ABSTRACT
                The development of continuing education programs for
school administrators has traditionally relied on the formal survey
and the utilization of small samples of practicing administrators to
provide direction to program planners in designing inservice
activities. The purpose of this study was to investigate the
feasibility, validity, and reliability of using the
quasi-ethnographic field technique of the structured interview to
determine the critical personal and professional competencies needed
by a sample of 50 Northeast Florida public school administrators. The
researchers trained 50 graduate students to conduct interviews with
50 practicing administrators and code the continuing educational
needs. The data collected provided a true representation of the
educational needs of those surveyed; reduced generic conceptual areas
into smaller, more critical training topics; provided valid and
reliable data; were consistent with the national concerns of
educators; and provided a list of specific skill needs of individuals
and subgroups within the sample population. The researchers concluded
that the structured interview technique offers a feasible, more
accurate needs assessment determination process than the formal
survey, has the unique byproduct of motivating administrators to more
readily participate in inservice activities, and is a practical
alternative for small and medium size school systems. (Author)

The Continuing Education of Administrators:

Identifying Competencies, the Critical First Step

Kenneth T. Wilburn, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Education

and

Ida May Summers, M.Ed.

Graduate Research Associate

Administration and Supervision Graduate Program

College of Education and Human Services

University of North Florida

August, 1983

Continuing Education   AERA

1984

Abstract

The development of continuing education programs for school administra-
tors has traditionally relied on the formal survey and the utilization
of small samples of practicing administrators to provide direction to
program planners in designing inservice activities. The purpose of this
study was to investigate the feasibility, validity and reliability of
using the quasi-ethnographic field technique of the structured interview
to determine the critical personal and professional competencies needed by
a sample of fifty Northeast Florida public school administrators. The
researchers trained fifty graduate students to conduct interviews with
fifty practicing administrators and code the continuing educational
needs. The data collected provided a true representation of the educa-
tional needs of those surveyed, reduced generic conceptual areas into
smaller, more critical training topics, provided valid and reliable data,
was consistent with national concerns of educators and provided a list of
specific skill needs of individuals and subgroups within the sample
population. The researchers concluded that the structured interview
technique offers a feasible, more accurate needs assessment determination
process than the formal survey, has the unique by-product of motivating
administrators to more readily participate in inservice activities and
is a practical alternative for small and medium size school systems.

Introduction

During the 60's and early 70's the public schools of our nation served as a focal point for social change, creative promise and a collective panacea for those who sou ⌐ to restructure the future of our democratic society. Although many educators did not view these new-formed aims of education as appropriate for schools and failed to welcome them with open arms, there was an interesting by-product from all this attention. Materials, money and human resources were poured into the schools in a seemingly endless stream of grants, projects and entitlement programs. The main concern for the administrator was to make the programs as effective as possible with his own school or school district.

As the factors of economic recession, inflation, decreasing public revenues and declining student populations began to emerge, the local school administrator began to be confronted with new types of need--the need to be efficient. However, most administrators in today's schools previously served three to five years as a teacher and attended the college or university to receive their graduate educational certification during the late sixties and early seventies. Since college programs are notoriously slow in adoption to current job demands, what many administrators found was that they were prepared to perform within an educational environment that no longer existed. The knowledge and skills they had obtained in order to be effective in times of plenty were vastly different from the training they needed to be both effective and efficient in a time of dwindling resources.

Like most states, Florida realized that their school managers needed to be retrained and that future managers would need a different emphasis

in their formal educational program if they were to be successful. In 1971 the Governor's Cabinet appointed a Citizens Committee to review the management statutes of Florida's schools. This led to a greater emphasis on local school based management and made the individual school principal the center of attention in the management of schools. In 1979 a Task Force was formed by the legislature to make specific recommendations as to administrative training (both preservice and inservice), selection, certification and compensation. As a result of this Task Force, three significant events occurred that have been paralleled in Maryland, Pennsylvania, California, Georgia and many, many other states throughout the country. First a state academy known as the Florida Academy of School Leaders (1979) was organized under the supervision of the State Department of Education. The primary purpose of the academy was to determine training needs of existing school administrators and provide high quality training institutes.

