DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 649 EA 023 108

AUTHOR	Murphy, Joseph
TITLE	The Effects of the Educational Reform Movement on Departments of Educational Leadership. Occasional Paper No. 10.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Educational Leadership, Nashville, TN.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	May 91
CONTRACT	RI17C80005
NOTE	40p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Harvard Graduate School of Education, The National Center for Education Leadership, 443 Gutman Library, 6 Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138 ($4.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; College School Cooperation; Curriculum; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Training; Management Development; *School Restructuring; Student Recruitment; Supervisory Training
IDENTIFIERS	University Council for Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

Revisions occurring in preparation programs for educational leaders have come about in response to pressures from the larger reform agenda bearing on administrators, calls for improvement in educational leadership, and demands for change in administrator preparation programs. To review the types of revisions being made in these programs, questionnaires completed by 74 of 108 randomly selected chairpersons in departments of educational leadership were analyzed. In general, department chairpersons felt that pressures from the reform movement exerted moderate influence over the way they prepared administrators. Slight to moderate alterations were occurring in student recruitment and selection, course content and clinical experiences, teaching and monitoring student progress, university-school relations, and departmental structure and alterations. The moderate intensity and mixed focus of program revisions may be attributed to the absence of a motive for change. Results from comparing program revisions in University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) member institutions and non-UCEA institutions are presented in an appendix. Two tables of results are given. (47 references) (EJS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334649

NCEL

The National Center for Educational Leadership

The Effects of the Educational Reform Movement on Departments of Educational Leadership[1]

by

Joseph Murphy
Vanderbilt University

Occasional Paper No. 10

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Miles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

May 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 023 108

Harvard Graduate School of Education
Gutman Library, 4th floor
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-3575

George Peabody College of Education
Box 514
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 322-8014

The University of Chicago
Department of Education
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
(312) 702-1566

ERIC

NCEL

The National Center for Educational Leadership

The National Center for Educational Leadership is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., Grant No. R117C80005. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author, and not necessarily those of the funding agency.

Additional copies of this paper are available at a cost of $4.00/per copy from:

Harvard Graduate School of Education
The National Center for Education Leadership
443 Gutman Library
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Harvard Graduate School of Education
Gutman Library, 4th floor
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138
495-3575

George Peabody College of Education
Box 514
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 322-8014

The University of Chicago
Department of Education
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
(312) 702-1566

NCEL OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

1. *Re-Thinking School Leadership: An Agenda for Research and Reform* by Lee G. Bolman, Susan Moore Johnson, Jerome T. Murphy, and Carol H. Weiss; Harvard University (February 1990)

This paper presents a basic model of the relationship between leadership, situation, and outcomes. Personal characteristics of leaders and the situation in which leaders find themselves both influence what leaders do, which in turn influences the kinds of outcomes that they produce. Embedded in the model are three questions: "What is good school leadership?" "How does good school leadership come about?" and "What will good school leadership mean in the future?" Systematic ways of approaching these questions are also presented.

2. *Preparing School Administrators for the Twenty-First Century: The Reform Agenda* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (May 1990)

In the second wave of school reform reports and studies of the 1980s, much attention has been directed to issues of school administration and leadership. Yet, to date, no comprehensive analysis of these calls for changes in school administration has been undertaken. The purpose of this paper is to provide such a review. The goals of the paper are threefold: (1) to explain the reasons for the calls for reform of school administration, (2) to review the major studies and reports on education reform from 1982 to 1988 and (3) to discuss educational administration reform issues that need further attention.

3. *What Makes a Difference? School Context, Principal Leadership, and Student Achievement* by Philip Hallinger, Leonard Bickman, and Ken Davis; Vanderbilt University (June 1990)

This paper addresses the general question, what makes a difference in school learning? We report the results of a secondary analysis of data collected as part of the Tennessee School Improvement Incentives Project. We utilized the instructional leadership model developed by researchers at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development to guide our analyses. This conceptual model makes provision for analysis of principal leadership in relation to features of the school environment, school-level organization, and student outcomes. The paper focuses on the following research questions: (1) What antecedents appear to influence principal leadership behavior? (2) What impact does principal leadership have on the organization and its outcomes? (3) To what extent is the Far West Lab instructional leadership framework supported empirically by the data collected in this study?

4. *The Teaching Project at the Edward Devotion School: A Case Study of a Teacher-Initiated Restructuring Project* by Katherine C. Boles; Harvard University (September 1990)

School districts around the country are in the process of initiating projects to restructure their schools. A small but growing number of these restructuring projects have been initiated by teachers, but as yet little has been written documenting the experience of classroom practitioners involved in such efforts. The purpose of this study is to add teachers' voices to the literature on restructuring. This project restructured a portion of a school and altered the work of a group of third and fourth grade teachers.

5. *Educational Reform in the 1980s: Explaining Some Surprising Success* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (September 1990)

In this paper issues of success and failure of reform initiatives are discussed from both sides of the aisle. The paper begins with a review of the financial, political, and organizational factors which normally support the position that reform measures are likely to result in few substantive improvements. Next the argument is made that educational reform recommendations have been surprisingly successful, and some speculations as to the reasons for this unexpected outcome are presented.

6. *New Settings and Changing Norms for Principal Development* by Philip Hallinger; Vanderbilt University and Robert Wimpelberg; University of New Orleans (January 1991)

Recently analysts have identified a variety of features that distinguish emerging administrative training programs from traditional ones. The rapid, but non-systematic growth in organizations providing administrative development services during the 1980's led to considerable natural variation in programmatic content as well as in organizational processes. In particular, significant variations emerged in the operation of state sponsored leadership academies and local principals' centers. The purpose of this paper is to analyze variations in current approaches to educational leadership development. The paper addresses three questions: (1) What is the range of variation among emerging staff development programs for school leaders on dimensions of program content and organizational process? (2) What can we learn from the naturally occurring variations in administrative development? (3) What are the most likely and promising directions for administrative development programs in the next decade?

7. *Images of Leadership* by Lee G. Bolman; Harvard University and Terrence E. Deal; Vanderbilt University (January 1991)

This project has undertaken a major study of the "frames", or orientations that leaders use to guide their understanding of their work. The investigators have developed a set of survey instruments to measure four leadership orientations (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), and collected data from leaders approach their task constituents in both education and the private sector. Their research results show that the four leadership orientations do capture significant elements of how leaders approach their task, and that those leadership variables are significantly associated with effectiveness. The results further show that the variables which predict effectiveness as a *manager* are different from those that predict effectiveness as a *leader*. In particular, structural and rational orientations are primarily predictive of manager effectiveness. This research was reported at the AERA meeting in April, 1990.

8. *Trouble in Paradise: Teacher Conflicts in Shared Decision Making* by Carol H. Weiss, Joseph Cambone and Alexander Wyeth; Harvard University (April 1991)

Many educators advocate teacher participation in school decision making as one strategy for improving schools. Through interviews with teachers and administrators in high schools that have adopted some version of shared decision making, the authors locate both advantages and disadvantages. Advantages center on great commitment and "ownership" of decisions. Disadvantages include, besides heavy time demands, the necessity for teachers to confront and negotiate with each other, a process that requires skills many teachers lack. There may also be conflicts with administrators, often because of unclear definitions of authority and responsibility. Suggestions are made for overcoming such problems.

