Central Washington University
ScholarWorks@CWU

1969

Performance Criteria for the Elementary School Principal in Developing Curriculum to be used in a "Cooperative" Team Teaching Approach to Instruction

Allan Lee Holmquist
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd

Part of the Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

IN DEVELOPING CURRICULUM TO BE USED IN

A "COOPERATIVE" TEAM TEACHING APPROACH TO INSTRUCTION

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Allan Lee Holmquist

August, 1969

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Lloyd M. Gabriel

_____

Donald G. Goetschius

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER   PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. Heretofore the role of
the elementary school principal in developing curriculum
for use in a "cooperative" team teaching approach has been
stated in generalizations. This study (1) surveyed twenty-
four elementary principals from Western Washington who were
using the "cooperative" team teaching approach in their
schools, and, (2) endeavored to determine if the perform-
ance criteria for the elementary principal in developing
curriculum, as established in Haney's study (6:15-21),
expressed the actual role played by these principals in
developing curriculum used in the "cooperative" team in
their schools.

Purpose of the study. This study proposes to see
what percent of the principals surveyed, by means of a ques-
tionnaire, agree or disagree that they fulfilled the stated
roles for developing curriculum for use in a "cooperative"
team teaching approach to instruction in their schools.
This study also proposes to test the following null
hypothesis: There is no significant difference between
the responses made on each role by principals in an

urban or suburban school setting.

Significance or importance of the study. In a
rapidly changing world, the curriculum of the schools
cannot stand still (6:1); and in the twenty-four princi-
pals surveyed in this study, a commitment to curriculum
change for use in a "cooperative" team teaching approach
was made in their schools. However, the importance for
this study is not so much the change, but the role the
principal played in initiating, planning, implementing,
and evaluating the change. It also is important, for no
one in the school system is in a more opportune position
for exerting leadership in curriculum development than the
principal, to establish performance criteria. Such
criteria, stated behaviorally so that they can be observed
and measured, will give principals something by which they
can measure their success in curriculum development.

Limitations of the study. This study was limited to
schools in Western Washington who were using the "coop-
ative" team teaching approach as identified by Dr. William
G. Gaskell, Professor of Education, Central Washington State
College, Ellensburg, through personal contact and a survey
of the state in the Spring of 1967, (see Appendix C for a
copy of this survey instrument). In an attempt to reach
schools in Western Washington who have started a "cooper-

ative" team approach since the Gaskell survey, the
principals being surveyed were asked to list other
elementary principals in their district who they knew
were also using a "cooperative" team approach. On the
questionnaire, the principals were asked to approximate
the extent to which they agree or disagree (SA; A; U;
D; SD; see Appendix B for meaning of symbols) that the
behaviorally stated performance criteria were actually
performed by them when they developed curriculum for use
in the "cooperative" team approach in their schools. Thus
the principal's perception of each role, which the
researcher tried to equalize for all principals by stating
the criteria behaviorally, and his honesty to answer accord-
ing to his actual performance in developing curriculum for
use in a "cooperative" team approach may have been limit-
ing factors. Also, any bias that Haney (6:15-21) may
have had in establishing the performance criteria being
tested in this study may have been a limiting factor.

Procedures of the study. The procedures of the
study include: (1) Development of the questionnaire;
(2) Description of the Research Sample and Administra-
tion of the questionnaire; and (3) Methods of analyzing
the data from the returned questionnaires.

Development of the questionnaire. In a

study done by Harry H. Haney Jr. (6:15-21), performance
criteria for the elementary principal in curriculum
development were proposed. The questionnaire for this
study was composed of the criteria proposed by Haney with
each item being rated (SA - Strongly Agree; A - Agree;
U - Undecided; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree) by
each principal in relation to his or her actual role in
developing curriculum presently being used in a "cooper-
ative" team approach in his or her school. Background
information on the school and the principal was also
included in the questionnaire. A copy of the question-
naire used in this study can be found in Appendix B.

Description of the research sample and
administration of the questionnaire. The study composed
twenty-four elementary schools in Western Washington who
are using the "cooperative" team teaching approach as
identified by Dr. William G. Gaskell, Professor of Educa-
tion, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, through
personal contact and via a survey of the state in the Spring
of 1967, (See Appendix C). Of the schools selected for
the study, as determined through Dr. Gaskell's surveys
and personal contact, the principal received a packet
containing a letter of introduction and his portion of
the questionnaire (which was my portion of the study,
see Appendix B) and a packet for him to distribute to

each teacher in the "cooperative" team approach in his
school that he had worked closest with in developing
curriculum. (This portion of the study was done by Norm
Standley, Graduate Assistant, Hebeler Elementary School).
An envelope was enclosed for each teacher and the princi-
pal to place his portion of the study, when completed, and
a self addressed and stamped envelope was enclosed for the
return of all questionnaires. The questionnaires were
mailed out on February 1, 1969, and the cutoff date for
returns was May 1, 1969. Incidentally, no questionnaires
were returned after this date.

Methods of analyzing the data from the
returned questionnaires. The data was analized as
follows: (1) In both the Information About Your School
and the Background Information sections the data are
expressed in terms of the range on each item and the
computed mean for each item, for the total sample and
for principals in urban and suburban school settings;
(2) on the questionnaire itself, each role was stated
with the number and percentage of the sample responding
in each of the five possible categories: SA - Strongly
Agree; A - Agree; U - Undecided; D - Disagree; and
SD - Strongly Disagree. Also the total of the SA
and A responses for each role and the D plus SD responses

for each role plus the Undecided category being split
evenly between the agreement and disagreement categories
when an even number, and when odd, the odd one being
added to the disagreement category; (3) in each of the
four sections on the roles for the Curriculum Develop-
ment portion of the questionnaire: I. Initiation of
Curriculum Development; II. Planning and Procedural Stages
of Curriculum Development; III. Implementation of Curric-
ulum Development; and IV. Evaluation of Curriculum; each
respondent was asked to indicate the role he or she felt
was the most important and the least important. This data
was viewed by ranking the items according to number of
responses on each role for the total sample and the urban
versus suburban responses on each role; and (4) this
study will also test the following null hypothesis:
using the Yates Correction for Chi Square as a statistical
measure (3:150-1): There is no significant difference
between the responses made on each role by principals in
an urban or suburban school setting.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

"Cooperative" team teaching - Involves two or more
teachers at the same time with the same or different grade
levels who join together in an "equal partnership" rela-
tionship (13:Appendix B), each teaching most or all of

the areas of the curriculum (1:94) to a group totaling
approximately thirty students or less per every full time
teacher in the team (7:218). The formalized leadership
is essentially parliamentary, and usually rotates so that
each member may take his turn in chairing meetings and
representing the group (1:85).

Curriculum - "All the educational experiences a
student had under the guidance of the school" (6:2).

Curriculum Development - "The procedures for develop-
ing a curriculum for a particular school or school system.
This procedure involves choosing general and specific
aims of the program, selection of curricular materials,
and decisions regarding the methods of instruction. Pro-
visions are made for continuous study, evaluation, and
improvement of the existing program" (6:2).

Evaluation - "A systematic process of determining
to what extent the education program or individual is
achieving the desired outcomes" (6:2).

Implementation - "As used herein, this term refers
to the procedure involved in enacting into the school
program adopted curriculum changes" (6:2).

Initiation Stage of Curriculum Development - "The
initial stage of curriculum development; the pre-planning
period. Characteristic of this period is the discussion
of educational problems and the search for provision of

better means of educating children" (6:3).

Performance Criteria _ "Criteria so stated that desired behavior is easily recognizable" (6:3).

Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development - "This period occurs after the initiation stage. It begins with the planning and ends with the official adoption of curriculum change" (6:3).

Principal - "The administrative head and professional leader of a school division or unit" (6:3).

Supervision - "The positive efforts of designated personnel to improve the learning situation through the growth of all persons involved" (6:3).

Western Washington - shall include the following school districts: Auburn, Bellevue, Bethel, Bremerton, Central Kitsap, Coupeville, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Highline, Issaquah, Kent, Lake Washington, Marysville, Mukilteo, Northshore, Renton, Seattle, Shoreline, Sumner, Tacoma, Tahoma.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"One of the most interesting and potentially signif-
icant developments in American education was the meteoric
rise during the late 1950's of an organizational structure
known as team teaching" (1:71). To trace its recent and
past history is almost impossible for cooperative endeavor
is by no means new to the experience of teachers, in fact
we can trace all the essential characteristics of modern
team organization to practices and events of this century
and the last (1:71).

I. MAJOR EARLY CONTRIBUTORS TO THE COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR

Pueblo Plan. Introduced in 1880 by Preston W.
Search in Pueblo, Colorado, it eliminated the concept of
nonpromotion, emphasized individual work and individual
progress, and called for the use of assistant teachers
(1:76).

Batavia Plan. In 1898, John Kennedy, superintendent
of the schools of Batavia, New York, suggested that two
teachers be assigned to the same classroom, one to handle
group recitations and the other to work with individual
pupils, to help cope with overcrowded classes (1:76).

John Dewey's Laboratory School. John Dewey and his

associates, from 1896-1903, operated the Laboratory
School of the University of Chicago, where Dewey argued
for team teaching and against the self-contained class-
room. Dewey used the phrase "cooperative social organi-
zation", and it was his intention that intellectual asso-
ciation and exchange should be a major factor in the lives
of pupils and teachers alike (1:77).

"Cooperative Group Plan". In the early 1930's,
James F. Hosic organized what he called the "Cooperative
Group Plan". "Its main feature was the organization of
the teaching staff into small cooperative groups of three
to six teachers, one of whom served as chairman" (1:79).

II. MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE FIRST SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE
OF LITERATURE IN THE FIELD OF COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR

The Trump Plan. J. Lloyd Trump, in 1956, as Director
on the Commission on the Experimental Study of the Utili-
zation of the Staff in the Secondary School, did a nation-
wide search for ideas and research designs on such criti-
cal problems as curriculum development, teaching methods,
space arrangements, and staff utilization, and surveyed
more than one hundred secondary schools throughout the
country using team teaching (1:73).