Secondly, in 1980, the Florida Council on Educational Management was formed in order to bring together experts from business, industry, colleges, public elementary and secondary schools and state agencies together to examine, make recommendations and oversee the rejuvenation of the total education and development of school administrators. And last of all the legislature funded the Management Training Act of 1981 as a means of providing funds to promote and support the retraining of current administrators and the investigation of new techniques for training future administrators.

Current Management Training Efforts

Throughout the country the last decade has seen several attempts to re-emphasize the importance of the effective administration. Three ex-

amples are the trend to place more authority at the building level with the principal and to adopt a professional development approach that seeks to identify specific competencies important to administrative effectiveness and then develop inservice programs to select, train, evaluate, certify and compensate administrators in regard to these competencies. These efforts have had tremendous impact on the traditional ways in which potential administrators are trained (i.e., graduate programs in adminis-tration and internships) and have spurred interest in a relatively new technique for education--the assessment center. Let us briefly examine current trends in these three areas.

Graduate Programs in Administration. Morris, Crawson, Hurwitz and Porter Gehrie (1981) have provided us with one of the best reviews of the evaluation of educational administrative study in America's colleges and universities. They inform us that:

> The study of school administration over the past forty years
>
> has passed through three definable epochs. In the late
>
> thirties and forties, Managerial Task Definitions was the
>
> dominating focus. Students of general management theory
>
> such as Mary Follett, Luther Gulick, Fritz Roethlisberger,
>
> Chester Barnard and Peter Drucker set the tone for this
>
> early emphasis. Characteristically, these scholars ex-
>
> amined an organization--usually a government bureau or a
>
> business corporation--as a total organizational entity.
>
> Out of all the tasks that must be performed, they asked, what
>
> are those specialized types of work reserved for those at
>
> the top? The culmination of this effort was Gulick's

master list of things managers do, celebrated in the
well-remembered acronym POSDCORB: Planning, Organization,
Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting...
In the fifties and sixties, attention turned away from
quasi-theoretical categories in favor of what might be
called the Contextual Interaction Field Approach...scho-
lars began to take an open systems view of the organiza-
tion...school administration directed its attention to the
client-publics with which a school administrator must
deal--the people the principal works for, works with,
works against--in performing the managerial function...
In the seventies and eighties, a third mode of inquiry has
made its entry into the study of school administration:
the Ethnographic approach--the thesis seems eminently
sensible...start out by examining directly what an ad-
ministrator actually does during the work day.

The end product of these efforts is that current graduate programs
of study are usually composed of a series of somewhat conceptually re-
lated courses which, in turn, are comprised of specific administrative
competencies. In this scenario the courses serve the function of
Gulick's master list of things administrators need to know and do and
the specific course objectives are designed so as to form a cognitive
hierarchy or sequence for teaching. The ethnographic considerations are
left to the individual skills of and previous professional experiences of
the individual professor conducting the class.

Like any approach for structuring a preservice and professional development program, the competency based one has its assets and flaws. On the positive side, the educational program can become very skill specific and results oriented. Ideally, this should provide the students with mastery of a specific group of skills and some general awareness of their application to a particular type of school, educational program or job category. On the other hand, none of the competency list type programs differentiate between those competencies which are necessary for minimal job success and those that when performed in the highest caliber will yield significant performance for the administrator. To say it another way, such programs may require the student to spend 90% of his time developing competencies that may produce only 10% of his success. And finally, for this list of competencies to be of greatest value, it must be constantly updated to reflect the changing needs of the profession. The more competency based and skill specific the educational program attempts to be, the more succeptible it becomes to being outdated with new educational innovation, fad and legislative mandate.

Internship. Traditionally, internships are aimed at the new "about to be" or "potential" administrator. Although many internship programs are part of a preservice graduate program, more and more school systems from California to Maryland are viewing the internship as an opportunity to "try out" a potential administrator as part of the selection and orientation process.

The Baltimore County School System, for example, has a five phase program of identifying potential administrators, providing them with long-term (2 to 3 years) orientation and professional development and the

opportunity for the top candidates to serve as "administrative assis-
tants" all prior to their actual appointment to an administrative posi-
tion. The Richland County School District One, Columbia, South Carolina,
in collaboration with the College of Education, University of South
Carolina, has implemented an administrative intern program designed to
provide training for persons interested in becoming school principals.
The program began in 1980 as a three year project funded partially through
the U.S. Department of Education for approximately $215,000. Those
selected are assigned as full-time apprentices to a building principal
and required to participate in a personalized training program at the
school level with the supervising principal. The Duval County School
System of Jacksonville, Florida, has instigated a program that allows
selected teachers that have completed the certification requirements for
the principalship to spend up to two years fully employed as trainees
and instructional support personnel at the local school and under the
supervision of the building principal. During the apprenticeship period
these individuals are trained "on the job" to gradually assume the duties
of principal.