9. *Restructuring Schools: Fourteen Elementary and Secondary Teachers' Perspectives on Reform* by Joseph Murphy, Carolyn M. Evertson and Mary L. Radnofsky; Vanderbilt University (May 1991)

Few efforts have been made to inject classroom teachers' voices into discussions on restructuring. In this article, we report on one exploratory study that begins to address this oversight. We interviewed 14 teachers from diverse roles about their views on the restructuring movement in general. We wanted to hear what they thought of the concept and to determine what effects they anticipated in restructuring schools. We also elicited their perceptions about what changes they would make in both the schools and classrooms if they were thrust into a school undergoing restructuring. We found that, while in some ways the views of these teachers were consistent with prevailing perspectives in the restructuring movement, in other cases, their preferences were at odds with the general body of literature on restructuring. We concluded that, while these teachers are optimistic about the possibilities of fundamental school reform, they remain skeptical about their ability to change the current educational system.

10. *The Effects of the Educational Reform Movement on Departments of Educational Leadership* by Joseph Murphy; Vanderbilt University (May 1991)

This paper reviews the types of revisions that preparation programs in educational leadership have begun to make in response to three related sets of pressures brought on by the reform movement of the 1980s: pressures bearing on school administrators from the larger reform agenda, i.e., improving education across the board; general critiques of and calls for improvement in educational leadership; and specific analyses and demands for change in administrator preparation programs. The results are based on questionnaires completed by 74 chairpersons in departments of educational leadership. The emerging picture is mixed. On the one hand, departments of educational administration have begun to respond to the pressures for change. In addition, for better or worse, discernable patterns in these revisions are generally consistent with the implicit demands for improvement that lace the critical reviews of the field and with the more explicit recommendations contained in the NPBEA and NCEEA reform reports. On the other hand, the response has been moderate (at best) in intensity and mixed in focus.

To receive a copy of any of the above papers, send a check for $4.00/per copy to: (prepayment preferred)

Harvard Graduate School of Education
The National Center for Educational Leadership
443 Gutman Library / 6 Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Please make checks payable to: **HARVARD UNIVERSITY**

Thank you.

The Effects of the Educational Reform Movement on Departments of Educational Leadership[1]

by

Joseph Murphy

> *Increased demands for fundamental improvements in administrator preparation programs are linked directly to the pressures for educational reform.* (Miklos, 1990, p. 26)

> *The pressure is on. The reform and restructuring of these [educational administration preparation] programs is part of the next wave of educational change.* (Anderson, cited in Bradley, 14 February 1990, p. 1)

In the 1980s we have witnessed the most thorough and sustained effort to reform the American public educational system in our history (see Murphy, 1990a). Beginning with largely unnoticed district and state efforts in the late 1970s (Firestone, 1990), and crystallizing with the publication of A Nation at Risk, efforts to improve education have been occurring at an unbroken pace for nearly a decade. Early analyses, critiques, suggestions for improvement, and resulting reform measures dealt primarily with teachers and students. Although the role that principals and superintendents would need to play to ensure implementation of reforms was vaguely outlined, little direct attention was devoted to school administration.

In the mid-1980s, however, analysts from a variety of perspectives began to discuss school administration as an area of reform (see Murphy, 1990b). One group of reformers (e.g., Chubb, 1988; Holmes, 1986) concluded that administrators were more likely to be impediments than catalysts for change, especially for the so-called wave 2 reforms designed to empower teachers and parents by decentralizing schooling. Not surprisingly, these reformers championed improvement strategies that would either bypass school leaders, or at least neutralize their ability to inhibit much needed alterations to the educational enterprise (see Slater, 1988).

A second, and larger, group of reviewers argued that school administrators were central to reform efforts. Most of the members of this group, relying on studies of effective schools and businesses and successful school improvement projects (see Murphy & Hallinger, 1987), argued that significant change was unlikely to materialize unless superintendents and principals were intimately involved with, and often at the helm of, reform efforts. Others in this group reached their conclusions about the centrality of school leaders from a different line of analysis. These men and women believed that restructuring of schooling provided the most likely avenue for improvement (see Elmore, 1989; Murphy & Evertson, in press). They argued that administrators would need to learn new roles and responsibilities to facilitate the transformation of schooling (see American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education [AACTE], 1988; Murphy & Hart, 1988; Rossmiller, 1986).

Once the reform spotlight was focused on the role of school administrators, a number of problem areas quickly became illuminated. None have been more visible than issues relating to administrator training, especially the quality of initial preparation programs. Thus, the reform movement has, in many ways, provided the momentum needed for a re-examination of the structures, content, and processes common to the schooling of administrators. The purpose of this paper is to review the types of revisions that preparation programs in educational leadership have begun to make in response to three related sets of pressures brought on by the reform movement of the 1980s: pressures bearing on school administrators from the larger reform agenda, i.e., improving education across the board; general critiques of and calls for improvement in educational leadership; and specific analyses and demands for change in administrator preparation programs. In the next section we discuss the procedures used in the study. We then turn our attention to the findings. Analysis of the data and discussion of the findings are integrated throughout the paper.

Procedures

Protocol

We developed a 15-item questionnaire based on the literature in four broad areas: (1) analyses of general reform reports of the 1980s, i.e., those that did not focus upon but included discussions of educational leadership; (2) analyses of the profession of educational administration; (3) critical reviews of administrator preparation programs; and (4) reports suggesting solutions to problems in each of these three areas.[2] Ten items contained a Likert-scale question and an open-ended response; three items were open-ended; two others contained only a Likert-scale question.

Exploratory Study

An exploratory study (Murphy, 1989, 1990d) was conducted during the summer of 1988 using source documents and the responses of 15 of the 18 department chairs of administrator preparation programs in Illinois. We revised it based upon feedback from two experts in educational leadership--one university-based and one field-based[3]. The final protocol contained 21 items--16 combination Likert-scale and open-ended format questions, 3 open-ended only items, and 2 Likert-scale only questions.

This paper analyzes responses to Likert-scale questions. Directions for the two Likert-scale only questions (numbers 1 and 3 in Tables 1 and 2) were as follows:

> Question 1: The reform movement of the 1980s has shaped/ changed the way you prepare school administrators in your college/school of education. (Scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = very little and 5 = a great deal.)
>
> Question 3: I believe that the school reform movement of the 1980s has effected principals and superintendents. (Same scale as above.)

Directions for the 16 combination Likert-scale and open-ended format questions (numbers 2a-p) were as follows:

> How would you characterize the amount of change in the preparation of school administrators at your school/college of education in the following areas? (Same scale as above.)

Please describe important changes, if any.

Sample

Two sub-sets comprised the population from which the sample was drawn--University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) programs and non-UCEA programs. The former group consists of 50 doctoral granting programs in the United States and Canada; the latter group, numbering approximately 450, contains all the remaining colleges and universities that maintain training programs in the United States. Department chairpersons from all 49 U.S.-based UCEA programs were asked to complete the questionnaire. The chairpersons from 59 of the 321 (non-UCEA) programs listed in Lilley's (1988-89) educational administration directory[4] were randomly selected to participate. Questionnaires completed in November and December 1989 were returned from 74 of the 108 chairpersons (69%)--45 of the 49 UCEA program schools (92%) and 29 of the 59 non-UCEA schools (49%).

Analysis

The 18 Likert-scale questions were analyzed descriptively. The 16 open-ended questions were analyzed qualitatively.