The Norwalk Plan. Developed by Superintendent
Harry Becker in Norwalk, Connecticut, in 1961; it defined

"cooperative team teaching" as that which involves two
or more teachers at the same time or different grade
levels who join together in an "equal partnership" rela-
tionship to provide for the instruction of the classes of
both teachers (13:Appendix B). It also went on to define
the Team Leader-Principal roles. The team leader accepts
responsibility for the day-to-day administration of his
team and shares responsibility with the principal for:
"the total program of the school; the supervision of the
team members; the development of the instructional pro-
gram; the professional growth of teachers; and interpret-
ing the program to parents and the community" (13:25).

The reviewer has briefly surveyed some of the major
contributors to "cooperative" team teaching; but what
about the principal's role in relation to the "cooperative"
team approach and specifically the role he plays in devel-
oping curriculum for use in this approach?

III. LITERATURE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

If the schools are to adequately meet the needs of
children; the curriculum must be under constant evaluation
and must be revised when needed (6:6).

The curriculum of the schools is affected by many
factors, such as: individual differences, the popula-
tion explosion, the knowledge explosion, the emerging

technology and research on how children learn, (12:236),
and the educationally disadvantaged child (1:5).

It is the responsibility of educators to recognize
the need for curriculum change and to take the lead in
shaping it, which they have failed to do in the past (4:3).

IV. LITERATURE ON THE PRINCIPALS'S ROLE
IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Harry H. Haney Jr., in his study, discussed the prin-
cipal's role in the following areas of curriculum develop-
ment: beginning with initiation, proceeding through plan-
ning and procedures, to implementation, and ending with
evaluation, which leads back into initiation (6:8).

Initiating curriculum development. The role of the
principal in the initiation stage of curriculum develop-
ment cannot be overemphasized, for without his cooperation
and leadership, no curriculum program can be effective (9:63).
A key task for the principal in all phases of curriculum
development, but especially in the initial stage of curric-
ulum development, is being actively engaged in creating
and maintaining an environment where on-going communication
between himself and his staff takes place, so that such
things as educational priorities for the development of the
staff and the program can be established and met (1:125).

Planning and procedures of curriculum development.

Adequate planning is essential before any program or proposal can be implemented, and if success is the hoped for outcome of implementing any proposal or program, then the faculty, especially those directly involved with the implementation of the program, should be involved in the overall planning (14:83).

Adequate planning should include time for research of the literature on the proposal, visiting other schools to view similar programs, and then the organizing, writing, and continuing appraisal of the plans that are to be implemented by the group (11:28).

It is also generally agreed, by those involved in team teaching, that the planning for a team teaching program and the implementation of the program, must fit you, the team, and your situation to be successful. A school that you may have visited that had a successful program, was successful with a particular group of teachers in that particular situation; and thus, their total program may not fit your situation at all, although parts of their program may fit your situation.

The principal has the responsibility of insuring that the adoption of any curriculum change is based on study, research, and evaluation (15:6). He also has the responsibility of providing stimulation, motivation, and coordination to help the group achieve its goals (15:6). He

may accomplish this by becoming familiar with the potentialities and characteristics of the group; by perceiving problems that face the teachers and determining the groups capability to solve them (14:18); and by acting as a resource person (11:27).

Implementation of curriculum change. The principal has the responsibility of: (1) recognizing and assisting staff who may be threatened by curriculum changes (6:13); (2) hiring staff which will facilitate the program (8:44), or allowing the staff, especially in a team teaching approach, as is being done at Shadow Lake Elementary School, Tahoma School District, Maple Valley, Washington, to interview and hire the person the team feels will facilitate the program and will be able to integrate into the team as a replacement or an addition; (3) "facilitating the implementation of curriculum by informing the community of new curriculum developments, as well as old" (6:13), which may be accomplished by weekly newsletters, and or such programs as: Back to School Night; Progress Night; Fathers' Morning; Mothers' Morning; and study groups (10:84).

Evaluation. "During any continuous curriculum development program, the philosophy of the school district and the individual school must be examined. If possible, these philosophies should be interpreted into measurable objectives. After deciding upon basic objectives, present

and future curriculum should be examined to determine if these goals are being worked toward. This involves evaluation of the school program.

In other phases of curriculum development, participation of staff was emphasized. Evaluation is no exception. The principal should strive to stimulate an atmosphere of continuous evaluation by all concerned" (6:14).

V. TWO STUDIES IN RELATION TO THE PRINCIPAL'S
ROLE IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

In searching the literature, the reviewer found only two works that stated the principal's role in curriculum development in terms of performance criteria; however, both studies had proposed performance criteria and neither study had been tested. It should be noted that the reviewer requested information on the principal's role in curriculum development stated in terms of performance criteria from Dr. William Gephart, chairman of SRIS, School Research Institute Service, and received the following acceptable resource: A study (5:3-4) that concerns the general role of the principal in initiating, stimulating, supporting, and evaluating the team teaching program (See Appendix A). And another study, (6:15-21) refers to the role of the principal in initiating, planning, implementing, and evaluating curriculum development. The reviewer prepared a question-

naire from the performance criteria established in the study just mentioned (6:15-21) for use in this study. (See Appendix B).

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A questionnaire on the roles of the elementary school principal in developing curriculum for use in a team teaching approach was used for this study. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

From Table I can be seen the name of the school districts surveyed in Western Washington; that 21 school districts were surveyed of which 16 or 76 percent participated; the number of schools surveyed in each district and the total number of schools surveyed, 68; the number of schools that replied, 31 or 46 percent, and of those, the number that were acceptable, 24 or 35 percent. Of the 7 that were not acceptable, 5 principals stated that their teams would not be starting until next year and returned the questionnaires blank, and 2 principals attempted to fill out the questionnaire, but neither was principal when the team was initially formed, therefore their questionnaires were disregarded in tabulating the data.

Table II lists the range and the computed mean of the responses for the total sample; schools in an urban setting; and schools in a suburban setting, on information about the schools being surveyed.

TABLE I

THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SURVEYED
IN EACH DISTRICT IN WESTERN WASHINGTON
AND THE NUMBER OF RETURNED AND ACCEPTABLE QUESTIONNAIRES
FROM EACH DISTRICT

Name of the school district	Number of schools surveyed	Number of schools replying	Number of acceptable replies
Auburn	1	1	0
Bellevue	9	1	1
Bethel	1	1	1
Bremerton	2	1	1
Central Kitsap	1	0	0
Coupeville	1	1	1
Enumclaw	1	1	1
Federal Way	4	1	1
Highline	6	3	2
Issaquah	4	0	0
Kent	5	3	2
Lake Washington	3	2	2

TABLE I (continued)

Name of the school district	Number of schools surveyed	Number of schools replying	Number of acceptable replies
Marysville	5	2	0
Mukilteo	1	0	0
Northshore	1	1	1
Renton	2	0	0
Seattle	6	5	3
Shoreline	6	1	1
Sumner	1	0	0
Tacoma	7	6	6
Tahoma	1	1	1
Totals 21	68	31 (46%)	24 (35%)

TABLE II

INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCHOOLS SURVEYED
ANALYZING (1) THE TOTAL SAMPLE - 24; (2) THE SCHOOLS IN AN URBAN
SETTING - 11; AND (3) THE SCHOOLS IN A SUBURBAN SETTING - 13,
IN REGARD TO THE RANGE OF THE RESPONSES
AND THE COMPUTED MEANS FOR THE RESPONSES

Statements	N	Total Sample Range	Mean	N	Urban Sample Range	Mean	N	Suburban Sample Range	Mean
Elementary schools in the district	24	2-86	30.37	11	12-86	49.81	13	2-35	13.92
Total pupil enrollment of your school	23	220-980	531.3	11	220-980	590.54	12	300-675	477
Number of teacher aides in your school	24	0-18	3.20	11	0-18	4.54	13	0-6	2.07
*Number of aides in the team being surveyed	23	0-2	0.69	10	0-2	0.70	13	0-2	0.69

*Note: Of the total range, 7 principals used no aides, 7 principals used part-time aides, and 9 principals used full time aides. Of the urban range, 3 principals used no aides, 4 principals used part-time aides, and 3 principals used full time aides. Of the suburban range, 4 principals used no aides, 3 principals used part-time aides, and 6 principals used full time aides.

On the statement regarding the number of elementary schools in the district, the smallest school district, 2 elementary schools, was in a suburban school setting and the largest school district, 86 elementary schools, was in an urban school setting. The mean number of schools was slightly over three and one half times as large when comparing schools in an urban setting (mean = 49.81) with schools in a suburban setting (mean = 13.92).

When viewing the total pupil enrollment of the schools surveyed, both the smallest (220) and the largest (980) elementary schools were found in an urban setting. The mean of the urban schools was 590.54 while the mean of the suburban schools was 477.

It is interesting to note that for approximately every 2 (mean = 2.07) teacher aides in a suburban school setting, there are four and one half aides (mean = 4.54) in an urban school setting. However, when comparing the number of aides assigned to the team being surveyed on a full or part-time basis, the most noticeable difference is that 3 schools used full-time aides in an urban setting while 6 schools used full-time aides in a suburban setting; the part-time aides were 4 urban to 3 suburban and 3 urban schools reported using no aides, while 4 suburban schools reported using no aides. The range for the number of aides assigned to the team being surveyed is identical, (0-2), for

both urban and suburban school settings with the means
differing by .01; urban - 0.70, suburban - 0.69.

Table III lists background information of the prin-
cipals being surveyed in both urban and suburban school
settings and for the total sample, viewing this information
in terms of yes and no responses.

When asked whether volunteer help was used - the
response was identical for both urban and suburban, 3 yes
and 8 no with 2 suburban principals not responding.

Of the 10 urban principals and 8 suburban principals
that responded to the question - Do you have an intern? - 3
urban principals replied yes, and 2 suburban principals
replied yes.

When asked whether they had an assistant principal, of
the 10 urban replies, 2 said yes, and of the 12 suburban
replies, none replied yes.

Table IV lists background information of the princi-
pals being surveyed in both urban and suburban school
settings and for the total sample, viewing this information
in terms of the range of responses and the computed mean
of these responses and also viewing some questions in
relation to principals comments.