In summary, whether trained by school district personnel, in coordina-
tion with a university's department of administration or "on the job" by
performing tasks under the supervision of another administrator, four
central aspects of internship are of primary consideration: (a) selection
of candidates: selection is usually based on potential not previous
administrative performance; (b) finances: the intern must earn a salary
at or near his previous level of income to participate in the program;
(c) quality of learning activities: the activities must be of "value" for

both the anticipated growth and present employment needs of the interns; and (d) selection of site leaders: the intern supervisor must be both an appropriate role model and a master teacher.

Assessment Centers. Following the Second World War, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) picked up a procedure previously developed by the Office of Strategic Services as an effort to determine how agents would do behind enemy lines. The procedure involved developing a realistic as possible simulation of actual situations such agents might encounter. The AT&T procedure became known as Assessment Centers and provided simulations that executives might experience on the job. These centers were used to screen prospective executives, and long-term research on these Assessment Centers, indicates they are excellent predictors of future executives' behavior.

Currently, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) has a national research and demonstration project on the application of Assessment Centers to the selection of principals. NASSP's process examines: problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, range of interest, personal motivation, educational values, stress tolerance, oral communication and written communication skills. In Florida, the public school systems of Dade County, St. Lucie County and Lee County are presently experimenting with their own adaptations of the NASSP model and other locally developed criteria for administrators in a district-operated assessment center. Like the national and business model, these centers focus upon the "characteristics of the administrative candidate" and their "readiness" for assignment to administrative duties.

Although the Assessment Center may seem to be an improvement over
the routine "seat-of-the-pants" way of selecting administrators, before
an Assessment Center is developed, considerable effort must be expended
in determining what the critical components of the administrator's role
are. It is the determination of these competencies that form the basis
of the behavior dimensions used in the Assessment Center. It is these
competencies that determine the validity of the assessment centers'
methodology.

In summary, although researcher Dale C. Lake (1981) in his recent
review of research on education administrative studies states that...

"the overwhelming type of study (86% of the 350 ab-
stracts reviewed) conducted on competencies consists of
making lists of competencies, and then asking princi-
pals, teachers, superintendents, etc., to rate each
competency on the basis of its importance to the role
of principal,"

the bottom line is that whether the education and training of an administra-
tor consists of a competency-based graduate program, internship or assess-
ment center review; the key factor is the underlying competencies of the
program. Therefore, the significant activity in developing educational
activities for administrators is the selection of competencies.

Purpose of the Study

There were two purposes for conducting this study. The major pur-
pose was to examine the applicability of the ethnographic research techni-
que of the structured interview to the critical process of determining
personal and professional development needs of practicing administrators.

The second purpose was to use the actual data collected as a basis for determining the inservice needs of our area administrators.

In reviewing the feasibility of the structured interview process, the researchers were primarily concerned with five critical questions. These questions were: (1) reality reference: does the data accurately describe the developmental needs of the administrators, (2) reductivity: does the technique provide information that reduces the complexity of administrative needs to more understandable and serviceable categories or concepts, (3) relationship with subjects: does the actual interview process limit or otherwise influence the accuracy and validity of the responses, (4) feasibility: are the costs, time and techniques needed to conduct interviews feasible for a school district to consider, and (5) generalizability: how transferrable are the experiences of the researchers in this study to other similar situations.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this research project lies in its attempt to recognize a process for determining the professional needs of the practicing administrator that goes beyond the obvious limitations of a predetermined survey and allows for greater input than the planning of development activities by a select few "representative" experts. The objective of this study was to address the inservice needs of current administrators in the Northeast Florida region using the interactive process of a structured interview technique. The critical first step of "determining competencies" is the most significant element of human resource programs if individuals are to attain their maximum potential. A general preservice program can provide a framework within which indi-

viduals can shape their career structures, but once on the job, the inservice or staff development process must help the individual to identify and elect appropriate programs that will strengthen skills that have direct on-the-job applicability (Luffin, 1983).