T-tests were used to assess differences between UCEA and non-UCEA schools.[5]

Results and Discussion

Overall Effect

Results. In order to ascertain the overall level of reform influence, we led with a general question that required unit heads to assess the overall effect of the reform movement on their programs. In general, these educational leaders felt that the reform movement had exerted a moderate influence (mean rating 3.14) on the way they prepared school administrators (see 1, Table 1). Even this moderate effect seemed high, however, when compared to the scores they ascribed to the specific types of program changes undertaken in response to recent reform activity (see 2a-p, Table 1). For example, the modal score for the 16 programmatic sub-areas in question 2 is only 2.5. Department heads assigned scores of 3 or higher to only 3 of 16 of these topic areas (2d, e, h). An examination of these three areas sheds some

light on the apparent discrepancy, however. All three are program topics--clinical experiences, course content, and involvement of practitioners in (program) development. It seems likely that, like their colleagues in elementary and secondary schools (Newmann, 1988), these men and women equate the overall program with the course of study.

TABLE 1

Effects of the Reform Movement of the 1980s on Departments of Educational Leadership--Chairpersons' Perceptions

AERA		n	Mean[a]
1	overall effect	73	3.14
2a	recruitment of students	72	2.39
2b	selection of students	72	2.34
2c	monitoring/assessing progress	73	2.61
2d	clinical experiences	76[b]	3.01
2e	content of the program	76[c]	3.21
2f	teaching and teaching strategies	74[c]	2.55
2g	degree structure	75[c]	1.75
2h	involvement of practitioners in development	75[c]	2.96
2i	involvement of practitioners in delivery	73	2.57
2j	involvement of faculty in schools	73[c]	2.54
2k	mix of students	72[c]	2.18
2l	services for practicing administrators	73	2.48
2m	selection of faculty	73	2.52
2n	departmental staffing	69	2.44
2o	faculty development opportunties	73	2.14
2p	departmental mission/agenda	73	2.74
3	perceived effects on school administrators	73	3.05

[a]1=very little, 3=somewhat, 5=a great deal

[b]Two respondents provided two answers--for different programs within the department

[c] One respondent provided two answers--for different programs within the department

Discussion. In general, it appears that the reform movement to date has not had a dramatic impact on administrator preparation programs. Part of this can be attributed to the relative recency of much of the reform activity, especially the release of reports specific to educational leadership. Since most of the pressures and calls for improving school administration have emanated from outside the professoriate (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987), it may be that we are witnessing a time lag between environmental pressure and internal response. The fact that these programs have historically been fairly well buffered from external interference may also contribute to the extent and celerity with which they feel compelled to act. The lack of incentives to change, combined with a widespread perception among professors of school administration that there are few problems in their field (McCarthey, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988), may help explain the limited impact of reforms. Although we return to this analysis in our conclusion, it is worth noting here that the reform efforts to date fall far short of Griffiths' (1988) plea for the comprehensive and radical reform needed to keep the profession from disintegrating (see also Beare, 1989).

Student Recruitment and Selection

Results. We asked three questions to determine how the student population is changing in response to suggestions for reform. Overall, recruitment and selection efforts have been only slightly affected (2.39 and 2.34 respectively; see 2a and b, Table 1). The mix of students in these programs (2k, Table 1) has changed even less (2.18), indicating that some of the efforts discussed below to increase enrollments of historically underrepresented groups were still in the early stages.

Analysis of the open-ended responses to questions 2a and b provides a fairly rich description of the types of alterations that 45 of these programs are undertaking in the areas of recruitment and selection of students. Four themes are evident. To begin with, nearly a third of the departments have increased selectivity by stiffening entrance requirements, especially test scores. Only one school reported reducing standards for matriculation. Program chairs also discussed their efforts to diversify student populations: seven unit heads noted increased attention to recruiting women

and minorities, five listed enhanced efforts to locate minority applicants,[6] and two others outlined efforts to attract more women. A few others reported that they are either gearing up for concerted efforts in the area of diversification for greater equity or have already created the infrastructures (e.g., recruitment committees) to begin the process. Measures are also in place in a number of programs to reduce traditional reliance on student self-selection. In at least five preparation programs, more aggressive recruitment means establishing closer working relationships with school districts and practitioners who, in effect, become partners in the identification and selection of students.[7] Finally, there is some evidence of a trend toward expanding the array of indicators that programs are using in the selection process. Four schools have placed greater weight on classroom teaching experience; three have added writing samples; three have added, or increased the importance of, personal interviews; and two have placed more stress on demonstrated leadership in instructional areas.

Discussion. How one interprets these findings depends to a large extent on the frame of reference one brings to the analysis process. On the positive side of the ledger, it is important to stress that each of the four themes discussed above address serious problems confronting most programs in educational administration (Achilles, 1984; Clark, 1988; Griffiths, 1988). They are also consistent with blueprints for improvement outlined in the two reports at the forefront of reform in preparation programs--the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration's (NCEEA) Leaders for America's Schools (1987) and The National Policy Board for Educational Administration's (NPBEA) Improving the Preparation of School Administrators (1989). For example, the NPBEA begins its call for reform by recommending that:

> Vigorous recruitment strategies be mounted to attract the brightest and most capable candidates, of diverse race, ethnicity, and sex [and that] entrance standards to administrator preparation programs be dramatically raised to ensure that all candidates possess strong analytic ability, high administrative potential, and demonstrated success in teaching. . . . (NPBEA, 1989, p. 5).

A number of the activities highlighted by department chairs reinforce other important elements of the reform agenda as well, most noticeably the development of stronger connective tissue between the practitioner and academic arms of the profession (see Carver, 1988). It is also worth noting that a few additional unit heads reported that their programs are gearing up for significant efforts at improving student recruitment and selection. In addition, reported changes in the mix of students in the programs are consistent with the four themes discussed earlier in the "results" section, especially increases in the percentage of women and minorities. Of the 25 answers to the open-ended section of question 2k, 17 administrators reported that their efforts had resulted in increased numbers of women (6), women and minorities (10), or minorities (1) in their programs.

It is unwise, however, to paint too bright a picture here. The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (1988) has labeled the lack of sound recruitment as perhaps the most serious problem confronting administrator preparation programs. Yet the level of activity reported herein (2.39 and 2.34) is not much greater than that noted nearly a year and a half earlier by the 15 department heads in our exploratory study--a 2.1 rating for the influence of the reform movement on both recruitment and selection.[8] The slight to moderate efforts reported in this study in such critical areas as these are, in the long run, unlikely to provide the numbers of high-quality personnel needed to lead America's schools. Even after factoring out programs with low ratings that undertook major improvement efforts in this area before the onslaught of the 1980s reform movement, over 40% of the schools sampled have been only marginally touched by calls for higher standards and greater equity in student recruitment and selection. Certainly, it is hard to imagine how we will develop the needed number of minority school administrators absent more vigorous attention to equity issues in recruiting and selecting students for our preparation programs. It is also disheartening to note the lack of attention to funding as a vehicle for increasing the number of minority and women candidates. Only two unit heads touched upon this issue, one directly and one indirectly.[9]

Course Content and Clinical Experiences

Results. Department heads reported that some important alterations have taken place in these areas of their programs in response to the recent pressures for reform. Of all the topic areas assessed, they reported that the largest amount of change occurred in the curriculum (3.21) and the clinical experiences (3.01) they offered (see 2d and e, Table 1). In terms of course content, there were no noticeable differences between UCEA and non-UCEA schools. Fifty chairpersons across both groups sketched out revisions on an array of topics, although at least some commonalities are evident in their responses. To begin with, a good deal of effort is underway throughout these institutions to examine and revise program content. New courses are being added, old courses are being revised or deleted, and new program content is being infused into existing offerings. Yet, by and large, with two clear exceptions, these changes tend to be highly idiosyncratic--one program emphasizes policy analysis, another focuses on computers, and a third underscores the importance of planning. There are also indications that state certification requirements are shaping, if not actually directing, the revisions unfolding in a number of these universities.