The mean age for the total sample was 43 years
4 months while the urban sample was slightly higher, 46
years and 9 months and the suburban mean slightly lower,

TABLE III

INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCHOOLS SURVEYED
ANALYZING (1) THE TOTAL SAMPLE - 24; (2) THE SCHOOLS IN AN URBAN
SETTING - 11; AND (3) THE SCHOOLS IN A SUBURBAN SETTING - 13,
IN REGARD TO THE RANGE OF THE RESPONSES
AND THE COMPUTED MEANS FOR THE RESPONSES

Statements	Total Sample			Urban Sample			Suburban Sample		
	N	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N	Yes	No
Use of volunteer help	22	6	16	11	3	8	11	3	8
Intern	18	5	13	10	3	7	8	2	6
Assistant principal	22	2	20	10	2	8	12	0	12

TABLE IV

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRINCIPALS BEING SURVEYED

Statements	N	Total Sample Range	Mean	N	Urban Sample Range	Mean	N	Suburban Sample Range	Mean
Age	24	32-60	43yrs. 4mos.	11	34-60	46yrs. 9mos.	13	32-52	40yrs. 6mos.
*Sex									
**Quarter hours beyond the Master's Degree	21	0-70	23.86	11	4-70	28.72	10	0-30	18.5
Years as an educator	24	7-33	17yrs. 8mos.	11	15-33	20yrs. 8mos.	13	7-19	15yrs. 2mos.
Years as a teacher	24	2-23	9yrs. 6mos.	11	5-23	11yrs. 7mos.	13	2-14	7yrs. 2mos.
Years as a principal	24	1-25	8yrs. 5mos.	11	1-25	9yrs. 9mos.	13	1-15	7yrs. 10mos.

*Note: See text page 26.

**Note: 1 suburban principal is a candidate for an Ed.D. Degree; 1 suburban principal has an Ed.D. Degree; and 1 suburban principal is a candidate for a M.Ed. Degree.

TABLE IV (continued)

Statements	N	Total Sample Range	Mean	N	Urban Sample Range	Mean	N	Suburban Sample Range	Mean
Years in present school district	24	1-22	12yrs. 1mo.	11	6-22	16yrs. 2mos.	13	1-17	8yrs. 7mos.
Years as a teacher in present school district	24	0-16	5yrs. 3mos.	11	3-16	7yrs. 9mos.	13	0-9	2yrs. 7mos.
Years as a principal in present school district	24	1-22	7yrs. 1mo.	11	1-22	8yrs. 11mos.	13	1-14	5yrs. 9mos.
*Percent of time the principal spent in teaching responsibilities for the entire school and in the team surveyed									

*Note: See text page 30 for explanation

TABLE IV (continued)

Statements	N	Total Sample Range	Sample Mean	N	Urban Sample Range	Sample Mean	N	Suburban Sample Range	Sample Mean
Years in present position	24	1-16	3yrs. 6mos.	11	1-16	5yrs. 4mos.	13	1-6	2yrs.
Number of years the team surveyed has functioned	24	1-3	1yr. 5mos.	11	1-3	1yr. 9mos.	13	1-2	1yr. 4mos.
*Changes (personnel, procedures, curriculum, etc.) that have been made in the team from its initial form to its present form									
*The initial relationship of the principal to the team (advisor, resource person, active participant, etc.)									

*Note: See text pages 31-33 for explanation

TABLE IV (continued)

Statements	N	Total Sample Range	Mean	N	Urban Sample Range	Mean	N	Suburban Sample Range	Mean
*Changes that have been made between the initial relation- ship of the principal with the team and his present relation- ship with the team									

*Note: See text pages 33-34 for explanation

40 years and 6 months. The youngest principal (32 years old) was from a suburban school setting while the oldest principal (60 years old) was from an urban school setting.

In the total sample there were 22 men and 2 women; of which 9 men and 2 women were in schools in an urban setting and 13 men and women were in schools in a suburban setting. All except 1, a woman in an urban school setting, were the principals when the team was formed, she being an assistant principal.

All 11 of the principals in the urban sample hold the Master's Degree with a range of 4-70 quarter hours beyond this degree and a mean of 28.72 quarter hours beyond this degree. Of the 13 principals in a suburban school setting, 10 hold the Master's Degree with a range of 0-30 quarter hours beyond this degree and a mean of 18.5 quarter hours beyond this degree. Of the 3 remaining suburban principals, 1 is a candidate for his Master's Degree; 1 is a candidate for his Ed.D. Degree and 1 has his Ed.D. Degree. When viewing the total number of years as an educator, a teacher, and a principal, those in an urban setting have been educators, teachers, and principals, longer than those in suburban settings. The most years as an educator is an urban principal with 33 years and the least number of years as an educator is a suburban principal with 7 years experience. Urban educators have a mean of 20 years and 8 months,

as compared with suburban educators 15 years and 2 months.

The principal with the least amount of teaching experience, 2 years, is from a suburban school setting, and the principal with the most teaching experience, 23 years, is from an urban setting. The means run from urban - 11 years and 7 months to suburban - 7 years and 2 months. There are first year principals in both urban and suburban settings, however, the greatest number of years as a principal (25) belongs to an urban principal. The means are 9 years and 9 months - urban, and 7 years and 10 months - suburban.

When viewing the number of years as an educator, a teacher, and a principal, in their present school district, the suburban range for years in the present school district is 1-17 with a mean of 8 years and 7 months, as compared with the urban range of 6-22 with a mean of 16 years and 2 months. As a teacher, the suburban range is from 0-9 with a mean of 2 years and 7 months, while the urban range is 3-16 with 7 years and 9 months as the mean. For the number of years as a principal, the suburban range is 1-14 with a mean of 5 years and 9 months, while the urban range is 1-22 with a mean of 8 years and 11 months.

When viewing either the total years as an educator, teacher, and principal and also the same 3 categories in the individual respondents present district, in all cases,

the urban principals show more experience in terms of
years when comparing means.

Each principal was also asked what percent of time
he spent in teaching responsibilities for the entire school
and what percent in the team being surveyed. It was found
that in an urban setting, 7 principals spent from 2 percent
to 10 percent of their time in teaching responsibilities
for the entire school; with 3 principals having no teach-
ing responsibilities; and with 1 response being discarded
because of an inaccurate response (greater percent of time
in the team than in the entire school). It also was found
that 5 principals in an urban setting spent from 1 percent
to 10 percent of their time in teaching responsibilities
in the team being surveyed, with 5 principals spending no
time and 1 principal answering inaccurately, (a greater
percent of time was spent in the team than in the entire
school). In a suburban setting, 3 principals stated that
they spend from 10 percent to 40 percent of their time in
teaching responsibilities for the entire school and 5 per-
cent of their time in the team being surveyed. Two prin-
cipals gave an inaccurate response, more time spent in
teaching responsibilities in the team being surveyed than
in the entire school, and 8 principals had no teaching
responsibilities.

Another factor, the number of years in his present

position, shows the urban range to be 1-16 years, with a mean of 5 years and 4 months and the suburban range to be 1-6 years, with a mean of 2 years.

The teams surveyed have been functioning in an urban setting between 1 to 3 years, with a mean of 1 year and 9 months and in a suburban setting from 1 to 2 years with a mean of 1 year and 4 months, which shows that all teams in this survey have been functioning 3 years or less.

Another question asked for changes that have been made in the team from its initial form to its present form, in the following areas: personnel, procedures, curriculum, etc.

Principals from an urban setting responded in regard to personnel changes as follows: 6 principals reported no change; 5 teachers left for the following reasons: 1 got married, 1 transferred, 1 became an administrator, and 2 gave no reason; all of the above 5 teachers who left were replaced plus 1 team added an additional teacher; and 1 principal did not respond to this question.

Principals in a suburban school setting responded as follows in regard to personnel changes: 4 principals reported no change; 1 teacher left due to pregnancy; 1 team added 2 teachers; 1 team was increased in size from 60-90 students and from 2-3 teachers; 1 team added a male teacher; and 5 principals did not respond to this question.

Urban principals reported the following procedural changes: three reported no change; 1 reported - "many changes;" and 7 did not respond to this question.

Suburban principals reported the following procedural changes: 2 reported no change; 4 reported - "many changes;" and 7 did not respond to this question.

Principals in an urban setting reported the following curriculum changes: 1 reported curriculum changes as staff defines needs; 1 reported changing to a 40 level math. program; 1 reported changing the reading program; 1 response stated - "many changes;" and 7 principals did not respond to this question.

Principals in a suburban setting reported the following curriculum changes: 2 reported no change; 1 reported changing from 1 subject to 3 subjects; 2 reported - "many changes;" and 8 principals did not respond to this question.

Miscellaneous changes were reported as follows: urban setting - 3 principals reported no change; 1 reported discussing regrouping teams to a K-2, 3-4, 5-6 combination; 1 reported self evaluation; 1 replied 1 change but did not specify; and 5 principals did not respond to this item. Suburban setting - 2 principals reported no change; 1 reported many changes; 1 reported moving into a new building; and 9 principals did not respond to this item.

Another question asked for the principal to describe his initial relationship to the team (advisor, resource person, active participant, etc.).

Responses from principals in an urban setting - 2 checked all 4 categories; 2 checked advisor and resource person; 2 checked advisor and active participant; 1 checked advisor, resource person, and active participant; 2 checked advisor; 1 checked active participant; and 1 checked resource person. Thus a total of 8 urban principals checked advisor; 6 checked resource person; 6 checked active participant; and 2 checked etc.

In the suburban school setting: 2 principals checked all 4 categories; 1 checked advisor and resource person; 2 checked advisor and active participant; 4 checked advisor; 1 checked resource person; 1 checked resource person and active participant; and 1 principal did not respond to this item. Thus a total of 10 principals responded advisor; 6 resource person; 6 active participant; and 2 etc. It is interesting to note that the rank order and number of responses in each of the 4 categories just discussed, is almost identical for principals in an urban and suburban school setting.

