Staff Development: Creating a Community of Learners

Staff Development: Creating a Community of Learners

NORMAN D. NORRIS
Nicholls State University

ABSTRACT: One of the most crucial roles of the school leader is to develop and maintain the professional level of the staff which he/she supervises. It is generally agreed upon that the desired school culture is one in which the focus is on the development of a community of learners. Consequently, intellectual growth can never happen for children unless it first happens for adults. It is of great concern to many practitioners that staff development experiences for educators are not of the serious, intellectual caliber as other professions. This article presents the findings of a formal study of practitioners' perspectives on staff development efforts and the relation to professional improvement. Additionally, the article discusses elements that make for quality staff development and those elements that hinder the intellectual growth of adults.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to bring awareness to teacher educators and educational leaders of the phenomenon of staff development in schools and how frequently the mission of staff development is misunderstood, misinterpreted or generally misguided. Following closely to this phenomenon, however, is concern among educational leaders surrounding the question of school culture, the impact on adults and ultimately the impact on student achievement and instructional outcomes. There is a body of literature offering suggestions for effective models of staff development and addressing the idea of the desired school culture. Unfortunately, this body of literature is somewhat limited in its usefulness for making policy decisions. First, the literature addressing the merging of the two ideas is often focused on the desired look of staff development programs and not the problems that impede the contribution of staff development in the creation of a community of learners. Second, the literature has yet to clearly establish a causal link between modes of staff development, improved school culture and all that is influenced by such.

Most accepted models of human resources processes join the ideas of process, development, utilization, and retention ultimately create both the school culture and the school climate. School culture is loosely defined as the collective sets of shared beliefs that underlie the operation of the school. On balance, the school climate is thought of as the collective personality of the school, the prevailing atmosphere and a reflection of interpersonal relations and friendships (Webb & Norton, 1999). Obviously, one cannot stand alone with no impact from the other. Both must be encouraged to grow in a positive direction. It is my position that the desired school culture

supports a community of learners. As such, for a community of learners to develop, real intellectual growth must happen for the adults before it will happen for children.

Staff Development vs. Continuing Education

Any profession requiring licensure demands some routine continuing education. Professions such as medicine, law, accounting or psychology require the licensee to seek out opportunities for professional growth on their own and such efforts are typically reported in "continuing education units" (CEU). The nature of the work in schools disallows educators, particularly teachers, the same autonomy in choices for professional development. Teaching is a profession of the masses (Lebaree, 1997) and as such, the school systems must necessarily design staff development that will not disrupt the workday yet provide services and choices to as many as possible for as little cost as possible. Unfortunately, several factors disallow educators the same choices as other professions in the design and delivery of staff development:

- In schools, the receivers of services are children. The educator cannot simply "close down shop" for the day. When children are present, there absolutely must be an adult present.

- The responsibility falls on the schools and school systems to provide the required professional development, continuing education. Naturally there is pressure to produce professional development that is not only meaningful but visibly produces results.

- School money is a precious commodity, so educational leaders understandably seek out generic modes of staff development that cover many bases for the least cost.

This makes sense in managerial and administrative discussion, but in practice seldom works as designed. It is fair to say that most professionals would not tolerate what is presented to and expected of educators in fulfilling professional development requirements (Norris, 2002). Later in this paper we will look a bit further at what is typically presented in schools under the guise of staff development and how such impacts the school culture.

Review of Related Literature

There is a body of literature addressing quality staff development experiences that spans three decades. Of recent report, Birman, Desimoine, Porter, and Garet (2000) support the idea that quality staff development is the critical link between standards-based reform and increased student achievement. The staff development model advocated by these researchers embodies several elements: focus, duration, participation, content focus, active learning, and coherence. These elements address many of the problem areas that have been identified in this study including a need to focus on some areas of academic content and the continuity of the efforts. Of particular note is the element of "active learning". It is a widely accepted tenet among educators that "active" learning is inherently superior to "passive, receptive" learning. For adults as well as children, the idea of active learning should not be confused with movement and/ or physical activity. Active refers to "meaningfully engaged" and not simply "physical movement" (Hirsch, 1996). Intellectual involvement in which thought and criticism are evoked can by no means be considered "passive."