Methods

Subjects

The subjects in this study were forty eight randomly selected public school administrators in Northeast Florida. The subjects were selected by graduate students enrolled in Elementary and Secondary School Adminis- tration graduate classes during the 1982-83 academic year. No criteria were established for selection, other than : lingness to be interviewed by a graduate student, and it was assumed that this randomness would pro- vide a representative sample. The subjects selected represent one large urban school system (greater than 90,000 students), two medium size suburban school systems (greater than 25,000 students), and four small rural school systems.

Tasks

Each administrator was interviewed by one graduate student using a structured interview instrument developed by the researchers (Appendix A) to solicit common biographical data and the subjects' responses to their job tasks, successes and failures, desired changes in the instructional program or the administration of the school and the skills the subjects desired to have that they did not possess. The subjects' responses were recorded on a response sheet as verbatim as possible.

The responses were analyzed by the researchers for duplication and grouped into one of the following five areas for the purpose of frequency analysis and comparison: (1) Instructional Program Development,

(2) Personnel Development, (3) School-Community Relations, (4) School

Management, and (5) Administrative Leadership.

Procedures

Phase one of this study was the training of graduate students in

the use of the structured interview format predetermined by the researchers.

This training consisted of one ninety-minute class session in which each

student: (1) reviewed the questions to be asked, (2) viewed a training

video tape of the researchers conducting a structured interview, and

(3) participated in supervised practice in the application of the tech-

nique.

Phase two consisted of the actual interview, conducted by the gradu-

ate student at the convenience of the public school administrator.

In phase three, the actual written responses of the administrators

participating were translated from specific personal activities into

generic administrative tasks. For example, the statement, "Selecting a

new science textbook" would be translated into "Selecting textbooks."

In addition, each response was classified as pertaining to one of five

administrative areas: (1) instructional program development, (2) personal

development, (3) school-community relations, (4) school management, and

(5) leadership.

Data Analysis

The translated responses of the practicing administrators were tabu-

lated by response type so as to provide a distribution of the different

responses and to allow a frequency tabulation of subjects giving the

same generic response.

Results

Biographical Data

As Table 1 indicates, the subjects participating in this study were 75% male and 25% female; 75% of the subjects were white and 25% were of a minority race; 21% received an undergraduate major in elementary education while 62% majored in a secondary school subject area, and 17% have an undergraduate major in a non-education area. Ninety four percent (94%) have a masters degree or better and 52% currently serve as school building level administrators with 48% of the subjects working in central off'ce administrative positions. The average administrator has five years in his current position.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 2 represents an overview of the general concerns of the study population by the five previously identified administrative functional areas. An examination of this data provides one with an identifiable trend concerning the overall administration of public schools in Northeast Florida. Based on the data one could say that:

1. Administrators see instructional program development as their major objective and are less concerned with their own personal leadership techniques.

2. Administrators feel they are most successful in improving instruction and least successful in improving school-community relations.

3. However, administrators feel that the area in most need of change is that of instruction.

4. In regard to administrative policies and procedures, administrators see the greatest area of need to be those policies and procedures dealing with personnel.

5. As a personal area for self-improvement, the administrators
indicated that their own personal leadership skills were the most de-
ficient area.

Insert Table 2 about here

In addition to these overall trends, responses to each of the six
interview questions were tabulated in order to prioritize specific re-
sponses to each interview question. An analysis of the responses is out-
lined below.

Interview Question #1. What were/are your major objectives for
this school year?

Response: The top five responses were in the area of instructional
program development. The major concerns were: (a) improving student
achievement and test scores, (b) improving student discipline, motivation
and student's general attitude towards school, (c) the addition of a
specific subject or topic to the existing curriculum (note: most often
subjects listed dealt with children or computers), (d) implementing a
completely new curriculum program and (e) coordination and articulation
between components of the existing program. Table 3 provides a summary
of the responses provided by this interview question.

Insert Table 3 about here

Interview Question #2. What would you consider to be your most re-
cent success?

Response: Like the response to question one, this data indicates
that the administrators surveyed are most concerned about instruction and
specifically improving student achievement as measured by standardized

tests. Motivating students toward academic excellence and the addition

of a particular subject to the existing curriculum are additional con-

cerns. After the area of instruction, the respondents were interested in

developing and/or securing new additional instructional facilities and

their own administrative ability related to the tasks of yearly planning

and goal setting. Table 4 provides a summary of the responses to question

number two.