When asking what changes have been made between the principal's initial relationship with the team and their present relationships with the team, principals from an

urban school setting responded as follows: 1 stated that
a closer relationship and mutual understanding between him-
self and the team now exists and that the team members are
freer to discuss changes and suggest them; 1 stated greater
participation; 1 stated that the team is assuming greater
responsibility for the program, and that he is consulted
and a team member; 1 stated some changes; 1 stated emphasis
on programmed instruction for lower students; 5 stated that
there were no changes; and 1 principal did not respond.

Principals from a suburban school setting responded
as follows: 1 stated growing enthusiasm; 1 stated advisor
and participant; 1 stated that he devotes less time because
he is now an administrative assistant to the superintend-
ent; 1 stated that he is both a help and a hindrance with
personnel problems in the team; 1 stated that he is a less
active participant as team members assume more leadership;
1 stated supervision and tour guide; 3 stated that there
were no changes; and 4 principals did not respond to this
item.

From Table V can be seen the number and percentage
of responses in each of the 5 possible categories (SA -
Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree,
SD - Strongly Disagree) for each role, and the total
number and percentage of agreement versus disagreement
responses for each role in the section entitled - Initia-

TABLE V

ANALYSIS OF TOTAL RESPONSES AND PERCENTAGES
IN EACH OF THE FIVE POSSIBLE CATEGORIES (SA; A; U; D; SD) FOR EACH ROLE
AND THE TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT VERSUS DISAGREEMENT
FOR EACH ROLE IN THE SECTION ENTITLED: INITIATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
1. Made available to staff sources which provided information on current curriculum developments.	16 67%	8 33%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	24 100%	0 0%
2. Provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.	14 58%	7 29%	2 8%	1 4%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
3. Wrote up, and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.	2 8%	8 33%	8 33%	6 25%	0 0%	14 58%	10 42%
4. Provided opportunities for individual staff members to visit other rooms and schools for inservice education.	17 71%	6 25%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
5. Provided time for members of the staff to attend educational conferences.	8 33%	14 58%	2 8%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%

35

TABLE V (continued)

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
6. Established inservice education programs within the building to meet the needs of individuals and the school.	10 42%	9 38%	1 4%	4 17%	0 0%	19 79%	5 21%
7. Formulated with assistance from staff and students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by which the school operates.	6 25%	8 33%	5 21%	4 17%	1 4%	16 67%	8 33%
8. Supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation within the building.	23 96%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	24 100%	0 0%
9. Supported staff participation on existing district committees.	16 67%	7 29%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
10. Formulated policies with assistance from staff.	13 54%	10 42%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%

TABLE V (continued)

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole percent. For total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses, the odd response was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

tion of Curriculum Development. It is important to note that all percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent; and for total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses, the odd response was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

Role 1 revealed that there was 100 percent agreement; all 24 respondents agreed that they had made available to staff sources which provided information on current curriculum developments.

Role 2 revealed that 92 percent or 22 of the 24 respondents agreed that they had provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.

In Role 3, the frequency and percentages of responses were clumped around the A; U; D; categories with few at either end; with 33 percent or 8 of the 24 respondents undecided as to whether they actually fulfilled the role: wrote up and distributed to staff information on curriculum programs within the district. The role seems to elicit some weakness of communication even though 14 or 58 percent of

the responses are in agreement with the role.

Role 4 stated that the principals provided oppor-
tunities for individual staff members to visit other rooms
and schools for inservice education and Role 5 stated that
the principals provided time for members of the staff to
attend educational conferences; both roles received 96 per-
cent agreement or 23 out of 24 respondents agreed, although
the ratio was approximately 2:1 with 17 principals strongly
agreeing to Role 4 while only 8 principals strongly agreed
to Role 5.

Role 6 established inservice education programs
within the building to meet the needs of individuals and
the school; 79 percent or 19 respondents agreed with 21 per-
cent or 5 respondents disagreeing.

Role 7 revealed that 16 or 67 percent of the respond-
ents agreed while 8 or 33 percent of the respondents dis-
agreed that they formulated with assistance from staff and
students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by
which the school operates.

All of the principals agreed that they had performed
Role 8: supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation
within the building; when initiating curriculum development,
with 23 or 96 percent strongly agreeing, and 1 or 4 percent
disagreeing.

Role 9: supported staff participation on existing

district committees; and Role 10: formulated policies with assistance from staff; both received 23 respondents or 96 percent who agreed and 1 respondent or 4 percent who disagreed.

On each of the 10 roles on Table V, the agreement outweighs the disagreement. The total agreement for the 10 roles is 211 or 88 percent while the total disagreement is 29 or 12 percent.

From Table VI can be seen the number and percentage of responses in each of the five possible categories (SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D- Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree) for each role, and the total number and percentage of agreement versus disagreement responses for each role in the section entitled - Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development. It is important to note that all percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent; and for total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses the odd response was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF TOTAL RESPONSES AND PERCENTAGES
IN EACH OF THE FIVE POSSIBLE CATEGORIES (SA; A; U; D; SD) FOR EACH ROLE
AND THE TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT VERSUS DISAGREEMENT
FOR EACH ROLE IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
PLANNING AND PROCEDURAL STAGES OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
1. Provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development.	7 29%	13 54%	2 8%	2 8%	0 0%	21 88%	3 13%
2. Provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum.	13 54%	9 38%	2 8%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
3. Included staff in all aspects of curriculum development. Curriculum development, as defined in this study, includes planning, selection of materials, and selection of instructional methods.	2 8%	13 54%	7 29%	2 8%	0 0%	18 75%	6 25%
4. Provided time, money, and facilities for curriculum meetings.	9 39%	9 39%	2 9%	2 9%	1 4%	19 83%	4 17%

TABLE VI (continued)

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
5. Secured needed resources and materials.	13 54%	8 33%	2 8%	1 4%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
6. Provided professional advice to curriculum committees as needed.	5 21%	18 75%	0 0%	1 4%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
7. Assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments.	2 8%	18 75%	4 17%	0 0%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
8. Participated in district curriculum assignments.	8 33%	14 58%	1 4%	1 4%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
9. Assisted in the development and distribution of district curriculum materials.	4 17%	11 46%	7 29%	2 8%	0 0%	18 75%	6 25%
10. Assisted in organizing curriculum laboratories, resource files, testing materials, and equipment.	3 13%	10 42%	7 29%	3 13%	1 4%	16 67%	8 33%
11. Cooperated with district, county, and state representatives, curriculum coordinators, and supervisors.	4 17%	16 67%	3 13%	1 4%	0 0%	21 88%	3 13%

TABLE VI (continued)

Roles	Responses SA	A	U	D	SD	Total Agreement	Disagreement
12. Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.	14 58%	7 29%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
13. Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district.	4 17%	9 38%	9 38%	1 4%	1 4%	17 71%	7 29%
14. Secured staff participation in school plant planning.	10 42%	10 42%	2 8%	1 4%	1 4%	21 88%	3 13%

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole percent. For total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses, the odd response was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

Role 1 revealed that 21 or 88 percent of the respondents agreed that they had provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development, while 3 or 13 percent disagreed.

Role 2 provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum, with 23 or 96 percent of the respondents agreeing and 1 or 4 percent of the respondents disagreeing.

Role 3, included staff in all aspects of curriculum development. Curriculum development, as defined in this study, includes planning, selection of materials, and selection of instructional methods; 18 or 75 percent agreed that they had done this, while 6 or 25 percent disagreed.

Role 4 provided time, money, and facilities for curriculum meetings; 19 or 83 percent agreed that they had done this, while 4 or 17 percent disagreed; 1 principal did not respond to this role, thus the n = 23.

Role 5 revealed that 22 or 92 percent of the respondents agreed that they had secured needed resources and materials, while 2 or 8 percent disagreed.

Role 6 provided professional advice to curriculum committees as needed; with 23 or 96 percent agreeing, while 1 or 4 percent disagreed.

Role 7, assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments, and Role 8, participated in

district curriculum assignments, both received 22 or 92 percent in agreement, and 2 or 8 percent in disagreement.

In Role 9, 18 or 75 percent agreed that they had assisted in the development and distribution of district curriculum materials, while 6 or 25 percent disagreed.

Role 10 stated that the principal assisted in organizing curriculum laboratories, resource files, testing materials, and equipment; 16 or 67 percent of the respondents agreed, while 8 or 33 percent disagreed.

Role 11, cooperated with district, county, and state representatives, curriculum coordinators, and supervisors; 21 or 88 percent agreed, while 3 or 13 percent disagreed. (Total to 101 percent due to rounding to the nearest whole percent).

Role 12 recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program; with 22 or 92 percent of the respondents agreeing, while 2 or 8 percent of the respondents disagreed.

In Role 13, 17 or 71 percent agreed that they had included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district, while 7 or 29 percent disagreed.

Role 14, secured staff participation in school plant planning; 21 or 88 percent agreed, while 3 or 13 percent disagreed.

On each of the fourteen roles on Table VI, agreement outweighs disagreement. The total agreement for the fourteen roles is 285 or 85 percent, while the total disagreement is 50 or 15 percent.

From Table VII can be seen the number and percentage of responses in each of the five possible categories (SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree) for each role, and the total number and percentage of agreement versus disagreement responses for each role in the section entitled - Implementation of Curriculum Development. It is important to note that all percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent; and for total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses the odd one was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

In Role 1, 21 or 88 percent of the principals responding agreed that they had provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed, while 3 or 13 percent disagreed.