Dufour and Berkey (1995) suggest a ten-part model that resembles a continuum encompassing shared visions/ expectations at one end and a need for consistency, follow through at the other. Their underlying idea in this model is that "people, not programs, bring about desired change." Change can come about only when professionals are appropriately empowered to do so.

Lankard (1995) discusses a three level model of adult learning: Action Learning, Situated Learning, and Incidental Learning. Action Learning is manifest in the active involvement in problem resolution, primarily in group settings whereby individuals are supported in the resolution of real-life problems. Situated Learning is focused less to real life application but instead "knowledge and skills are taught in contexts that reflect how knowledge will be used in real-life situations." Incidental Learning involves less reflection or specific instruction but tends to come about from experience, errors or simply "figuring things out." The writers position is that all three levels of adult learning contribute to effective organizational dynamics in the workplace, though not necessarily or specifically in a school setting.

Abal-Haqq (1996) discusses what is likely the most common complaint among both practitioners and educational leaders surrounding the question of staff development – the adequate allowance for realistic and productive time to complete staff development work. The writer argues that as the demands placed on the schools and teachers has become increasingly more complex, school systems have been quite remiss in not allowing adequate time for training in the new demands. Also of note is the reference to the general perception of what constitutes the work of a teacher. He states:

Perhaps the most formidable challenge to institutionalizing effective professional development time may be the prevailing school culture, which generally considers a teacher's proper place during school hours to be in front of a class, which isolates teachers from one another and discourages collaborative work (p. 6).

Weathersby and Harkreader (1999) completed a study in Georgia where the styles and formats of staff development were compared in high and low achieving schools. The researchers compiled the data via interviews and focus groups and found significant differences in the quality and style of staff development experiences in the better and poorer performing schools.

It is often discussed that effective staff development programs involve those who must implement changes. The literature seldom discusses what can easily become the "down side" of delegating such efforts and decisions to practitioners. Farber and Ascher (1991) caution educational leaders in making hasty decisions regarding delegating decisions to staff who are already overworked. Site-based initiatives must have the built in time element to provide realistic efforts toward the end. If staff are made responsible for certain decisions and then not allowed the time and space to complete the work, then the problem of staff input is compounded, not alleviated because the additional duties become "one more thing to do."

In short, the majority of the literature can be summed up in two parts. When the element of time is addressed, two major factors continue to surface:

1. Activities that focus on an area of academic content are known to be more effective than others.
2. Staff development experiences that are focused on the intellectual involvement of adults tend to be more effective than others.

Measuring Practitioner Perspectives

Research Question/ Hypothesis

The phenomenon investigated in this study was the perspective of the practitioner on staff development as it relates to creating a learning culture in the work environment. Therefore, the study examined four hypotheses: (a) the number of practitioners who report that current modes of staff development bring about positive change in both teacher perception(s) and teacher behavior(s) will not be significant at the .001 level of confidence; (b) the number of practitioners who report that current modes of staff development are not well-planned, intellectual exercises supported by a body of empirical evidence will not be significant at the .001 level of confidence; (c) the number of practitioners who report that current modes of staff development involve adult-focused activities which stimulate academic and scholarly interest(s) will not be significant at the .001 level of confidence; and (d) the number of practitioners who report their belief that current modes of staff development minimizes and/or trivializes the complexities of the science of teaching and learning will not be significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Design of the Study

Since the design of this study was the self-reporting of professional beliefs and ideologies, this report was prepared using a survey design. The survey format addressed four very broad questions, all of which would be known to significantly influence the practitioners perspective and the overall effectiveness of staff development experiences. The general questions addressed were:

1. Do staff development experiences bring about positive change in both teacher perception(s) and teaching behavior(s)?
2. Are staff development experiences well planned, intellectual exercises which are supported by a body of quantitative evidence?
3. Do staff development experiences involve adult focused activities which stimulate academic and scholarly interests?
4. Do staff development experiences minimize and/or trivialize the complexities of the science of teaching and learning?