The one substantive area where change efforts converge is around the topic of leadership--a fact that is not surprising given that leadership is the coin of the realm in virtually all reform reports related to school administration (Murphy, 1990b). A dozen of these administrators reported that they have either added courses in leadership or refocused their entire programs around leadership issues. Particular emphasis has been provided to the area of instructional leadership with related attention devoted to issues of change and school improvement. Again, this trend is consistent with the bulk of reform proposals that have exhorted administrators to develop a better understanding of the core technology of education (Murphy, 1990b. In addition, departmnt heads underscored the development of, or revisions to, core sequences of courses for students. This movement is in line with calls for educational reform in secondary schools and colleges as well (see Murphy 1990g).

As noted earlier, the 74 unit heads believed that a moderate amount of change has occurred in the clinical components of their departments (3.01). Fifty unit heads also

provided responses to the open-ended question on clinical aspects of their programs. Two patterns stand out in their descriptions of revisions. First, the focus on clinically-based experiences in these programs has increased. Some departments established new field-based requirements for their programs; others added them to specific certification or degree areas (e.g., the Ed.S.) where they previously had not been required. The overall effect was that the clinical component comprised a larger percentage of the total program completed by students. In addition, and most consistently throughout the sample, clinical experiences had been extended in length--e.g., from one to two semesters, to include more clock hours, to be integrated with the first year of employment--and broadened--e.g., to include more experiences, to take place at additional settings and varied levels of schooling, to have students interact with more groups at the school level. Second, consideration was given to upgrading the quality of field activities, although there was little evidence of consistent use across the group of one or more specific strategies to do so. Measures employed to enhance quality included: establishing more control over where interns worked and what they did; being more selective in choosing field placements; creating more structured learning experiences; providing better supervision to students in the field; evaluating programs more thoroughly; requiring evidence of reflective and analytic activities rather than simple documentation of time on the job; integrating field experiences and academic offerings more effectively; and establishing more formal relationships with school districts, including field-based coursework.

Discussion. McCarthy and her colleagues (1988) provide the backdrop for examining the information presented above regarding changes in course content:

> The most pressing need in the field, according to the 1986 respondents [professors of educational leadership], was curriculum reform in educational administration preparation programs. But most faculty spent little or no time in collective efforts to modify curriculum. This does not mean that courses are not periodically revised or that reading lists are not updated. Such efforts, while important and necessary, are essentially autonomous acts, independent of other program elements.
>
> Critics have charged that the educational administration curriculum has remained essentially unchanged for decades. This is not surprising since educational administration preparation programs are bastions of conservatism in tolerant but

risk-aversive universities. Gibboney (1987) lamented that even blue-ribbon panels, such as the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987), seem destined to simply tinker with, rather than recommend a fundamental restructuring of, a curriculum grounded in management and business administration principles. If Gibboney's interpretation is accurate (i.e., preparation programs emphasize school management at the expense of understanding education and scholarship), nothing less than a fundamental reordering of what is covered in graduate programs can respond to the current crisis in educational leadership. Only group action can reorganize training programs to the magnitude necessary to respond to the challenges facing the field. Systemic curriculum revision demands a level of commitment and effort from faculty members that they do not presently seem prepared to give. (p. 172)

What light do our data shed on the issues raised by McCarthy, et al.? There is some cause for optimism. Clearly, department heads believe that there is more activity afoot here --in the area of greatest need--than in other dimensions of their programs. The movement away from what one respondent labeled a cafeteria program for doctoral students to more focused, coherent, and integrated sequences of core classes also appears to be a move in the right direction (see especially Peterson & Finn, 1985). And, if one believes what reformers have argued for the past decade--that considerably more attention in preparation programs needs to be devoted to the technical core or teaching-learning process of schooling (see Murphy, 1990e, for a review)--then the reports of increased stress on instructional leadership will be heralded as good news indeed. Also embedded in these reports are indications that curricular reform is becoming more of a departmental activity than a collection of course revisions undertaken by individual professors working in isolation. Finally, the changes noted above, and throughout other parts of this report, suggest that the calls for the development of a practice-based, problem-based approach to learning (NPBEA, 1988) appear to be exerting a noticeable influence on the curriculum of preparation programs in school administration.

At the same time, however, our analysis raises some concerns. With the exception of instructional leadership, there seems to be little evidence that the field has a collective vision about what content should be emphasized in training programs. Our earlier critique of what seemed like a pervasive unwillingness to address this issue

may still apply (Murphy, 1990c). With a few notable exceptions, we did not find programs addressing "the fundamental reordering of what is covered" that McCarthy and her associates (1988, p. 172) and others (Murphy, 1990f) have called for. Neither did we uncover any information that would confirm that these programs were spearheading the curricular revisions called for by the NPBEA (1989) in the areas of societal and cultural influences on schooling, organizational theory--especially alternative organizational paradigms (see Lotto, 1990, for a review)--and the moral and ethical dimensions of schooling.

The clinical aspects of many preparation programs in educational administration are notoriously weak. Despite an entrenched belief that supervised practice "could be the most critical phase of the administrator's preparation" (Griffiths, 1988, p. 17) and a long history of efforts to make field-based learning an integral part of preparation programs (see Daresh, 1987, for a review), little progress has been made in this area. The field-based component continues to be plagued by problems: inadequate attention to clinical experiences; activities arranged on the basis of convenience; poor planning, supervision, and follow-up; absence of integration between classroom and field-based experiences; and over-emphasis on low-level (orientation type) activities (Clark, 1988; Erlandson, 1979; Peterson & Finn, 1985).

It is obvious that many of the programs in this sample have begun to address these issues. Particularly noteworthy are their endeavors to exercise quality control over clinical activities, an area that has in recent years been largely managed by default; i.e., left to the discretion of individual students. The data fail to provide much information on the nature of the clinical experiences themselves. We need better information at a micro-level about the activities included in these longer and "improved" field experiences.

Teaching and Monitoring Student Progress

Results. Program chairs reported that slight to moderate changes (2.55) have taken place in instructional approaches employed in their departments in response to reform efforts of the 1980s (see 2f, Table 1). Thirty-five schools have made marginal changes (18 ratings of "1", 17 ratings of "2"), while only 17 have made serious

attacks (15 ratings of "4", 2 ratings of "5") on the issue of instruction. The types of revisions programs are making tend to cluster into three major categories: increased emphasis on simulations and case studies (9 schools); more stress on problems of practice, especially heightened efforts to integrate theory, research, and practice, and expanded use of problem-based pedagogical approaches (8 schools); and reorienting instructional focus more toward the field, including field-based instructional activities (5 schools). Only a handful of those responding described any initiatives outside of these three related clusters.