All 24 respondents or 100 percent agreed that they

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF TOTAL RESPONSES AND PERCENTAGES
IN EACH OF THE FIVE POSSIBLE CATEGORIES (SA; A; U; D; SD) FOR EACH ROLE
AND THE TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT VERSUS DISAGREEMENT
FOR EACH ROLE IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
1. Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed.	9 38%	10 42%	4 17%	1 4%	0 0%	21 88%	3 13%
2. Conferred with affected staff members.	12 50%	12 50%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	24 100%	0 0%
3. Observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed.	8 33%	14 58%	2 8%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
4. Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.	11 46%	11 46%	1 4%	1 4%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
5. Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.	5 22%	15 65%	2 9%	1 4%	0 0%	21 91%	2 9%

TABLE VII (continued)

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
6. Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials.	2 8%	14 58%	7 29%	1 4%	0 0%	19 79%	5 21%
7. Assisted staff in locating and selecting resources.	4 17%	13 54%	5 21%	2 8%	0 0%	19 79%	5 21%
8. Involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment.	10 42%	12 50%	2 8%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
9. Provided feedback to the Superintendent's Office regarding curriculum programs.	4 17%	17 71%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
10. Interpreted the school program to lay people.	9 45%	11 55%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	20 100%	0 0%
10a. By: Distributing materials which explained school curriculum and methods.	7 29%	7 29%	6 25%	3 13%	1 4%	17 71%	7 29%
10b. By: Preparing handbooks for parents as necessary.	5 23%	9 41%	5 23%	3 14%	0 0%	16 73%	6 27%
10c. By: Conducting group meetings as necessary.	11 46%	11 46%	2 8%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%

TABLE VII (continued)

Roles	Responses					Total	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Agreement	Disagreement
10d.By: Holding parent-teacher conferences.	16 67%	7 29%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
10e.By: Organizing school exhibits.	6 25%	7 29%	9 38%	2 8%	0 0%	17 71%	7 29%
10f.By: Supporting school visits by parents.	17 71%	6 25%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	23 96%	1 4%
10g.By: Creating other means of disseminating ideas to fill gaps such as parent clubs, and study groups.	7 29%	10 42%	4 17%	3 13%	0 0%	19 79%	5 21%

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole percent. For total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses, the odd response was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

had conferred with affected staff members, Role 2.

In Role 3, 23 or 96 percent of the principals stated that they had observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed, while 1 or 4 percent disagreed.

Role 4 discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings, with 22 or 92 percent of the principals agreed that they had done this, while 2 or 8 percent disagreed.

Role 5, assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff; 21 or 91 percent agreed, while 2 or 9 percent disagreed. One principal did not respond to this item.

Role 6, assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials, and Role 7, assisted staff in locating and selecting resources, both received 19 or 79 percent of the principals in agreement, while 5 or 21 percent were in disagreement.

Role 8 involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment, with 23 or 96 percent in agreement and 1 or 4 percent in disagreement.

Role 9 provided feedback to the superintendent's office regarding curriculum programs; 22 or 92 percent agreed with this role, while 2 or 8 percent disagreed.

Role 10, interpreted the school program to lay people;

all 20 that responded agreed (100 percent); four principals did not answer this item.

Role 10a, By: distributing materials which explained school curriculum and methods, 17 or 71 percent agreed that they had done this, while 7 or 29 percent disagreed.

Role 10b, By: preparing handbooks for parents as necessary, 16 or 73 percent agreed with this role, while 6 or 27 percent disagreed; 2 principals did not respond to this item.

Role 10c, By: conducting group meetings as necessary, and Role 10d, By: holding parent-teacher conferences; in both roles, 23 or 96 percent agreed, while 1 or 4 percent disagreed.

In Role 10e, 17 or 71 percent agreed that they interpreted the school program to lay people by organizing school exhibits, while 7 or 29 percent disagreed.

Role 10f, By: supporting school visits by parents, 23 or 96 percent agreed, while 1 or 4 percent disagreed.

Role 10g, By: creating other means of disseminating ideas to fill gaps such as parent clubs, and study groups; 19 or 79 percent agreed, while 5 or 21 percent disagreed.

On each of the seventeen roles on Table VII, agreement outweighs disagreement. The total agreement for the seventeen roles is 352 or 88 percent while the total disagreement for the seventeen roles is 49 or 12 percent.

From Table VIII can be seen the number and percentage of responses in each of the five possible categories (SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree) for each role, and the total number and percentage of agreement versus disagreement responses for each role in the section entitled - Evaluation of Curriculum. It is important to note that all percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent; and for total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses the odd one was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

Role 1 included staff and community in program evaluation; 18 or 82 percent agreed that they had done this while 4 or 18 percent disagreed. Two principals did not respond to this item.

Role 1a, By: conducting group meetings; 19 or 91 percent agreed that they had done this, while 2 or 10 percent disagreed. Three principals did not respond to this item.

Role 1b, By: conferencing with individual parents, teachers, and students; 22 or 92 percent agreed that they

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF TOTAL RESPONSES AND PERCENTAGES
IN EACH OF THE FIVE POSSIBLE CATEGORIES (SA; A; U; D; SD) FOR EACH ROLE
AND THE TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT VERSUS DISAGREEMENT
FOR EACH ROLE IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM

Roles		Responses SA	A	U	D	SD	Total Agreement	Disagreement
1.	Included staff and community in program evaluation.	6 27%	10 45%	4 18%	2 9%	0 0%	18 82%	4 18%
1a.	By: Conducting group meetings.	9 43%	9 43%	3 14%	0 0%	0 0%	19 91%	2 10%
1b.	By: Conferencing with individual parents, teachers, and students.	12 50%	9 38%	3 13%	0 0%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%
2.	Devised and utilized means of measuring the educational program.	6 26%	10 43%	5 22%	1 4%	1 4%	18 78%	5 22%
3.	Maintained a file on evaluative activities within the school and district.	3 13%	13 54%	5 21%	2 8%	1 4%	18 75%	6 25%
4.	Included in the school handbook, district or school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials and resources.	1 4%	6 26%	10 43%	5 22%	1 4%	12 52%	11 48%

TABLE VIII (continued)

Roles		SA	A	U	D	SD	Total Agreement	Disagreement
				Responses				
5.	Surveyed community opinions about the effectiveness of the schools.	5 21%	8 33%	8 33%	2 8%	1 4%	17 71%	7 29%
6.	Cooperated with the Superintendent's Office in programs of curriculum evaluation.	7 29%	14 58%	2 8%	0 0%	1 4%	22 92%	2 8%
7.	Forwarded recommendations from staff and community to the Superintendent.	8 33%	14 58%	1 4%	1 4%	0 0%	22 92%	2 8%

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole percent. For total agreement (SA + A) and total disagreement (D + SD), the undecided column (U) was split evenly when an even number of responses, with half of the responses added to the agreement column and the other half to the disagreement column. When the undecided column had an odd number of responses, the odd response was added to the disagreement column, and then the remaining even number was split evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns.

had done this, while 2 or 8 percent disagreed.

Role 2 devised and utilized means of measuring the educational program; 18 or 78 percent agreed that they had done this, while 5 or 22 percent disagreed. One principal did not respond to this item.

In Role 3, 18 or 75 percent of the principals agreed that they maintained a file on evaluative activities within the school and district, while 6 or 25 percent disagreed.

Role 4, included in the school handbook, district or school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials and resources; 12 or 52 percent agreed that they had done this, while 11 or 48 percent disagreed. One principal did not respond to this item.

Role 5 surveyed community opinions about the effectiveness of the schools; 17 or 71 percent agreed that they had done this, while 7 or 29 percent disagreed.

Role 6, cooperated with the Superintendent's Office in programs of curriculum evaluation, and Role 7, forwarded recommendations from staff and community to the Superintendent; both received 22 or 92 percent of the respondents in agreement, while 2 or 8 percent of the respondents were in disagreement.

On each of the nine roles on Table VIII, agreement outweighs disagreement. The total agreement for the nine roles is 168 or 80 percent, while the total disagreement

for the nine roles is 41 or 20 percent.

Table IX lists the ranking of roles as to the most important and least important for the total sample, the urban sample, and the suburban sample in the section entitled: Initiation of Curriculum Development.

For the total sample, the urban sample, and the suburban sample, Role 8: Supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation within the building; ranked as the most important. While Role 3: Wrote up and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district; ranked as least important for the total sample and the suburban sample. Role 7: Formulated, with assistance from staff and students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by which the school operates; ranked as the least important for the urban sample and ranked as the second least important for the total sample.

Table X lists the ranking of roles as to the most important and least important for the total sample, the urban sample, and the suburban sample in the section entitled: Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development.

Role 2: Provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum; ranked as the most important role for the total sample, the urban sample and the suburban sample.

TABLE IX

THE RANKING OF ROLES AS TO THE MOST IMPORTANT AND LEAST IMPORTANT
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE, THE URBAN SAMPLE, AND THE SUBURBAN SAMPLE
IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
INITIATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample

Most Important			Least Important		
Role 8	14 responses	Supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation within the building.	Role 3	9 responses	Wrote up and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.
Role 10	3 responses	Formulated policies with assistance from staff.	Role 7	7 responses	Formulated, with assistance from staff and students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by which the school operates.
Role 2	3 responses	Provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.			
Role 4	2 responses	Provided opportunities for individual staff members to visit other rooms and schools for inservice education.	Role 5	4 responses	Provided time for members of the staff to attend educational conferences.
Role 3	1 response	Wrote up and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.	Role 9	3 responses	Supported staff participation on existing district committees.

TABLE IX (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample (continued)

Role 6 - 1 response - Established inservice education programs within the building to meet the needs of individuals and the school.

Note: N=23, 1 principal did not respond and 1 principal responded to both Role 2 and Role 8.

Urban Sample

Role 8 - 6 responses - Supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation within the building.

Role 4 - 2 responses - Provided opportunities for individual staff members to visit other rooms and schools for inservice education.

Role 2 - 2 responses - Provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.

Role 7 - 5 responses - Formulated, with assistance from staff and students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by which the school operates.

Role 3 - 2 responses - Wrote up and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.

Role 9 - 2 responses - Supported staff participation on existing district committees.

58

TABLE IX (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

<div align="center">Urban Sample (continued)</div>

Role 10	1 response	Formulated policies with assistance from staff.	Role 5	1 response	Provided time for members of the staff to attend educational conferences.
		Note: One principal did not respond to this item and 1 principal answered both Role 2 and Role 8.			Note: One principal did not respond to this item.

<div align="center">Suburban Sample</div>

Role 8	8 responses	Supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation within the building.	Role 3	7 responses	Wrote up and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.
Role 10	2 responses	Formulated policies with assistance from staff.	Role 5	3 responses	Provided time for members of the staff to attend educational conferences.
Role 2	1 response	Provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.	Role 7	2 responses	Formulated, with assistance from staff and students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by which the school operates.