Sample

The sample chosen for this study came from seven schools that were conveniently within the powerbase of the researcher. The sample included classroom teachers, counselors and various content specialists (i.e. physical education, expressive arts, vocal and instrumental music, special education). The instructional level(s) of the sample included Pre-K through 12th grade. The demographics of the schools varied from urban to suburban to rural (three inner city elementary, one rural elementary, two sub-urban middle schools, one inner magnet city high school). While

the researcher had access to school performance data at each school, he was not particularly familiar with the staff or the general atmosphere of the schools. Each school and faculty was chosen on their availability to distribute the survey forms, collect objective data and were willing to participate in the study.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in the study was a survey instrument designed and created by the researcher. The instrument was divided into four broad categories addressing various aspects of staff development. Each broad category was supported by questions surrounding the topic. The instrument was set up with a Lykert-type scale of "agree", "neutral" or "disagree." Each response was weighted equally.
In order to be able to demonstrate a realistic chi-square analysis and reject the null hypothesis if necessary, each category of questions was designed so that the desired responses would fall at one end of the scale or another. The desired directions were altered so as to be less conspicuous or distracting to those completing the survey. Most participants were able to complete the survey in five to ten minutes.

Method

Two hundred-fifty (250) questionnaires (35-36 at each campus) were delivered with instructions to distribute randomly, complete anonymously and return. Of the 117 returned (47%), 104 (42%) were usable in the study. Those not used were discarded for various reasons including incomplete information or not having completed the form in the manner prescribed.

The responses for all 104 usable surveys were tallied. An average was found for each response as well as an average for each category (hypotheses a, b, c, and d). The percentages and responses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Responses to Survey Questions				
Attribute **A. In my experience, staff development efforts...**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Total(s)**
...challenge me to think reflectively...	33/32%	18/17%	53/51%	104/100%
...encourage positive change in my change...	29/ 28%	49/ 47%	26/25%	104/100%
...are well-planned, vision-oriented & focused on long term results...	19/18%	26/25%	59/57%	104/100%
...are focused on permanent change...	21/20%	17/16%	66/64%	104/100%
...encourage long-term change in my teaching behavior...	29/28%	14/13%	61/59%	104/100%
TOTAL/AVERAGE RESPONSES	131/25%	124/24%	265/51%	520/100%
B. In my experience, staff development efforts...				
...are practices, procedures & methods that have been adequately field tested prior to large-scale implementations...	9/8%	32/31%	63/61%	104/100%
...usually provide adequate follow-up and support following initial implementation...	21/20%	16/15%	67/65%	104/100%
...usually fully (not partially implement a program, practice or procedure...	34/33%	7/6%	63/61%	104/100%
...usually go beyond a surface application of the activities behind a practice, procedure or program...	8/7%	39/38%	57/55%	104/100%
...usually focus on the entire philosophy behind a practice, procedure or program rather than an emphasis on one small component of a program...	9/8%	29/28%	66/64%	104/100%
TOTAL/AVERAGE RESPONSES	81/15%	123/24%	316/61%	520/100%

C. Typically, staff development efforts ask or require teachers to engage in the following...				
...role-playing as a child...	66/64%	7/6%	31/30%	104/100%
...classroom activities demonstrated far more times than necessary or practical...	62/60%	21/20%	21/20%	104/100%
...classroom activities that are juvenile rather than adult...	55/53%	30/29%	19/18%	104/100%
...activities bordering on silly behavior...	38/37%	27/26%	39/37%	104/100%
...classroom activities that have no use or value beyond tomorrow...	39/37%	34/33%	31/30%	104/100%
...creating silly or juvenile projects...	41/39%	29/28%	34/32%	104/100%
...creating charts/lists of desirable characteristics for any number of things...	47/45%	42/41%	15/14%	104/100%
TOTAL/AVERAGE RESPONSES	81/15%	123/24%	316/61%	520/100%

Following the tabulation of categorical averages, a chi-square was found for each of the four categories. The chi-square statistical measure was chosen because of the nature of the data to be compared. The chi-square findings are reported in Table 2. Their significance will be discussed in the next section.