As with most of the areas examined in this study, department chairpersons believed that some, but hardly extensive, improvements have occurred in the ways in which student performance is monitored in their preparation programs. They scored alterations in this area in response to calls for reform at 2.61 (see 2c, Table 1). Few differences by type of program--UCEA vs non-UCEA --were evident. Analysis of the 32 open-ended responses in this area reveals that the enhanced climate for tracking student performance in some schools is due, at least in part, to reform legislation establishing standardized exit examinations for certification (e.g., Illinois and Kentucky) or annual reviews of preparation programs by state agencies. Program administrators also reported that the nexus between the university and the field--internships and clinical experiences--is the area in which monitoring attention has increased the most; 7 program heads singled out this area for discussion. Other initiatives to improve assessment of student progress during training focused on the university-based components of preparation programs. Three sub-themes were discernible. Improvement, enhancement, or expansion were the directions of choice. No-one reported dismantling existing structures or reducing attention to tracking student progress. Second, for a number of programs, expansion meant developing the infrastructure, or record keeping systems, required to support expanded monitoring efforts. Third, there was little consistency in the specific assessment methods employed by the schools--two raised grading standards, another instituted comprehensive examinations, a fourth added additional assessment points as students progressed through the program, two more established end-of-year evaluations, three

others began relying more heavily on skills assessments and competency-based approaches to monitoring, while still others identified other methods in their quest to improve the assessment of student progress.

Discussion. Earlier analyses of pedagogy in educational administrator preparation programs concluded that there was ample room for improvement. In most departments, instruction is provided in learning formats and through instructional approaches that are least conducive to learning (AACTE, 1988; Erlandson & Witters-Churchill, 1988; Nunnery, 1982). Like instruction in elementary and secondary schools (see Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984), teaching in school administration training programs suffers from a numbing dullness of boring and routinized delivery practices.

The alterations chronicled by unit heads in this study begin to address these pedagogical limitations directly. The improvement strategies outlined above--increased emphasis on simulations, additional attention to problems of practice, and reorienting instructional focus toward the field--represent an important step toward infusing more learner-centered approaches into training programs. Combining this trend with the changes in the clinical program components discussed earlier reveals that instruction in training programs is becoming more field-based and practice-oriented, if not practice-driven.[10] These changes are in line with reform reports that call for greater reliance on reality-oriented instructional formats and instructional strategies employed in other professional schools (AACTE, 1988; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985; NCEEA, 1987). It is also worth emphasizing that, although the overall level of change in these 74 schools has been slight (2.55), this score represents a significant increase from the rating provided by the respondents in the exploratory study conducted 18 months earlier (1.8) (see note 8).

Although some activity is occurring in the area of teaching,, the data provide little evidence of the types of systemic changes that are needed in order to transform instruction in preparation programs. While the patterns noted above are consistent with reform suggestions, the overall level of response is rather small. Unlike our experience with the curriculum area, when we analyze the data here, we develop the

sense that instructional issues continue to lurk in the background, that the critical mass of attention required to galvanize the collective energy of the profession around issues of teaching has not yet been reached. Two topics in particular received extremely limited consideration in these reports. Only two chairpersons discussed instructional enhancement through the use of recent technological advancements. Even more importantly, there was an absence of direct attention to restructuring teaching based on the principles of adult learning.[11] While a number of themes uncovered in the analysis--emphasis on practice, use of cases and simulations, stress on field-based work--are consistent with the principles of andragogy, there was little evidence of attention to the intellectual scaffolding that would allow for more coherent efforts to address the needs of adult learners.

Monitoring of student progress in many preparation programs leaves much to be desired. Assessments of progress at the key junctures of students' programs are either absent or conducted in a perfunctory fashion. Meaningful competency tests on needed skills are conspicuous by their absence in most programs. "Too many [programs] have exit requirements that are slack and unrelated to the workplace of the profession" (Peterson & Finn, 1985: 540). A standards-free, non-judgmental attitude pervades many departments of school administration (Peterson & Finn, 1985). Performance criteria are ill-defined and little monitoring occurs (Hawley, 1988). Not surprisingly, very few entrants to certification programs fail to complete their programs for academic reasons (Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984). The unstated assumption is that rigorous and appropriate standards will be applied at later stages in the process of moving toward administrative employment--especially at the dissertation, certification, and job-selection steps. Unfortunately, this assumption is inaccurate (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983; NCEEA, 1987).

A variety of the points presented above convey the impression that the profession has made some progress during the current era of reform in addressing weaknesses in the area of monitoring student progress. Recognition of the need for change and new initiatives for improvement (although at only a moderate level) are themselves good signs, as is the wide range of areas that programs have targeted for action. The

focus on performance based appraisal--more extensive and systematic attempts to judge whether students can use what they have learned--is especially heartening.[12] We also find a cause for optimism in the fact that a number of programs have begun to develop infrastructures to support more thoughtful monitoring programs.

Major concerns in this area center on the limited level of action and on the lack of evidence that these programs have developed comprehensive and interlocking systems to assess student progress. The first issue we have noted before. Is the overall response sufficient to signal an important breakthrough in this area? Based on the analysis in this study, at this time the answer is "no"; insufficient consideration is being devoted to upgrading procedures used to track and evaluate student progress. The second concern deals with the fact that only one program noted that it had put in place, and only a small handful were considering installing, comprehensive systems to enhance monitoring of performance. Almost all the programs were selecting one, or at most two, points in students' programs on which to focus their efforts. While this may be due to the recency of initiatives in this area, e.g., many programs were still building their procedures, it seems prudent to call for more attention to the array of leverage points that can be targeted in comprehensive plans to enhance the monitoring of student performance.

University-School Relations

Results. In his insightful essay on the study of educational administration, Carver (1988, p. 6) labeled "the absence of any meaningful coupling between the training arm and the employment agents [as] the point in the fabric of educational administration when the threads are weakest." In order to ascertain what preparation programs were doing to address this critical problem, we asked four interrelated questions. Two assessed the role of practitioners in preparation program development and delivery; two others measured faculty involvement with practitioners, working with them in the schools and providing them with professional development services. The questions were designed to overlap and to provide information on these issues from multiple perspectives.

Chairpersons reported that their departments had undertaken some, but not extensive, alterations in each of these areas. They rated practitioner participation in program development at 2.96 and program delivery at 2.57 (see 2, h and i, Table 1). Faculty involvement in schools was rated at 2.54 while services for practicing administrators received a score of 2.48 (see 2, j and l, Table 1). It is important to reemphasize here, however, that these scores are perceptions of change undertaken since the early 1980s. This is one area in the survey where a significant block of chairpersons (approximately 15%) reported high levels of activity before the onset of the reform movement of the 1980s.

There were 151 responses to the open-ended parts of these four questions--50, 38, 34, and 29 respectively. Analysis of these answers yields a number of interesting patterns. Efforts to involve practitioners in program development had begun or been expanded in the majority of these 74 schools. Advisory councils were the involvement strategy of choice. Twenty-one chairpersons reported that they were using practitioner advisory councils as new programs were developed. Practitioner participation in program delivery had also increased over the last decade. That is, superintendents and principals had picked up additional instructional responsibilities in university-based training programs.