TABLE IX (continued)

Role Number	Most Important Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Least Important Responses	Role Stated

Suburban Sample (continued)

Role 3 - 1 response - Wrote up and
distributed to staff, infor-
mation on curriculum programs
within the district.

Role 6 - 1 response - Established
inservice education programs
within the building to meet
the needs of individuals and
the school.

Role 9 - 1 response - Supported
staff participation on exist-
ing district dommittees.

TABLE X

THE RANKING OF ROLES AS TO THE MOST IMPORTANT AND LEAST IMPORTANT
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE, THE URBAN SAMPLE, AND THE SUBURBAN SAMPLE
IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
PLANNING AND PROCEDURAL STAGES OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample

Role 2 - 14 responses - Provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum.

Role 5 - 3 responses - Secured needed resources and materials.

Role 12 - 3 responses - Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.

Role 14 - 3 responses - Secured staff participation in school plant planning.

Role 4 - 2 responses - Provided time, money, and facilities for curriculum meetings.

Role 13 - 6 responses - Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district.

Role 7 - 4 responses - Assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments.

Role 9 - 3 responses - Assisted in the development and distribution of district curriculum materials.

Role 10 - 3 responses - Assisted in organizing curriculum laboratories, resource files, testing materials, and equipment.

TABLE X (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample (continued)

Role 1 - 1 response - Provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development.

Role 11 - 3 responses - Cooperated with district, county, and state representatives, curriculum coordinators, and supervisors.

Role 12 - 2 responses - Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.

Role 1 - 1 response - Provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development.

Role 3 - 1 response - Included staff in all aspects of curriculum development. Curriculum development, as defined in this study, includes planning, selection of materials, and selection of instructional methods.

Role 14 - 1 response - Secured staff participation in school plant planning.

TABLE X (continued)

	Most Important			Least Important	
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample (continued)

Note: One principal responded to both Role 4 and Role 5, and 1 principal responded to both Role 2 and Role 12.

Note: One principal responded to both Role 7 and Role 9 and 1 principal did not respond.

Urban Sample

Role 2 - 8 responses - Provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum.

Role 14 - 2 responses - Secured staff participation in school plant planning.

Role 5 - 1 response - Secured needed resources and materials.

Role 7 - 3 responses - Assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments.

Role 9 - 2 responses - Assisted in the development and distribution of district curriculum materials.

Role 11 - 2 responses - Cooperated with district, county, and state representatives, curriculum coordinators, and supervisors.

Role 1 - 1 response - Provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development.

TABLE X (continued)

	Most Important			Least Important	
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Urban Sample (continued)

Role 3 - 1 response - Included staff in all aspects of curriculum development. Curriculum development, as defined in this study, includes planning, selection of materials, and selection of instructional methods.

Role 12 - 1 response - Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.

Role 13 - 1 response - Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district.

Note: One principal answered Role 7 and Role 9 and 1 principal did not respond.

TABLE X (continued)

	Most Important			Least Important	
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Suburban Sample

Role 2 - 6 responses - Provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum.

Role 12 - 3 responses - Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.

Role 4 - 2 responses - Provided time, money, and facilities for curriculum meetings.

Role 5 - 2 responses - Secured needed resources and materials.

Role 1 - 1 response - Provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development.

Role 14 - 1 response - Secured staff participation in school plant planning.

Note: One principal checked Role 2 and Role 12, and 1 principal checked Role 4 and Role 5.

Role 13 - 5 responses - Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district.

Role 10 - 3 responses - Assisted in organizing curriculum laboratories, resource files, testing materials, and equipment.

Role 7 - 1 response - Assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments.

Role 9 - 1 response - Assisted in the development and distribution of district curriculum materials.

Role 11 - 1 response - Cooperated with district, county, and state representatives, curriculum coordinators, and supervisors.

TABLE X (continued)

	Most Important			Least Important	
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Suburban Sample (continued)

Role 12 - 1 response - Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.

Role 14 - 1 response - Secured staff participation in school plant planning.

Role 13:   Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district; was the least important for the total sample and the suburban sample, while Role 7:   Assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments; was the least important for the urban sample and the second least important for the total sample.

Table XI lists the ranking of roles as to the most important and least important for the total sample, the urban sample, and the suburban sample in the section entitled: Implementation of Curriculum Development.

Role 10:   Interpreted the school program to lay people; was the most important role for the total sample, and the urban sample, and ranked a tie with Role 1: Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed; for the suburban sample.

Role 6:   Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials; ranked as the least important role for the total sample, and the suburban sample and ranked second to Role 4:   Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings; for the urban sample.

Table XII lists the ranking of roles as to the most important and least important for the total sample, the urban sample, and the suburban sample in the section entitled: Evaluation of Curriculum.

TABLE XI

THE RANKING OF ROLES AS TO THE MOST IMPORTANT AND LEAST IMPORTANT
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE, THE URBAN SAMPLE, AND THE SUBURBAN SAMPLE
IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample

Role 10 - 7 responses - Interpreted the school program to lay people.

Role 1 - 4 responses - Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed.

Role 8 - 3 responses - Involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment.

Role 2 - 2 responses - Conferred with affected staff members.

Role 3 - 2 responses - Observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed.

Role 6 - 7 responses - Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials.

Role 9 - 5 responses - Provided feedback to the Superintendent's Office regarding curriculum programs.

Role 4 - 3 responses - Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.

Role 10e - 2 responses - Organizing school exhibits.

Role 7 - 2 responses - Assisted staff in locating and selecting resources.

TABLE XI (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample (continued)

Role 5 - 2 responses - Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.

Role 10c - 2 responses - Conducting group meetings as necessary.

Role 4 - 1 response - Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.

Role 10d - 1 response - Holding parent-teacher conferences.

Role 10f - 1 response - Supporting school visits by parents.

　　Note: One principal answered both Role 1 and Role 10.

Role 5 - 1 response - Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.

Role 10 - 1 response - Interpreted the school program to lay people.

Role 10a - 1 response - Distributing materials which explained school curriculum and methods.

Role 10b - 1 response - Preparing handbooks for parents as necessary.

Role 10g - 1 response - Creating other means of disseminating ideas to fill gaps such as parent clubs, and study groups.

TABLE XI (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Urban Sample

Role 10	4 responses	Interpreted the school program to lay people.	Role 4	3 responses	Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.
Role 8	2 responses	Involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment.	Role 6	2 responses	Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials.
Role 1	1 response	Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed.	Role 9	2 responses	Provided feedback to the Superintendent's Office regarding curriculum programs.
Role 2	1 response	Conferred with affected staff members.	Role 10e	2 responses	Organizing school exhibits.
Role 10c	1 response	Conducting group meetings as necessary.	Role 7	1 response	Assisted staff in locating and selecting resources.
Role 10d	1 response	Holding parent-teacher conferences.	Role 10a	1 response	Distributing materials which explained school curriculum and methods.
Role 10f	1 response	Supporting school visits by parents.			

TABLE XI (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Suburban Sample

Role 1 - 3 responses - Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed.

Role 10 - 3 responses - Interpreted the school program to lay people.

Role 3 - 2 responses - Observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed.

Role 5 - 2 responses - Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.

Role 2 - 1 response - Conferred with affected staff members.

Role 4 - 1 response - Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.

Role 6 - 5 responses - Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials.

Role 9 - 3 responses - Provided feedback to the Superintendent's Office regarding curriculum programs.

Role 5 - 1 response - Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.

Role 7 - 1 response - Assisted staff in locating and selecting resources.

Role 10 - 1 response - Interpreted the school program to lay people.

Role 10b - 1 response - Preparing handbooks for parents as necessary.

TABLE XI (continued)

	Most Important			Least Important	
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Suburban Sample (continued)

Role 8 - 1 response - Involved staff
   in the selection of supplies
   and equipment.

Role 10c - 1 response - Conducting
   group meetings as necessary.

   Note: One principal answered
   both Role 1 and Role 10.

Role 10g - 1 response - Creating
   other means of disseminating
   ideas to fill gaps such as
   parent clubs, and study groups.

TABLE XII

THE RANKING OF ROLES AS TO THE MOST IMPORTANT AND LEAST IMPORTANT
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE, THE URBAN SAMPLE, AND THE SUBURBAN SAMPLE
IN THE SECTION ENTITLED:
EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Total Sample

Role 1 - 14 responses - Included
staff and community in
program evaluation.

Role 2 - 4 responses - Devised and
utilized means of measuring
the educational program.

Role 1b - 2 responses - Conferencing
with individual parents,
teachers, and students.

Role 7 - 2 responses - Forwarded
recommendations from staff
and community to the Super-
intendent.

Role 6 - 1 response - Cooperated
with the Superintendent's
Office in programs of
curriculum evaluation.

Note: One principal did not
answer this item.

Role 4 - 10 responses - Included in
the school handbook, district
or school procedures for
evaluating all instructional
materials and resources.

Role 3 - 8 responses - Maintained a
file on evaluative activities
within the school and dis-
trict.

Role 5 - 4 responses - Surveyed
community opinions about the
effectiveness of the schools.

Role 7 - 1 response - Forwarded
recommendations from staff
and community to the Super-
intendent.

Note: One principal did not
answer this item.

73

TABLE XII (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Urban Sample

Role 1 - 8 responses - Included staff and community in program evaluation.

Role 1b - 2 responses - Conferencing with individual parents, teachers, and students.

Role 2 - 1 response - Devised and utilized means of measuring the educational program.

Role 3 - 4 responses - Maintained a file on evaluative activities within the school and district.

Role 4 - 4 responses - Included in the school handbook, district or school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials and resources.

Role 5 - 2 responses - Surveyed community opinions about the effectiveness of the schools.

Role 7 - 1 response - Forwarded recommendations from staff and community to the Superintendent.

TABLE XII (continued)

Most Important			Least Important		
Role Number	Responses	Role Stated	Role Number	Responses	Role Stated

Suburban Sample

Role 1 - 6 responses - Included staff and community in program evaluation.

