with other Tennessee administrators
   D. ___Social (location, fun)
   E. ___Desire for increased contact with Tennessee State Department officials
   F. ___To meet state mandate of 72 hours of attendance every five years
   G. ___As an observer
   H. ___Other (specify)_____________________________
11. Please indicate the years you have attended the Tennessee Principal’s Academy. (Check more than one category if applicable.)

A. ___1984  E. ___1988  
B. ___1985  F. ___1989  
C. ___1986  G. ___1990  
D. ___1987  H. ___1991  

12. Please indicate the number of planned instructional innovations or school improvement strategies which were implemented at your school as a direct result of attending the Principal’s Academy.

A. ___0  F. ___5  
B. ___1  G. ___6  
C. ___2  H. ___7  
D. ___3  I. ___8  
E. ___4  J. ___9  
K. ___10 or more
PART III. (B.) PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION

The following questions are related to your knowledge gained as the result of your attending the Principal’s Academy, the degree to which you were able to implement your knowledge after attending the Academy.

After Attending the Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Extent of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. My level of knowledge about how to develop and accomplish work objectives is:</td>
<td>High: 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Low: 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My level of knowledge about management theory as it applies to my job is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My level of knowledge about how to involve my staff in school planning is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My level of knowledge about an effective school’s characteristics is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My level of knowledge about school law as it affects my job is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My level of knowledge about school finance as it affects my job is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My level of knowledge about current legislation as it affects my job is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My level of knowledge about different leadership styles as it affects my job as principal is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III. (C.) CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

The following questions are related to your knowledge gained as the result of your attending the Principal's Academy, the degree to which you were able to implement your knowledge after attending the Academy.

After Attending the Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Extent of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. My level of knowledge about techniques and practices for monitoring instruction is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My level of knowledge about leadership curriculum and instruction is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My level of knowledge about learning and instructional theory is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My level of knowledge about how to manage instruction is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My level of knowledge about special programs for target student population is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III. (D.) COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The following questions are related to your knowledge gained as the result of your attending the Principal's Academy, the degree to which you were able to implement your knowledge after attending the Academy.

After Attending the Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Extent of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. My level of knowledge about building school support in my community is:

27. My level of knowledge about involving my community in school planning is:

28. My level of knowledge about raising school awareness in the community is:

29. My level of knowledge about assessing my community’s feelings concerning the school is:
PART III. (E.) PERSONNEL

The following questions are related to your knowledge gained as the result of your attending the Principal’s Academy, the degree to which you were able to implement your knowledge after attending the Academy.

After Attending the Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Extent of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. My level of knowledge about how to recruit and select effective teachers is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My level of knowledge about how to plan and implement staff development training for my teachers is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My level of knowledge about performance appraisal of teachers is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My level of knowledge about how to motivate my staff is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My level of knowledge about employment, assignment, transfer, and termination of my staff is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My level of knowledge about how to communicate effectively with my staff is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III. (F.) SCHOOL CLIMATE

The following questions are related to your knowledge gained as the result of your attending the Principal’s Academy, the degree to which you were able to implement your knowledge after attending the Academy.

After Attending the Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Extent of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. My level of knowledge about how to resolve conflicts is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My level of knowledge about how to effectively manage the students in my school is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My level of knowledge about how to develop and maintain a positive school climate is:</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART IV.

Circle the number on the rating scale which best describes the value of the training you received from the Academy in terms of helping you in your role as principal.

Academy Perceptions
4—Highly Valuable
3—Valuable
2—Of Limited Value
1—Of No Value

45. The "Academy" training in my opinion is:
VITA

DAVID E. WETZEL

Address: 607 Golf Course Drive
Elizabethton, Tennessee 37643

Personal Data: Date of Birth: March 29, 1937
Marital Status: Married, 2 Children

Education: Public Schools, Elizabethton, Tennessee
Carson Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee; education psychology, B.S., 1959
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; reading specialist and school administration, M.A., 1963
NDEA Reading Institute, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky; workshop, 1967
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational leadership and policy analysis, Ed.D., 1992