Changes in faculty participation in schools were even less extensive than changes in practitioner involvement in program development and delivery. It was also much more amorphous. Department heads believed that their faculties were out working in the schools. They also perceived that pressure to do so was increasing. Yet their descriptions of what their colleagues were doing were not very specific. Few threads cut through the answers they provided. The only thing approaching a pattern was the belief listed by 5 heads that this increased school level work had been spurred on by the need to handle the growing clinical component of training programs discussed earlier. The provision of professional development services to practitioners was also limited. However, the activities and programs that were offered were increasingly taking place in conjunction with various centers and institutes housed at or connected to departments of educational leadership.

Discussion. Two lines of work set the context for discussing changes in university-school relationships. There are the descriptions of the status quo in this area, such as the one presented earlier by Carver, which conclude that there is a serious "university-field gap" (Goldhammer, 1983, p. 265) in the profession of educational administration (Murphy, 1990c). There are also a number of thoughtful strategies that have been proffered to address the problem. For example, the NCEEA (1987, p. 10) argues that one of the solutions is to have "public schools share responsibility with universities and professional organizations for the preparation of administrators." The NPBEA is even more specific in its recommendation "that long term formal relationships be established between universities and school districts to create partnership sites for clinical study, field residency, and applied research." The members of this group also outline a "vision of a unified responsibility for the preparation of school leaders" (1989, p. 22).

The efforts described in the results section above lead us to conclude that many of these 74 programs, and the academic arm of the profession as a whole, are becoming increasingly sensitive to the need for tighter connections between the university and field components of educational leadership. The extensive use of practitioner advisory councils to help develop, shape, and modify university-based training programs is a good indicator of this awareness, as is the enhanced use of principals and superintendents in the delivery of program content.

As useful as these activities are, however, they appear somewhat anemic when judged against the standards of "partnership" and "unified responsibility for preparation." To begin with, we saw little evidence of equality in the university-school relationships described by department chairs. Advice was sought and feedback was solicited from practitioners, but the locus of decision making remained in the academic departments. By and large, attempts to address the university-field gap were designed to repair the current delivery system. Departments' efforts were formulated to do a better job of using strategies already in place, to use them more frequently or more effectively. Thus, there was emphasis on approaches such as seeking more advice from the field, employing additional adjunct faculty, and

spending longer amounts of time in schools. We saw only a few tentative efforts to fundamentally transform or restructure the relationship between the two arms of the profession. For example, a couple of the Danforth project schools were moving closer to the idea of partnership. Another program had moved to create "clinical professorships." Not surprisingly, given the focus on tightening the existing threads that tie together university training programs and schools, there were few systemic efforts to strengthen bonds. Coherent and integrated packages of strategies to address the problem of school-university relations were markedly absent.

The data on faculty involvement in schools and services to practitioners are troubling in a number of respects. We have already outlined the major problem: department leaders believed that many of their colleagues were working closely with public school personnel but seemed unable or unwilling to provide rich descriptions of exactly what they were engaged in when they were there.[13] We do know that whatever they were doing, they appeared to be doing it alone. Only three respondents noted a departmental focus that helped direct the collective energy of faculties as they worked in schools. In contrast, as noted above, services for practicing administrators provided at the university tended to have a more cohesive focus. We also know that, with the exception of one respondent, there is no indication that faculty involvement in school-based research activities--applied or otherwise--has increased in response to recent reform pressures. Finally, again with one exception, there were no references to efforts to "exchange professional and [school] administrative assignments," as suggested in the NCEEA and NPBEA reports (NPBEA, 1989, p. 22).

Departmental Structure and Operations

Results. Five questions were designed to assess the responsiveness of department structures and operations to reform pressures of the 1980s. In general, department heads reported that their programs had undergone only slight to moderate alterations in this area. Degree structure (see 2g, Table 1) was perceived to have changed the least (1.75) and department mission (see 2p, Table 1) the most (2.74). Changes in faculty development opportunities (2.14), departmental staffing (2.44), and selection

of faculty (2.52) fell between these two outliers (see 20, n and m, Table 1). In two of these five areas--selection of faculty and faculty development opportunities--there were important differences between UCEA and non-UCEA schools (see Appendix for discussion).

Review of the 25 open-ended responses provides only limited information about the nature of the changes in degree structures in these preparation programs. Theme analysis yields three weak patterns that may be worth tracking over the next decade: (1) additional emphasis on advanced degree programs; (2) enhanced program requirements; and (3) greater stress on the traditional differences between Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees.

In the area of staff selection,[14] the 34 respondents conveyed only one theme--an increased sensitivity to hiring faculty with a practitioner orientation. Although expressed in a variety of ways, credibility with the field, previous administrative experience, and scholarly concern for issues of practice have become increasingly important to these leaders over the last decade. Significant differences between UCEA and non-UCEA schools in the area of staff selection are detailed in the Appendix.

Patterns were particularly difficult to isolate in the 28 answers provided under the topic of professional development. For each program that reported new budgetary constraints on professional growth opportunities, another department revealed the presence of additional resources. It may be worth highlighting, however, that the enhanced funding for at least half the schools that received additional professional development monies came from outside the regular budgetary process, e.g., money from an alumni fund, external grants, income generating outreach programs. Although professional development continues to be defined largely in terms of funds to support faculty travel to conferences, a few program chairs described augmentation of non-traditional growth opportunities over the last decade, such as exchanging personnel between school districts and university preparation programs, working on group projects with peers, and acting as evaluators in assessment centers.

As discussed earlier, heads revealed a moderate amount of change in department missions in response to reform efforts (2.74). The only pattern to the written information provided in response to this question is that about one-fifth of the programs are poised on the threshold or in the early stages of reassessing their operations and procedures as a prelude to developing updated departmental agendas. There was also a slight trend for revised mission statements to reflect increased attention to issues of practice, to make the training of practitioners the central activity of departments. Other revisions were idiosyncratic to the needs and interests of individual training programs. There was little evidence of tension between incompatible aims across the sample, however.

Discussion. The analysis about departmental structure and operations raises as many questions as it answers. We know that almost all the variation between UCEA programs and non-UCEA programs are found in the five areas treated in this section. We also have evidence that one theme--increased sensitivity to the world of educational practice--cuts across changes in departmental operations and is congruent with findings reported earlier. Finally, we can conclude that the weak patterns within the various categories--emphasis on advanced coursework, issues of practice, stiffer requirements, non-traditional forms of professional development, and separation of practitioner and research degrees--are generally consistent with the directions laid out by the NCEEA (1987) and the NPBEA (1989).

Conclusion

> *I am thoroughly and completely convinced that unless a radical reform movement gets underway--and is successful--most of us in this room will live to see the end of educational administration as a profession.* (Griffiths, 1988, p. 1)

The overall picture presented above is one of slight to moderate change in departments of educational administration in response to the reform movement of the 1980s. Reasons for this relatively limited level of activity are not difficult to ascertain. To begin with, the entire reform movement itself is less than a decade old.

Although predated by a number of important critical reviews (Achilles, 1984; Nunnery, 1982; Peterson & Finn, 1985), the reform movement's direct connection to school administration dat s from the late 1980s. Given these short time frames, some may be surprised that departments have undertaken as much as they have. Changes in areas like degree structure, staff composition, and mix of students are nearly impossible to alter in the short term. Numerous other areas examined--such as program content and student assessment procedures--lend themselves somewhat more readily to changes, although over a longer time frame than the one used in this study.