Table 2. Chi Square Calculations				
Questionnaire Section	**Chi Square**	**Degrees of Freedom**	**P Value**	**Significant**
A. Do staff development experiences bring about positive change in both teacher perception(s) & teaching behavior(s)	56.89	8	Less than or equal to 0.001	Yes
B. Are staff development experiences well-planned, intellectual exercises which are supported by a body of quantitative evidence?	59.53	8	Less than or equal to 0.001	Yes
C. Do staff development experiences involve adult focused activities which stimulate academic and scholarly interests?	59.58	12	Less than or equal to 0.001	Yes
D. Do staff development experiences minimize and/or trivialize the complexities of the science of teaching and learning?	73.91	10	Less than or equal to 0.001	Yes

Results

The chi-square analysis of each category indicated the observed (reported) responses to be highly significant. The consistently low p-values indicate a very low probability of the responses falling by chance.

The data surrounding hypothesis (a) generated a chi-square of 56.89 with 8 degrees of freedom. A chi-square of 20.09 would have been sufficient to consider these findings significant at the .001 level of confidence. A p-value of "less than or equal to 0.001" easily supports the notion that these findings did not come about by chance. The null hypothesis (a) is rejected.

The data surrounding hypothesis (b) generated a chi-square of 59.53 with 8 degrees of freedom. Again, a chi-square finding of 20.09 would have been sufficient to consider these findings significant at the .001 level of confidence. A p-value of "less than or equal to 0.001" easily supports the notion that these findings did not come about by chance. The null hypothesis (b) is rejected.

The data surrounding hypothesis (c) generated a chi-square of 59.58 with 12 degrees of freedom. A chi-square finding of 26.22 would have been sufficient to consider these findings significant at the .001 level of confidence. A p-value of "less than or equal to 0.001" easily supports the notion that these findings did not come about by chance. The null hypothesis c is rejected.

The data surrounding hypothesis (d) generated a chi-square of 73.91 with 10 degrees of freedom. A chi-square finding of 23.21 would have been sufficient to consider these findings significant at the .001 level of confidence. A p-value of "less than or equal of 0.001" easily supports the notion that these findings did not come about by chance. The null hypothesis is rejected.

It is well known and accepted that chi-square findings are limited in many ways, particularly in relation to extremes in both sample size and observed frequencies. However, the sample in this study is not extreme in size or frequency of responses. The chi-square findings of all four hypotheses easily fit the definition of substantively (practically) significant as well as statistically (numerically) significant.

Of interesting note is the wide discrepancy between the chi- square findings of null hypothesis (d) and the other three null hypotheses. The questions surrounding hypotheses (a), (b), and (c) all deal with the practitioners recall of their own staff development experiences. However, the questions surrounding hypothesis (d) cause the practitioner to reflect on various beliefs that would certainly influence the school culture. If we were to generalize these findings to other populations, it would certainly be fair to assert that the findings of this study support the notion that practitioners believe that current modes of staff development generally do not support a community of learners.

Analysis and Implications of Findings

In every category surveyed a significant percentage of respondents indicated from their experience that many inefficiencies and discrepancies exist in the design, delivery and implementation of staff development programs for teachers. The findings of the study indicate symptoms of many other problems that fall on educational leaders. Obviously, staff development choices can be influenced as much by politics as the needs of a particular student population.