Insert Table 4 about here

Interview Question #3: What would you describe as your most recent

failure or frustration?

Response: This question provided the first break of primary concern

with the instructional program, and four of the top five priorities were

non-instructional concerns. In fact, the administrators' primary con-

cern with instruction was with student discipline and its negative

effect on pupil achievement. As Table 5 illustrates, the administrators

were most frustrated by their inability to: (a) manage their own time,

(b) effect parents' concern about their children, (c) teacher evaluation

and (d) teacher motivation.

Insert Table 5 about here

Interview Question #4: What changes would you like to see made in

the curriculum or instruction procedures?

Response: Overwhelmingly, the responding administrators were con-

cerned with upgrading policies and procedures for graduation and promo-

tion from grade to grade as an effort to increase academic achievement.

In coordination with this effort, the respondents see a need for in-

creased development and flexibility by the individual school in setting

these policies. The results provided in Table 6 also indicate a concern

with fragmentation and a lack of coordination between components of the

existing curriculum.

Insert Table 6 about here

Interview Question #5: What would you like to change about how the

school or school system is administered?

Response: In reflecting on their own area, the responding adminis-

trators were most concerned with policies and procedures related to the

way schools are staffed and how the existing teachers are utilized. In

addition, planning and communication between teachers and administrators

seem to be areas that the policies and procedures need to be revisited.

Table 7 provides a summary of the responses to this interview question.

Insert Table 7 about here

Interview Question #6: What new or increased skills would ycu like

to have that you did not obtain in your formal education program?

Response: As Table 8 indicates, the responding administrators are

most concerned with their own personal management skills. In fact, four

of the top five items listed deal with specific technical skills such as

budget development and financial management, collective bargaining and

contract negotiations, computerized management systems and knowledge of

school law.

Insert Table 8 about here

Summary and Conclusions

Analysis of the information collected via a structured interview process did provide the researchers with suitable data for determination of professional development needs. The interviews allowed the researchers to determine which behaviors administrators feel capable of accomplishing and need to be continued, which behaviors need to be improved and what new skills administrators feel they need to continue to improve their performance.

As an example of how the results of these interviws would be used to plan a program of professional development for administrators, the researchers treated the data collected in the study as if the participants were members of one school system. In this case, we would have data from the levels of assistant principal to superintendent in one school system. One possible alternative for using the data collected would be in the identification of developmental activities in categories where current skills need to be maintained and enriched and another category of activities for new skills needed or desired. Based on the data collected in this study, sample programs might address the following topics.

Enrichment Program Topics

Improving Pupil Achievement

Motivating Students

Strategies for Implementing New Instructional Programs

Coordinating your School's Curriculum

Verbal and Non-Verbal Communications: Are You Effective?

New Skills Topics

Managing One's Own Time

Getting Parents Involved in Your School's Program

Motivating Faculty and Staff

Differentiated Staffing: What Can and Has Been Done?

Budget Development and Financial Management

Micro-Computer Systems for the School Manager

In addition to being concerned about the usability of the data for professional development planning, the researchers were also concerned with the factors of reductivity, validity, feasibility and generalizability of the data. From the more than 100 pages of field notes collected by the interviewers, it was possible for the researchers to not only categorize the data into topics for planning continuing educational activities, but also to list specific skill needs of subgroups of the survey population. This provided maximum effectiveness for the reduction of the normal general survey categories into individualized learning activity packages for specific user groups.

The validity aspect of the study was addressed through an analysis of trend data. The degree of continuity of concerns between the administrators from the seven different school districts participating in the study was significant and led the researchers to believe that issues were correctly and adequately being collected by the interviewers via the structured interview technique. It seems obvious that the data collected by fifty different interviewers did not exert any undue influence on the data, or otherwise the trends between administrators and school districts would not be so apparent.

Discounting travel time it took approximately fifty minutes for each interviewer to complete the task. Even in a rural district where it might take sixty to ninety minutes to travel between schools, two or three interviews could be completed per day. Considering the degree of quality and specificity provided by the interactive process of the structured interview, the technique would seem to be most feasible for small and medium (30 or less schools) size school districts.