Endorsements: 01 Elementary Education 1-9
15 Biology
90 Superintendent
91 Principal 1-9 (Advanced)
92 Principal 7-12 (Advanced)
93 Supervisor of Instruction 1-12
94 Supervisor of Attendance

Honorariums: First Chairman, East Tennessee Education Association (Reading Subcommittee), Knoxville, Tennessee; 1969
Keynote Speaker, First Tennessee International Reading Association, Murfreesboro, Tennessee; 1971
Knox County Trainer, Peer Evaluation of Better Schools Program, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1985-1986
Guest Lecturer, Better Schools Program, Tennessee Academy for Principals, Knoxville, Nashville, Jackson, Clarksville, Cookeville, Memphis, Johnson City, Chattanooga; 1984-1990
President, Knox County Education Association, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1979-1980
Co-Chairman, East Tennessee Education Association, Superintendents and Administrators Conference, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1985-1986

Member, Teacher Negotiation Team for Knox County Education Association, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1979-1980

Knox County Instructor, Tennessee Instructional Model (TIMS) Training, Better Schools Program, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1984-1986


President, East Tennessee Education Association, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1991

Leadership Development Process, Tennessee State Department of Education through East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; 1991

Treasurer, President, Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents (TOSS); 1988-1990, 1991

Convention Presenter, Tennessee School Board Association (TSBA), Nashville, Tennessee; "How Important Are Policies to School Boards?", 1991

Board Member, Carter County Workcamp, Elizabethton, Tennessee; 1987-1989

Keynote Speaker, Tennessee Association of School and Curriculum Development (TASCD), Memphis, Tennessee; 1989

Presenter, East Tennessee Education Association (ETEA), Knoxville, Tennessee; Fall Meeting, 1990-1991

President, Kiwanis Club of Elizabethton, Elizabethton, Tennessee; 1991-1992

Assessment Center Training Seminar, National Association of Secondary School Principals, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; February 1991

Executive Board, United Way of Carter County, Elizabethton, Tennessee; 1988-Present

Member, Community Goal-Setting Task Force, City of Elizabethton, Elizabethton, Tennessee; 1992

Conducted and trained teachers in reading in the following states: Tennessee, Kentucky, South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Alabama, Virginia, Mississippi, Panama Canal Zone, Louisiana; 1967-Present

Teacher, Knox County, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1959-1961
Principal, Mascot Elementary School, Knox County, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1961-1962
Graduate Assistant, Instructor, Curriculum and Instruction, (formerly) Department of Reading, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; 1962-1963
Reading Specialist, University City Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri; 1963-1964
Principal, Maury High School, Jefferson County, Dandridge, Tennessee; 1964-1965
Reading Supervisor, Knox County, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1965-1970
Reading Consultant, J. B. Lippincott Publishers, Atlanta, Georgia; 1970-1972
Supervisor/Assistant Superintendent, Jefferson County, Dandridge, Tennessee; 1972-1974
Principal, Carter High School, Knox County, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1974-1980
Principal, East Knox Elementary, Knox County, Knoxville, Tennessee; 1980-1985
Superintendent, Elizabethton City Schools, Elizabethton, Tennessee; 1986-1992

Graduate Reading Courses, East Tennessee State University, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, (formerly) Department of Reading, Johnson City, Tennessee; 1968-1969
Undergraduate Reading Workshop, Maryville College, Education Department, Maryville, Tennessee; Summer 1968
Reading and Education Courses, Carson Newman College, Education Department, Jefferson City, Tennessee; 1970-1971
Graduate Courses in Reading and School Administration, Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky; 1972-1977

School Activities:
High School: Sophomore and senior class president, student government representative, football, baseball, and basketball
College: Student government representative, varsity baseball; Carson Newman College: Graduate assistant, reading department; East Tennessee State University, member of Phi Delta Kappa Education Society, attended National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Reading Institute, Eastern Kentucky

Memberships:
Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents (TOSS)
East Tennessee Education Association (ETEA)
Tennessee Association of Curriculum and Development (TACD)
Phi Delta Kappa
American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)