First, it is a common concern that many educational leaders and policy makers are simply not knowledgeable of research processes and procedures (Norris, 2002). We are seeing an abundance of programs emerge that make the claim of being "based in research." There are varying definitions of "researched", none of which are necessarily incorrect. Educational leaders need not be skilled researchers but must be knowledgeable of research methods, processes and procedures in order to make informed decisions. At one extreme researched can mean that a phenomenon has been observed, documented, and described in extreme detail. Conversely, researched can mean that the phenomenon has been systematically tested under controlled conditions. Descriptive research is useful in making some types of decisions, but it is generally accepted among scholars of research that only when the phenomenon has been systematically compared can one assert that it was the phenomenon that brought about change and not other mitigating factors. To say that a program is "Research-Based" can be quite misleading because the terminology can mean anything you want it to mean (R. Slavin, personal communication, Feb, 1999). For example, research-based can mean that a program is based upon a survey of expert opinions yet have never been observed in practice or systematically tested in any regard (Grossen, 1998). Research based doesn't mean inherently inferior but can lend a false degree of credibility to an idea. Problems ensue when poor quality, misleading or weak research is used as the basis for making policy decisions.

Many educational leaders assume that because the word research is attached to an idea, program or practice that a degree of quality or applicability is implied. Many such programs claim to be research-based which can mean any number of things, including that a program or procedure has been written about descriptively with no experimentation or scientific testing to support the claims. Grossen (1998) warns to be aware or reading literature with citations supporting an idea, program or procedure as such citations may be of a person's opinion, not any methodical testing of the idea. Further compounding the research question is the type and quality of information that becomes part of the professional knowledge base. In most research areas, a theory is assumed to be only an idea that must be tested and re-tested in order to find similar results. When there is an adequate body of information on the theory it then becomes part of the accepted knowledge base. Unfortunately, in the field of teaching and learning, widely accepted information has gone from theory to knowledge base with no formal testing of any sort (Slavin, 1987). Obviously, this makes for bad information. Ornstein & Hunkins (1993) state:

A theory is a generalizable construct supported by language or quantitative data. Nonetheless, theory must be modified from paper to practice, from the abstract to the concrete world, from complex concepts to lay terms. When we move theory to practice, we include many people (and resources) to make it work. Theory must fit with people (not mold people to theory) to move it away from an idea to action (p. 28).

Quality staff development is both expensive and time consuming. School systems are under such financial restraints that any funds available for staff development must go as far as possible. It is certainly understandable that educational leaders responsible for the design of staff development must consider programs and efforts that are both affordable and most universally applicable. Unfortunately, in the field of teaching it is often perceived that a little bit of poorly done staff development is better than none. Since there are seldom any formal gauges or guidelines, other than an occasional post-survey, almost anything can go.

The business of education is notorious for establishing movements – mostly out of a need to address the most pressing issues and problems in the most comprehensive manner. The most current movement is that of standards and accountability. While there is much dissent on what constitutes quality in these areas, the fact still remains that under the intense public pressure to fix things quickly, educational leaders are desperately seeking programs and procedures that will create an immediately visible difference in schools, presumably for the better. The pressure to be visible manifests itself in the choice of staff development experiences for teachers. As such, any visible difference, however temporary, is welcomed.

It would make sense that the increased push for high-stakes testing has had a profound influence on the choices and quality of staff development. Most practitioners have probably at some point seen or experienced some type of staff development that was clearly aimed at the influence of test scores. When program quality is being judged by one test score alone, it is certainly understandable that educational administrators will choose to use staff development time in any effort that might even remotely influence test scores (translated - improve).

It is generally accepted that teaching is a profession that can hardly be considered elite or selective, but instead is a profession of the masses (Lebaree, 1997). Teaching is not a profession in which the receivers of services have the autonomy of those private sector service providers simply because the receivers of services are usually children. Unlike other professions, the nature and structure of schools makes it impossible for professionals to "shut down practice" and individually seek out opportunities for staff development. Understanding this need, many school systems are creatively building into their annual calendars days set aside for staff development. While such efforts are welcomed as a step in the right direction, until teachers have the same autonomy on those days as would other professionals, the current dilemma will not change greatly.