In regard to generalizability, although the data collected in this study seem to reflect the administrator's needs and concerns in this particular region of the country, a close examination of the 1983 Gallup Poll (Kappan, 1983, 33-47) indicates the results are very generalizeable to the opinions and concerns of the country as a whole. The results of this poll indicate that the poor curriculum and poor standards are two of the biggest problems with which public schools must deal, and that a lack of student discipline, pupils' lack of interest and a lack of proper financial support are major problems confronting the school and the school administrator. In addition, approximately 72% of those surveyed indicated that computer training should be required of all students. All of these opinions are in agreement with the present concerns and future needs identified by the data collected in this survey of area administrators.

In summary, the data collected by the researchers did provide a basis for planning continuing education activities for administrators; it allowed the identification of specific critical competencies and provided insight into the needs and motivation behind the needs of administrative personnel. The quasi-ethnographic technique of using structured

interviews provided a medium between administrators far superior to the
traditional data collection techniques of predetermined surveys and
decision-making by small sample "blue ribbon" pannels. An additional
by-product of the field based interview technique was the personal regard
enhancement that occurred as a result of the face-to-face contact between
the administrator and the interviewer. The researchers are convinced
that this would have a significantly positive effect upon the participation
of administrators participating in the program. The implications are
that the small and medium size school districts could be well served by
a trained staff of interviewers to be utilized as the basic data collec-
tion staff for planning continuing educational programs for administrators.

Reference Notes

1. Lake, Dale C. Futures for Principals, unpublished report, 1981. (available from [Southeastern Council for Educational Improvement, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina]).

References

Florida Council on Educational Management. Guidelines for school dis-
trict management training programs. Tallahassee: State of Florida
Printing Office, 1982.

Gallup, G. H. The 15th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitude toward
the public schools, Phi Delta Kappan, 1983, 65, 33-47.

Getzels, J. W. Administration as a social process , in A. S. Halpin
(ed.) Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Adminis-
trative Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

Getzels, J. S., ,ipman, J. M. & Campbell, R. F. Educational administra-
tion as a social process. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Luftin, E. Staff development in Dade County, Florida. Urban Education,
1983, 7, 37-42.

Morris, V. & Crowson, R. L. The principal and instructional management.
Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Research
Conference, 1980.

South, O. School based management. Gainesville. Florida Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

Appendix A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR AN ADMINISTRATOR OR SUPERVISOR

DIRECTIONS: In order to gather accurate information each of the following questions should be answered. You may carry this form with you during the interview and write the answers directly on the form.

1. What is your current title?

2. What is the title of the previous position you held?

3. Race.

4. Sex.

5. What is the year of your birth?

6. What was your major in Undergraduate School?

7. What is the highest level of education you have achieved?

8. How many years have you been in your current position?

9. What is the name of your school district?

10. What is the school level you administer or supervise?

11. What are/were your major objectives for this school year?

    1st Priority _____

    2nd Priority _____

    3rd Priority _____

12. What would you consider to be your most recent success?

    1st Priority _____

    2nd Priority _____

    3rd Priority _____

13. What would you consider as your most recent failure or frustration?

    1st Priority _____

    2nd Priority _____

    3rd Priority _____

14. What changes would you like to see made in curriculum or procedure?

    1st Priority _____

    2nd Priority _____

    3rd Priority _____

15. What would you like to change about how the school (or school system) is administered?

    1st Priority _____

    2nd Priority _____

16. What new or increased skills would you like to have that you did not obtain in your formal education?

    1st Priority _____

    2nd Priority _____

    3rd Priority _____

Table 1

Profile of Administrators Interviewed*

Sex			Highest Degree		
Male	75%	(36)	Undergraduate	3	
Female	25%	(12)	Masters	32	
			Specialist	3	
Race			Doctorate	10	
White	75%	(36)	Current Position		
Black	21%	(10)			
Hispanic	4%	(2)	Superintendent	8%	(4)
			Asst/Assoc		
Average Age			Superintendent	17%	(8)
			Director	8%	(4)
Male	44.2 years		Supervisor	15%	(7)
Female	41.5 years		Principal	35%	(17)
			Vice/Asst		
Undergraduate Major Education (32)			Principal	17%	(8)
Business	1		Years in Current Position		
Elementary Ed.	8				
English	6		Minimum	1 year	
Mathematics	2		Mean	5 years	
Physical Education	8		Median	8 years	
Reading	1		Maximum	25 years	
Science	5				
Voc. Technical	1				

Non-Education (16)

Psychology	1
Political Science	11
Business/	6
Accounting	

School District Size

Large Urban	
(Duval)	30
Medium Suburban	
(Clay/St. Johns)	4

Rural
(Gradford, Nassau,
Union, Putnam)   14

*Due to rounding, percents may be greater than 100.