Change unfolds slowly in almost all organizations and seems to occur with even less celerity in universities. The collegial decision making process employed in academic settings is designed for comprehensiveness, not speed. The prevailing culture of the university, with professors cloaked in the roles of detachment and critical analysis, may also cause changes to happen there more slowly than they would elsewhere. Finally, it is important to remember that some of the planks of the reform movement of the 1980s threaten the traditional autonomy enjoyed by departments of school leadership (Murphy, 1989). Professors in preparation programs may respond with a lack of ardor to proposals which they perceive as enhancing state bureaucracies and enriching the practice arm of the profession at their expense.

The absence of significant change chronicled throughout this report may be due less to resistance to improvement than to apprehension over constructing revisions based on the reform movement of the 1980s. Like the major critics of the so-called wave 1 reforms (see Murphy, 1990a, for a review), a few of the respondents in this study believed that much of the early reform agenda was wrongheaded and counterproductive. As one department head cautioned, "be careful not to equate the lack of incorporation of reform 'elements' into educational administration with unresponsiveness or stability. Many aspects of the current waves of reform are vague and ill-conceived; hence they are not worthy of inclusion in a program." Others found the fabric of reform woven by the NCEEA and the NPBEA to be equally

flawed--"we believe the UCEA recommendations are self-serving and 'way off-base' as to what is needed."

The moderate level of program revisions reported herein may also be attributable to the absence of a motive for change, which in turn may take two forms. First, important changes in the areas investigated in this report may have predated the reform movement of the 1980s, thus making additional revisions unnecessary. Indeed, a few of the respondents revealed areas where this was the case. Second, it may be that descriptions of the rotting infrastructure of preparation programs in the various reform reports and critical reviews are drawn too starkly, that conditions are better than critics would have us believe--or at least that a substantial number of professors believe this to be the case. McCarthy and her colleagues (1988) provide ample support for the latter proposition. They conclude that "professors are complacent about problems in the academic field of educational administration and about the quality of preparation programs" (p. 170).

Finally, it is important to underscore the fact that all of the results contained in the study are self-reports from department chairs. We have no data to check these reports. It is possible that the scores reported may in fact be slightly inflated, tempering the slight to moderate changes that were reported by these leaders.

In conclusion, it is worth restating the obvious: the picture we developed is mixed. Departments of educational administration have begun to respond to the pressures for change that have accompanied, and sometimes fueled, the reform movement of the 1980s. In addition, for better or worse, discernable patterns in these revisions are generally consistent with the implicit demands for improvement that lace the critical reviews of the field and with the more explicit recommendations contained in the NPBEA and NCEEA reform reports. Yet, overall, the response has been moderate (at best) in intensity and mixed in focus. How one assesses these findings depends a good deal on one's view of the world. Among such reviewers as Griffiths (1988) and Beare (1989), who see very dark clouds on the educational administration horizon, there will be a good deal of consternation. They are likely to view the responses to date as rather anemic. Clearly the findings do not represent a radical

reformation of the academic arm of the educational administration profession. Those who believe that a more incremental approach to improvement is needed as well as those who argue that we have traveled about as far as possible in such a short time will be more sanguine about the conclusions.

Appendix

Although this study was not undertaken to compare differential effects of the reform movement on UCEA and non-UCEA schools, during the course of analyzing the data it became clear that there were a few important differences that might be of interest to the reader. To be sure, there is considerably more similarity than variation between UCEA and non-UCEA schools in this study. Yet, as can be seen in Table 2, there are three statistically significant differences (2b, 2m, and 2n). Analysis of the open-ended components of these questions allows us to unpack this diversity. We present these findings below.

TABLE 2

Effects of the Reform Movement of the 1980s on Departments of Educational Leadership in UCEA Schools and non-UCEA Schools--Chairpersons' Perceptions[a]

Areas	non-UCEA schools n	M	SD	UCEA schools n	M	SD	t-test
1 overall effect	28	3.07	1.1	45	3.18	1.0	.415
2a recruitment of students	27	2.18	1.3	45	2.51	1.2	1.081
2b selection of students	27	1.89	1.3	45	2.62	1.2	2.368*
2c monitoring/assessing progress	29	2.58	1.3	44	2.54	1.0	.150
2d clinical experiences	31	3.23	1.3	45	3.00	1.3	.720
2e content of the program	30	3.13	1.2	46	3.26	1.2	.453
2f teaching and teaching strategies	29	2.59	1.2	45	2.51	1.1	.273
2g degree structure	30	1.70	1.0	45	2.11	1.4	1.368
2h involvement of practitioners in development	30	3.00	1.3	45	2.96	1.1	.157
2i involvement of practitioners in delivery	29	2.76	1.2	44	2.46	1.2	1.070
2j involvement of faculty in schools	27	2.48	1.3	46	2.57	1.1	.297

Areas	non-UCEA schools n	M	SD	UCEA schools n	M	SD	t-test
2k mix of students	29	2.14	1.3	43	2.16	1.1	.086
2l services for practicing administrators	28	2.54	1.3	45	2.44	1.3	.302
2m selection of faculty	28	2.14	1.4	45	2.76	1.4	1.841**
2n department staffing	28	1.93	1.2	41	2.12	1.2	.651
2o faculty development opportunities	29	2.45	1.4	44	1.96	1.1	1.697**
2p departmental mission/ agenda	28	2.71	1.3	45	2.82	1.2	.357
3 perceived effects on school administrators	28	3.11	1.4	45	3.02	1.2	.272

[a]1 = very little, 3 = somewhat, 5 = a great deal

*p < .05

The first area where we uncover meaningful differences is in the recruitment and selection of students (see Table 2, 2a and 2b). To begin with, we can see that the reform efforts of the 1980s have had more effect on the recruitment of students in UCEA programs. Qualitative analysis of respondents' answers reveals that heads in UCEA schools were more likely than their counterparts in non-UCEA schools to equate enhanced selectivity with establishing new or raising existing entrance requirements. While 27% of the UCEA program heads outlined efforts to raise entrance standards, only 11% of non-UCEA chairs did so. Administrators at UCEA schools also reported devoting more energy to attracting women and minority candidates for their programs than did their non-UCEA peers. Only 3% of non-UCEA schools noted a focus on recruiting minorities; 7% reported increased efforts

to attract women. In contrast, 18% of the UCEA schools outlined new initiatives in the area of minority recruitment, while another 4% discussed continuing the efforts that they had begun in the 1970s. Another 9% detailed attempts to expand the recruitment of both women and minorities. All told, 31% of the UCEA schools as compared to 10% of the non-UCEA schools reported efforts to attract more women and minorities to their programs.

Program chairs in UCEA programs also detailed more activity in the area of faculty selection than did their peers in non-UCEA schools (see Table 2, 2m). More importantly, noteworthy differences emerged from their written responses. Administrators in non-UCEA schools more often related that they were unable to hire new faculty in the 1980s. When they did fill vacancies, they underscored the importance of a background in the practice of school administration more than their counterparts in UCEA programs--some of whom emphasized a practitioner focus while an equal number stressed a preference for research-focused faculty. Finally, department heads in UCEA universities expressed greater sensitivity to issues of recruiting and hiring women and minority faculty members.

Professional development opportunities represent the final area of variation between UCEA and non-UCEA programs, with heads from the latter group outlining more change in response to recent reform efforts than their colleagues in UCEA institutions. Although non-UCEA chairs note that there has been more change in professional development opportunities for their faculty members, there are no discernable differences by type of program in the kinds of professional growth opportunities emphasized.