Typical Staff Development

If we make some comparisons between the staff development of teachers and comparably educated professionals in the private sector, we find some serious discrepancies. Other professions can expect staff development to occur away from the work setting as a variation to the workday. From a purely realistic perspective, teachers can expect staff development to occur after work hours and held in some location like the school cafeteria or library where neither the space nor the furniture is designed for adults. Often there are bells sounding, announcements blaring, telephones ringing, and mop buckets being rolled around during meetings. After teaching all day, such environments can hardly be considered conducive to learning, professional reflection and preparing to improve performance upon returning to work. Staff development presented in this manner tends to be viewed not as an opportunity for growth but as "one more thing to have to do." School culture is negatively influenced as such efforts are practically always met with resentment. Staff development meetings away from the school site via release time, adult sized furniture, but most importantly, adult time with other adults are generally not part of the professional development experience of teachers. Many school systems do plan for staff development by delegating a specific number of days into a teacher's contract (usually three – five days) or creatively reworking schedules. But the professional differences in staff development efforts go much further than the question of time and place.

Many staff development efforts focus on aspects other than the intellectual stimulation of the teacher so that he or she gains perspective and can therefore be empowered to make decisions. Likewise, too many staff development efforts are a reaction to a crisis or impending problem rather than a planned, vision oriented effort with certain results in mind. It is all too common to visit a school during a staff development day and see teachers being asked to sit in circles, draw charts, create lists or role play as children. Staff development days are too often spent engaged in activities that look more like children's theater than professionals seriously involved in adult efforts. There seems to be a prevailing mindset that cute and enjoyable constitutes quality. Challenging adults to think and reflect on their work and its improvement certainly produces desired change in the long term, but schools are under intense public pressure to make their improvement efforts starkly visible and change to be seen immediately. As such, many staff development efforts focus on a tiny piece of a bigger idea that can be seen in the classroom the following day with little regard for what happens the day after. When teaching graduate classes in School Administration and these discussions ensue, I often cite my own "can of paint theory." Staff development efforts are often similar to a can of paint in that when it is returned to the

classroom is very easily put on the walls. There is an immediate and very visible difference that everyone can see and admire. Unfortunately, the new look is short lived as the wall will be touched, kicked, and bumped with furniture. In time, the new color will no longer be fashionable. Most importantly, the new wall color does absolutely nothing to address the problems in the design and construction of the wall. In short, there is an immediate difference but no real change.

Intellectual Development

The desired purpose of a program of staff development is to bring about intellectual growth and ultimately create a school culture that supports a community of learners. Therefore, staff development efforts must challenge people to think, reflect, and refocus their efforts and do so in a positive manner. There is a rich body of literature addressing good and bad modes of staff development that goes back a number of years (Fullan & Steigelbauer, 1991; Little, 1989). Those attributes that contribute to effective staff development are well documented. The body of literature, however, seldom addresses how well-intended staff development efforts are often not a good use of professional time and do not intellectually challenge the teacher, all of which negatively influence the school culture. Most people have at least one good horror story of a wasted workshop day with a shallow topic, silly activities, and a non-educator presenter who, with probably honorable intentions, minimized and, or, dismissed the work of teachers. It is only through creating an awareness of this problem, phenomenon that change will ever come about.

Conclusion

The findings of this study support several points relative to the design, delivery and implementation of effective staff development for teachers. First, these findings indicate that practitioners do not perceive the typical staff development experience as bringing about positive change in either teacher perceptions or teaching behaviors. I am reminded of the old adage, "You can have change without improvement, but you cannot improvement without change." Those who make staff development decisions must always consider the element of change.

Second, these findings support the notion that practitioners generally do not believe staff development experiences are well-planned, intellectual exercises which are supported empirically, or with a reputable body of professional literature. Certainly, practitioners and policy makers should not fall victim to the mindset that only empirical data is useful.

Third, these findings lend credence to the idea that the typical teacher staff development experience is not focused on activities that stimulate the academic and scholarly interests of adults. Those making such decisions should consider adult sensibilities.