Table 2

Responses By Administrative Functional Area

# QUESTION	FUNCTION				
	Instructional Program Development	Personnel Development	School-Community Relations	School Management	Leadership
1. What were your major objectives for this school year?	64%	14%	6%	14%	2%
2. What would you consider to be your most recent success?	51%	11%	0%	24%	14%
3. What was your most recent failure or frustration?	24%	19%	12%	12%	33%
4. What changes would you like to see made in the curriculum or instructional procedures?	77%	9%	2%	9%	2%
5. What would you like to change about how the school (or school system is administered?	29%	42%	-0-	26%	3%
6. What new or increased skills would you like to have that you did not obtain in your formal education?	5%	10%	20%	22%	44%

N= 48 (Due to rounding totals may exceed 100%)

30

Table 3

Top 10 Priority Objectives for the School Year

FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PRIORITY	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES
1. Instruction	Improve student achievement/ test scores
2. Instruction	Improve student discipline, motivation and general attitude toward school
3. Instruction	Addition of a specific subject or topic to the existing curriculum
4. Instruction	Implementation of a completely new instructional program
5. Instruction	Coordination and articulation between components of existing program
6. School Management	Yearly management planning and goal setting
7. Instruction	Revise specific objectives within an existing course or subject area
8. School Community Relations	Improve enrollment in after-school community (adult) education classes
9. Personnel	Improve communication between teachers and administration, and guidance counselors
10. School Community Relations	Improving parent participation and interest in school activities
11. Personnel	Implementing a teacher professional development program

Table 4

Major Recent Successes

FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PRIORITY	SPECIFIC SUCCESSES
1. Instruction	Improve student achievement and achievement test scores
2. Instruction	Improving student's motivation to academically excel
3. Instruction	Adding a particular subject of local interest to the existing curriculum
4. School Management	Developing/adding new facilities
5. School Management	Yearly planning and goal setting

Table 5

Major Failure or Frustration

FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PRIORITY	SPECIFIC FAILURE/FRUSTRATION
1. Leadership Skills	Time management (i.e., adminis-trators self management)
2. Instruction	Improving student discipline
3. School Community Relations	Lack of concern by parents about their children
4. Personnel Development	Teacher evaluation: processes and methods
5. Leadership	Motivating teachers
6. Leadership	Achieving cooperation of other administrators

Table 6

Top Ten Changes in Curriculum and Instruction

FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PRIORITY	SPECIFIC CHANGES DESIRED
1. Curriculum	Upgrading of policies/procedures for promotion to increase academic requirements
2. Curriculum	Increased development or instructional goals by individual schools (i.e., reduction in standardized curriculum set at state and/or district levels)
3. Curriculum	The addition of classes in child care and computer education to the curriculum
4. Personnel	Greater flexibility in assignment of faculty staff responsibilities
5. Curriculum	Improved coordination between schools and components of existing instructional programs
6. Curriculum	More effective use of existing instructional materials
7. Curriculum	Reduce the amount of testing
8. Curriculum	Expand the existing 180 day school year
9. Student Services	Improve student counseling programs
10. Curriculum	Assess learning needs of students and utilize in student placement

34

Table 7

Major Changes in Administrative Policies and Procedures

FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PRIORITY	SPECIFIC CHANGES DESIRED
1. Personnel Development	Effective use of existing faculty and current staffing procedures
2. School Management	Yearly management planning and goal setting
3. Instructional Program Development	Improve student discipline
4. Personnel Development	Communication between teachers and district level instructional support (supervisory) personnel
5. Instructional Program Development	Revision of policies related to increasing academic requirements

Table 8

Major New Skills Administrators Would Like to Have

FUNCTIONAL AREA IN PRIORITY	SPECIFIC RESPONSES
1. School Management	Public relations
2. Leadership Skills	Time management
3. School Management	Developing the school's budget and financial management
4. School Management	Knowledge of collective bargaining and negotiations
5. School Management	Computerized management systems
6. School Management	Knowledge of school law and its application to students