Role 2 - 3 responses - Devised and utilized means of measuring the educational program.

Role 7 - 2 responses - Forwarded recommendations from staff and community to the Superintendent.

Role 6 - 1 response - Cooperated with the Superintendent's Office in programs of curriculum evaluation.

Note: One principal did not respond to this item.

Role 4 - 5 responses - Included in the school handbook, district or school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials and resources.

Role 3 - 4 responses - Maintained a file on evaluative activities within the school and district.

Role 5 - 3 responses - Surveyed community opinions about the effectiveness of the schools.

Note: One principal did not respond to this item.

Role 1: Included staff and community in program evaluation; ranked as the most important role for the total sample, the urban sample and the suburban sample.

Role 4: Included in the school handbook, district or school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials and resources; ranked as the least important in the total sample, and the suburban sample, and tied with Role 3: Maintained a file on evaluative activities within the school and district; in the urban sample.

From Table XIII can be seen the acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the responses made on each role by principals in an urban or suburban school setting.

On all roles in Table XIII, the null hypothesis was accepted by observation or by using the Yates Correction for Chi Square Analysis where an obtained value after computation was not equal to or greater than the 3.84 needed to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha .05 level of significance. "When any one of the expected frequencies is small, say less than 10, the chi-square computed is likely to be an overestimate with df = 1, a correction called Yates' Correction for continuity is applied" (3:166).

TABLE XIII

ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF THE NULL HYPOTHESIS:
THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE RESPONSES MADE
ON EACH ROLE BY PRINCIPALS IN AN URBAN OR SUBURBAN SCHOOL SETTING

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

I. Initiation of Curriculum Development

		Agree	Disagree	
1. Made available to staff sources which provided information on current curriculum developments.	Urban	11	0	Acceptance by observation
	Suburban	13	0	
2. Provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	12	1	
3. Wrote up, and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.		Agree	Disagree	The Null Hypothesis was tested using the Yates Correction for Chi Square Analysis and a value of 0.14 obtained. The obtained value was not equal to or greater than the 3.84 needed to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha = .05 level of significance.
	Urban	6	5	
	Suburban	7	6	

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

I. Initiation of Curriculum Development (continued)

			Agree	Disagree	
4.	Provided opportunities for individual staff members to visit other rooms and schools for inservice education.	Urban Suburban	11 12	0 1	Acceptance by observation
5.	Provided time for members of the staff to attend educational conferences.	Urban Suburban	10 12	1 1	Acceptance by observation
6.	Established inservice education programs within the building to meet the needs of individuals and the school.	Urban Suburban	9 10	2 3	Acceptance by observation
7.	Formulated with assistance from staff and students, a school handbook incorporating a philosophy by which the school operates.	Urban Suburban	7 9	4 4	Acceptance by observation
8.	Supported, stimulated, and encouraged innovation within the building.	Urban Suburban	11 13	0 0	Acceptance by observation

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection
I. Initiation of Curriculum Development (continued)				
9. Supported staff participation on existing district committees.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	11	0	
	Suburban	12	1	
10. Formulated policies with assistance from staff.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	13	0	
II. Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development				
1. Provided information to staff regarding factors which influence curriculum development.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	8	3	
	Suburban	12	1	
2. Provided information on district and legal requirements of curriculum.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	12	1	
3. Included staff in all aspects of curriculum development. Curriculum development, as defined in this study, includes planning, selection of materials, and selection of instructional methods.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	8	3	
	Suburban	10	3	

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

II. Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development (continued)

			Agree	Disagree	
4.	Provided time, money, and facilities for curriculum meetings.	Urban Suburban	8 10	2 3	Acceptance by observation
5.	Secured needed resources and materials.	Urban Suburban	10 11	1 2	Acceptance by observation
6.	Provided professional advice to curriculum committees as needed.	Urban Suburban	10 13	1 0	Acceptance by observation
7.	Assisted staff members who have district level curriculum assignments.	Urban Suburban	10 12	1 1	Acceptance by observation
8.	Participated in district curriculum assignments.	Urban Suburban	11 11	0 2	Acceptance by observation
9.	Assisted in the development and distribution of district curriculum materials.	Urban Suburban	8 10	3 3	Acceptance by observation
10.	Assisted in organizing curriculum laboratories, resource files, testing materials, and equipment.	Urban Suburban	8 8	3 5	Acceptance by observation

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection
II. Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development (continued)				
11. Cooperated with district, county, and state representatives, curriculum coordinators, and supervisors.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	11	2	
12. Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	12	1	
13. Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district.		Agree	Disagree	The Null Hypothesis was tested using the Yates Correction for Chi Square Analysis and a value of 0.407 obtained. The obtained value was not equal to or greater than the 3.84 needed to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha = .05 level of significance.
	Urban	9	2	
	Suburban	8	5	

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

II. Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development (continued)

			Agree	Disagree	
14. Secured staff participation in school plant planning.	Urban		10	1	Acceptance by observation
	Suburban		10	3	

III. Implementation of Curriculum Development

		Agree	Disagree	
1. Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed.	Urban 10	1		Acceptance by observation
	Suburban 11	2		
2. Conferred with affected staff members.	Urban 11	0		Acceptance by observation
	Suburban 13	0		
3. Observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed.	Urban 10	1		Acceptance by observation
	Suburban 12	1		
4. Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.	Urban 9	2		Acceptance by observation
	Suburban 13	0		

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

III. Implementation of Curriculum Development (continued)

Roles	Setting	Agree	Disagree	Acceptance or Rejection
5. Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.	Urban Suburban	10 11	1 1	Acceptance by observation
6. Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials.	Urban Suburban	9 10	2 3	Acceptance by observation
7. Assisted staff in locating and selecting resources.	Urban Suburban	9 10	2 3	Acceptance by observation
8. Involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment.	Urban Suburban	10 12	1 1	Acceptance by observation
9. Provided feedback to the Superintendent's Office regarding curriculum programs.	Urban Suburban	10 12	1 1	Acceptance by observation
10. Interpreted the school program to lay people.	Urban Suburban	8 12	0 0	Acceptance by observation

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

III. Implementation of Curriculum Development (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting	Agree	Disagree	Acceptance or Rejection
10a.By: Distributing materials which explained school curriculum and methods.	Urban Suburban	9 8	2 5	Accepted by previous observation - Role 13, part II.
10b.By: Preparing handbooks for parents as necessary.	Urban Suburban	7 9	2 4	Acceptance by observation
10c.By: Conducting group meetings as necessary.	Urban Suburban	11 12	0 1	Acceptance by observation
10d.By: Holding parent-teacher conferences.	Urban Suburban	11 12	0 1	Acceptance by observation
10e.By: Organizing school exhibits.	Urban Suburban	7 10	4 3	Acceptance by observation
10f.By: Supporting school visits by parents.	Urban Suburban	10 13	1 0	Acceptance by observation

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

III. Implementation of Curriculum Development (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection
10g. By: Creating other means of disseminating ideas to fill gaps such as parent clubs, and study groups.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	9	2	
	Suburban	10	3	

IV. Evaluation of Curriculum

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection
1. Included staff and community in program evaluation.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	8	3	
1a. By: Conducting group meetings.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	9	1	
	Suburban	10	1	
1b. By: Conferencing with individual parents, teachers, and students.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	10	1	
	Suburban	12	1	
2. Devised and utilized means of measuring the educational program.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	8	3	
	Suburban	10	2	

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection
IV. Evaluation of Curriculum (continued)				
3. Maintained a file on evaluative activities within the school and district.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	9	2	
	Suburban	9	4	
4. Included in the school handbook, district or school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials and resources.		Agree	Disagree	The Null Hypothesis was tested using the Yates Correction for Chi Square Analysis and a value of 0.404 obtained. The obtained value was not equal to or greater than the 3.84 needed to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha = .05 level of significance.
	Urban	7	4	
	Suburban	5	7	
5. Surveyed community opinions about the effectiveness of the schools.		Agree	Disagree	Acceptance by observation
	Urban	8	3	
	Suburban	8	5	

TABLE XIII (continued)

Roles	Responses in setting			Acceptance or Rejection

IV. Evaluation of Curriculum (continued)

			Agree	Disagree	
6.	Cooperated with the Superintendent's Office in programs of curriculum evaluation.	Urban Suburban	10 11	1 2	Acceptance by observation
7.	Forwarded recommendations from staff and community to the Superintendent.	Urban Suburban	10 12	1 1	Acceptance by observation

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

This study proposed to see what percent of the principals surveyed, by means of a questionnaire, agree or disagree that they fulfilled the stated roles for developing curriculum for use in a "cooperative" team teaching approach to instruction in their schools. This study also proposed to test the following null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the responses made on each role by principals in an urban or suburban school setting.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Of the 68 schools that were surveyed, 31 replied (46 percent) of which 24 (35 percent) were acceptable.

Items on the general information section of the questionnaire revealed the following data: (1) The smallest school district, 2, in terms of the number of elementary schools, was located in a suburban school setting, while the largest (86) was located in an urban school setting, the mean number of schools was slightly over three and one half times as large when comparing schools in an urban setting (49.81) with schools in a suburban setting (13.92); (2) When viewing the total pupil enrollment of the schools

surveyed, both the smallest (220) and the largest (980) elementary schools were found in an urban setting. The mean of the urban schools was 590.54 while the suburban schools was 477; (3) It is interesting to note that for approximately every 2 (mean = 2.07) teacher aides in a suburban school setting, there are four and one half (mean = 4.54) aides in an urban school setting; (4) The range for the number of aides being assigned to the team being surveyed is identical (0-2) for both urban and suburban school settings, with the means differing by .01, urban = 0.70, suburban = 0.69; (5) Three principals from an urban and 3 from a suburban school setting replied that they use volunteer help in their schools; (6) Three urban principals stated that they have an intern, and 2 suburban principals stated that they have an intern; (7) Two urban principals replied that they have an assistant principal while no suburban principal had an assistant principal.