Finally, these findings support the frequently discussed notion that staff development for teachers tends to marginalize the significance of the work done by educators. Teaching and learning are complex but imperfect processes which cannot be reduced to checklists.

But despite areas in which problems do exist, it is refreshing to see educational leaders abandoning the one-size fits all mindset of teacher staff development. With more and more frequency we are seeing staff development requirements delegated to individual teachers, or

more often teams of teachers so that plans can be developed that meet the professional needs of the adults and the academic needs of the children. Likewise, we are seeing educational leaders and staff development professionals become far more creative and adventuresome in their efforts. For example, the concept of study groups has been generally well-received and quite effective because the topic and focus can vary relative to the needs of the group. Another alternative to the one-size problem is what is currently being termed "Action Research." Action research very much parallels the problem solving style of research that is currently being advocated by many programs of graduate study in the social sciences and business. A faculty is able to collect objective data about specific problems in the particular school setting, analyze the weak points, design a solution to the problem, and then implement the solution (Calhoun, 1994). Unlike traditional quantitative research that generates more data and information, action research, problem solving research contributes to the existing body of knowledge as it brings about change.

Finally educational leaders and policy makers should exercise caution when confronted with the trap of immediacy. Intellectual growth takes time. It is a naive and terribly flawed idea that one or two days of study alone will become the catalyst of change for the next twenty years. Staff development plans that are hurriedly slapped into place are far less likely to succeed.

Creating a Community of Learners

Staff development efforts that lead to the development of a cohesive group of educated adults who are lifelong learners will never come about as a result of workshops, checklists, or program implementation. This comes about by developing the attitude of a scholar who is equipped with the intellectual tools and the perspectives to make valid decisions. Educational leaders and practitioners must become literate consumers of the existing research and literature relative to our profession. I state quite often in classes and lectures that teaching and learning are not exact sciences that begin with a uniform raw product. As such teaching and learning will never be practices that can be approached logically, worked out systematically and come out with no loose ends or unexplained phenomenon. A school culture that supports lifelong learning will only grow from nurturing intellect and scholarship.

References

Abal-Haqq, I. (1996). Making time for teacher professional development. ERIC Digest No. ED 400259.

Barman, B.F., Disimone, L., Porter, A.C., & Gareth, M.S. (2000). Designing professional development that works. Educational Leadership, May, 2000, 28-33.

Calhoun, E.F. (1994). How to use action research in the self-renewing school. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

DuFour, R., & Berkey, T. (1995). The principal as staff developer. Journal of Staff Development, 16(4). Available: http://www.nsdc.org/library/jsd/jsddufour.html

Farber, B., & Ascher, C. (1991). Urban school restructuring and teacher burnout. (ERIC Digest No. ED340812)

Fullan, M.G., & Steigalbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Grossen, B. (1998). What does it mean to be a research-based profession? Available: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~bgrossen/resprt.htm

Hirsch, E.D. (1996). The schools we need and why we don't have them. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Lankard, B.A. (1995). New ways of learning in the workplace. (ERIC Digest No. 161. ERIC No. ED385778)

Lebaree, D. (1997) How to succeed in college without really learning: The credentials race in American education. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Little, J.W. (1989). District policy changes and teacher's professional development opportunities. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11(2), 165-179.

Norris, N.D. (2002) Perspectives on the mistreatment of American educators: Throwing water on a drowning man. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Ornstein, A.C., & Hunkins, F. (1993). Curriculum: Foundations, principals, and theory. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
Slavin, R.E. (1987). The PET and the pendulum. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(10), 752-758.

Weathersby, J., & Harkreader, S. (1999). Staff development and student achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, April 19-23, 1999). (ERIC No. ED430918)

Webb, L.D., & Norton, M.S. (1999). Human resources administration. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Author’s Address:

Nicholls State University
Thibodaux, LA 70310
USA
EMAIL: normdal@aol.com