Notes

[1]I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the 74 department chairs who invested the time and energy necessary to make this study possible. I am also grateful to Dr. Linda C. Holste of the department of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics, Vanderbilt University, who assisted with the analysis of the data.

[2]Our treatments of this literature base can be found in Murphy (1990a, 1990b, 1990c), Murphy and Hallinger (1987), and Hallinger and Murphy (in press).

[3]I am grateful to Patrick Forsyth, Executive Director of UCEA, and Philip Hallinger, formerly Director of the Westchester (NY) Principals Center, for their assistance.

[4]This is the most comprehensive listing of educational administration preparation programs available.

[5]There were 3 statistically significant differences between the responses of UCEA and non-UCEA schools--questions 2b, m, and o. See Table 2 for an analysis of these differences.

[6]Completely new programs to address the need for minority administrators have been established at two of the schools. The University of Tennessee at Knoxville created the Black Principals' Preparation Fellowship Fund. Long Island University developed a program entitled "Educational Leadership in Multicultural Settings." This latter effort, which is designed to help prepare school administrators to work in diverse population centers, recently enrolled its first fellowship class of 20 students--15 Hispanic, 4 African-American, and 1 Caucasian.

[7]The influence of the Danforth Foundation is evident here. Two of the schools in question are receiving Danforth grants to improve their programs. Commitment to cooperative university-district recruitment is a requirement for receiving this funding.

[8]Ten of the same topic areas in question 2 were also included in our earlier study. In addition, questions 1 and 3 were identical. Response comparisons in these areas are recorded below.

	Summer 1988 Group (15)		Fall 1989 Group (74)	
	Mean Score	Rank	Mean Score	Rank
overall effect	2.6		3.1	
recruitment	2.1	6	2.4	8
selection	2.1	6	2.3	9
monitoring	2.2	5	2.6	4
clinical experiences	2.4	3	3.0	2
content	2.7	2	3.2	1
teaching	1.8	9	2.6	5
degree structure	1.5	10	1.8	10
services for practitioners	3.1	1	2.5	7
selection of faculty	2.0	8	2.5	6
mission	2.3	4	2.4	3
effects on practitioners	3.1		3.1	

[9]One of the surprising findings in this area was the virtual absence of references to the use of assessment center techniques in selecting students. Given the growing popularity of this method of screening job candidates and the fairly widespread attention assessment centers have received at the university level--including the development of a UCEA program center on this topic--we expected to uncover more than the single reference found in the responses.

[10]There is an important distinction between being oriented to issues of practice and being practice-driven. The work of Bridges (1989, 1990) is especially informative on this topic.

[11]For discussions of the principles of adult learning related to instruction in educational administration programs see Levine, Barth, and Haskins (1987) and Pitner (1987).

[12]This movement toward performance based appraisal is consistent with restructuring of student assessment systems in elementary and secondary schools; see Murphy (1990g), for a review.

[13]McCarthy and her colleagues' (1988) extensive examination of the professoriate in educational administration also fails to shed much light on this issue.

[14]Analysis of the question on department staffing (2N) revealed little of interest and therefore it is excluded from the discussion.

References

Achilles, C. M. (1984). A proposal for excellence in educational administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Orono, ME.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, DC: Author.

Baltzell, D. C., & Dentler, R. A. (1983, January). Selecting American school principals: A sourcebook for educators. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education/National Institute of Education.

Beare, H. (1989, September). Educational administration in the 1990s. Paper presented at the national conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia.

Bradley, A. (1990, 14 February). States, colleges heeding call to improve administrators' training. Education Week, 9(21), 1, 12-13.

Bridges, E. M. (1989, October). Combining theory research and practice: Problem-based learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Scottsdale, AZ.

Bridges, E. (1990, 23 January). Problem-based learning in management education. Paper presented at the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Leadership: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College of Education, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Leadership, Nashville.

Carver, F. D. (1988, June). The evaluation of the study of educational administration. Paper presented at the EAAA Allerton House Conference, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Chubb, J. E. (1988, Winter). Why the current wave of school reform will fail. The Public Interest, (90), 28-49.

Clark, D. L. (1988, June). Charge to the study group of the National Policy Broad for Educational Administration. Unpublished paper.

Elmore, R. F. (1989, March). Models of restructured schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Erlandson, D. A. (1979, Fall). Language, experience, and administrator preparation. Planning and Changing, 10(3), 150-156.

Erlandson, D. A., & Witters-Churchill, L. (1988, March). Design of the Texas NASSP study. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Firestone, W. A. (1990). Continuity and incrementalism after all: State responses to the excellence movement. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Gerritz, W., Koppich, J., & Guthrie, J. (1984, November). Preparing California school leaders: An analysis of supply, demand, and training. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Educators, University of California, Berkeley.

Goldhammer, K. (1983, Summer). Education in the profession. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 249-272.

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

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration. (Occasional paper: #8312).

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (in press). Developing leaders for tomorrow's schools. Phi Delta Kappan.

Hawley, W. D. (1988). Universities and improvement of school management. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Holmes Group (1986, April). Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Levine, S. L., Barth, R. S., & Haskins, K. W. (1987). The Harvard principals' center: School leaders as adult learners. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lilley, H. E. (1988). Educational administration directory, 7th ed. Morgantown: College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University.

Lotto, L. S. (1990). Thinking and theorizing about organizations and educational administration. In L. S. Lotto and P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Recent advances in educational administration, Vol. IB. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G., Newell, L., & Iacona, C. (1988). Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Miklos, E. (in press). Administrator preparation in education (first draft). Encyclopedia of Educational Research.

Murphy, J. (1989). Effects of educational reform on programs of school administration in Illinois. Administrator's notebook, 33(3), 1-4.

Murphy, J. (1990a). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A Comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1990b). Preparing school administrators for the twenty-first century: The reform agenda. In B. Mitchell & L. L. Cunningham (Eds.), Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. (1990c). The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspectives and cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1990d). School administration responds to pressures for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspectives and Cases. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1990e). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Recent advances in educational administration, Vol. IB. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J. (1990f). Restructuring the technical core of preparation programs in educational administration. UCEA Review, 31( ), .

Murphy, J. (1990g). Restructured schools: Focus on teaching and learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

Murphy, J., & Evertson, C. (in press). Restructuring schools: Capturing and Assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Emerging view of the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis with suggestions for improvement. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.) Approaches to Administrative Training. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, M. J., & Hart, A. W. (1988, October). Preparing principals to lead in restructured schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati.

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

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

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989). Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform. Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Newmann, F. M. (1988, January). Can depth replace coverage in the high school curriculum? Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 345-348.

Nunnery, M. Y. (1982). Reform of K-12 educational administrator preparation: Some basic questions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15(2), 42-52.

Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985, Spring). Principals, superintendents and the administrator's art. The Public Interest, 79, 42-62.

Pitner, N. J. (1987). Principles of quality staff development: Lessons for administrative training. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to Administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rossmiller, R. A. (1986, Winter). Some contemporary trends and their implications for the preparation of educational administrators. UCEA Review, 27(1), 2-3.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Slater, R. (1988, March). How does leadership affect teaching and learning? The School Administrator, 45(3), 13-15, 20.