Items on the background information of the principals revealed the following data: (1) The mean age for the urban sample was 46 years and 9 months as compared to the suburban mean of 40 years and 6 months; (2) The youngest principal, 32 years old, was from a suburban school setting while the oldest principal, 60 years old, was from an urban school setting; (3) All of the urban principals hold a Master's Degree, while all but 3 of the suburban principals

hold a Master's Degree. One is a candidate for his Master's Degree, 1 is a candidate for his Ed.D. Degree and 1 has his Ed.D. Degree; (4) When viewing the most total years as an educator, principal and teacher, and when viewing the same 3 items in the individual's present situation, in all cases the principals in an urban school setting have more years of experience than their counterparts in a suburban setting, when comparing means; (5) The teams surveyed have been functioning in an urban setting between 1 and 3 years, with a mean of 1 year and 9 months and in a suburban setting from 1 to 2 years with a mean of 1 year and 4 months, which shows that all teams in this survey have been functioning 3 years or less; (6) Five principals in an urban school setting, replied that they spent from 1 to 10 percent of their time in teaching in the team being surveyed, while 3 suburban principals reported spending 5 percent of their time in teaching in the team being surveyed; (7) Principals in both settings reported many personnel changes from the teams initial stage to its present form, but few procedural, curriculum or miscellaneous changes; (8) Approximately half of the principals stated no change from their initial relationship to the team being surveyed and their present relationship, however, the rest were split between growing enthusiasm, and more or less participation; (9) Principals in both settings ranked

their initial relationship to the team in the following

order: advisor, resource person, active participant, and

etc.

On the section of the questionnaire entitled: Ini-

tiation of Curriculum Development; on each of the 10 roles,

the agreement outweighed the disagreement. The total agree-

ment for the 10 roles is 211 responses or 88 percent, while

the total disagreement is 29 responses or 12 percent. The

following roles in this section received from 92 percent

to 100 percent, or 22 to 24 respondents, agreeing that they

fulfilled the role:

Role 1: Made available to staff sources
which provided information on
current curriculum developments.

Role 2: Provided time for and led discussions
of recent curriculum developments at
faculty meetings.

Role 4: Provided opportunites for individual
staff members to visit other rooms
and schools for inservice education.

Role 5: Provided time for members of the
staff to attend educational con-
ferences.

Role 8: Supported, stimulated, and encouraged
innovation within the building.

Role 9: Supported staff participation on
existing district committees.

Role 10: Formulated policies with assistance
from staff.

The total sample ranked Role 8: supported, stimu-

lated, and encouraged innovation within the building; as
the most important role, and Role 3: Wrote up and distri-
buted to staff, information on curriculum programs within
the district, as the least important role.

On the section of the questionnaire entitled:
Planning and Procedural Stages of Curriculum Development;
on each of the 14 roles, the agreement outweighed the dis-
agreement. The total agreement for the 14 roles is 285
responses or 85 percent, while the total disagreement is
50 responses or 15 percent. The following roles in this
section received from 92 percent to 100 percent, or 22 to
24 respondents agreeing that they fulfilled the role:

> Role 2: Provided information on district and
> legal requirements of curriculum.
>
> Role 5: Secured needed resources and
> materials.
>
> Role 6: Provided professional advice to
> curriculum committees as needed.
>
> Role 7: Assisted staff members who have dis-
> trict level curriculum assignments.
>
> Role 8: Participated in district curriculum
> assignments.
>
> Role 12: Recommended for hiring personnel who
> would complement the curriculum
> program.

The total sample ranked Role 2: Provided informa-
tion on district and legal requirements of curriculum; as
the most important role, and Role 13: Included lay people
in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating

curricular policies within the district; as the least important role.

On the section of the questionnaire entitled: Implementation of Curriculum Development; on each of the seventeen roles, the agreement outweighed the disagreement. The total agreement for the 17 roles is 352 responses or 88 percent, while the total disagreement for the 17 roles is 49 responses or 12 percent. The following roles in this section received from 91 percent to 100 percent, or 21 to 24 respondents, agreeing that they fulfilled the role:

Role 2: Conferred with affected staff members.

Role 3: Observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed.

Role 4: Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.

Role 5: Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.

Role 8: Involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment.

Role 9: Provided feedback to the Superintendent's Office regarding curriculum programs.

Role 10: Interpreted the school program to lay people.

Role 10c:By: Conducting group meetings as necessary.

> Role 10d:By: Holding parent-teacher
> conferences.

> Role 10f:By: Supporting school visits
> by parents.

The total sample ranked Role 10: Interpreted the
school program to lay people; as the most important role,
and Role 6: Assisted in establishing procedures for
selecting materials; as the least important role.

On the section of the questionnaire entitled:
Evaluation of Curriculum; on each of the nine roles, the
agreement outweighs the disagreement. The total agree-
ment for the 9 roles is 168 responses or 80 percent, while
the total disagreement for the 9 roles is 41 responses or
20 percent. The following roles in this section received
from 91 percent to 92 percent, or 19 to 22 respondents,
agreeing that they fulfilled the role:

> Role 1a: By: Conducting group meetings.
>
> Role 1b: By: Conferencing with individual
> parents, teachers, and students.
>
> Role 6: Cooperated with the Superintendent's
> Office in programs of curriculum
> evaluation.
>
> Role 7: Forwarded recommendations from staff
> and community to the Superintendent.

The total sample ranked Role 1: Included staff and
community in program evaluation; as the most important role,
and Role 4: Included in the school handbook, district or
school procedures for evaluating all instructional materials

and resources; as the least important role.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the responses made on each role by principals in an urban or suburban school setting; was accepted for all of the roles in the questionnaire. The acceptance was by observation or by using the Yates Correction for the Chi-Square Analysis, where an obtained value after computation must be equal to or greater than the 3.84 needed to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha = .05 level of significance. The need for using the Yates Correction is expressed in the following: "When any one of the expected frequencies is small, say less than 10, the chi-square computed is likely to be an overestimate with df=1, a correction called Yates' Correction for continuity is applied" (3:166).

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that this study be replicated to reduce the 4 major types of research errors: (1) administrative errors; (2) computational errors; (3) sampling errors; and (4) population errors (2:126-128).

It is also recommended that this study be replicated with the following change: compare the role of elementary principals in curriculum development in innovative ("cooperative" team teaching) schools with noninnovative schools

(no "cooperative" team teaching).

Further, it is recommended that this study be replicated with the principals surveyed being asked to answer the roles on the questionnaire in terms of whether they agree or disagree that they actually did fulfill the roles in developing curriculum; and also to agree or disagree as to the appropriateness of each role for curriculum development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, Robert H. <u>Teaching in a World of Change.</u> New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966. 180 pp.

2. Bauernfeind, Robert H. "The Need for Replication in Educational Research," <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, 50:126-128, October, 1968.

3. Downie, N. M. and R.W. Heath. <u>Basic Statistical Methods.</u> New York: Harper and Row, 1965. 325 pp.

4. Foshay, Arthur W. "Shaping Curriculum: The Decade Ahead," Influences in Curriculum Change, pp. 3-12. <u>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.</u> Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.

5. <u>A Handbook of Team Teaching in the Elementary Schools.</u> Baltimore: Department of Education, July, 1963. 21 pp.

6. Haney, Harry H. Jr. "Performance Criteria for the Elementary Principal in Curriculum Development." Unpublished Master's thesis, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington, August, 1968. 34 pp.

7. Hillson, Maurie. <u>Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization.</u> New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966. 387 pp.

8. Marchus, Lloyd I., Rudolph F. Sando, and Harold J. De Fraga. <u>Mr. Principal, How Do You Do?</u> Martinez, California: Sandemark Enterprises, 1956.

9. McNally, Harold J., and Harry A. Passo. <u>Improving the Quality of Public School Program: Approaches to Curriculum Development.</u> New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960.

10. McPherson, Philip Eby, and Lloyd L. Taylor. "The Superintendent and the Principal," <u>The National Elementary Principal</u>, 47:80-84, May, 1968.

11. Myers, Donald A. "The Principal as a Procedural Administrator," <u>The National Elementary Principal</u>, 47:25-29, February, 1968.

12. Neagley, Ross L., and N. Dean Evans. Handbook for
    Effective Supervision of Instruction. New York:
    Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

13. Norwalk Plan of Team Teaching. Norwalk, Connecticut:
    Norwalk Board of Education, October, 1961. 39 pp.

14. Sinclair, Robert L. "Leadership Concerns," The
    National Elementary Principal, 48: 16-20,
    September, 1968.

15. Washington Elementary School Principal's Association.
    Evaluating Your Elementary School. Olympia,
    Washington, 1967.

APPENDIX A

The following material is quoted from, A Handbook of Team Teaching in the Elementary Schools (6: 3-4).

The principal exercises the leadership role in initiating, stimulating, supporting, and evaluating the program by:

1. inviting teachers to participate in the project.

2. planning for the orientation of the senior teacher and the team members.

3. assisting in the selection of the classes for the team.

4. initiating the project with the faculty.

5. interpreting the project to the children.

6. assisting the team teachers in setting up flexible schedules for classroom activities.

7. coordinating school-wide activities into a schedule that enables all of the children to profit.

8. arranging for wise use of school facilities.

9. facilitating interaction of the team with the total school.

10. assisting in the planning of effective classroom activities to use the special talents and abilities of the team teachers.

11. keeping lines of communication open between the team teachers and other members of the faculty.

12. coordinating the services of the resource teachers in the special areas and the team classes so that the activities are an integral part of the total instructional program.

13. informing the parents of the progress of the project through meetings, letters, and/or bulletins.

14. planning meetings and observations to acquaint parents with the team project.

15. keeping teachers fully informed of new materials.

16. encouraging continuous evaluation of the team project.

17. developing a follow-up program for the children in the program.

18. promoting active participation of the Administrative and Supervisory staff in all aspects of the program.

APPENDIX B

Dear Principal,

With your help and the help of one of your "cooperative" teams, we will be able to survey schools in the Western Washington Area who are using the "cooperative" team teaching approach.

The outcome of this survey should prove advantageous to those participating and should also serve as a guide for others considering a "cooperative" team teaching approach.

A report of our findings will be prepared and each participating principal and team in this survey will receive a copy.

Please use the enclosed envelope to return the entire survey, both your portion and the teacher's portions.

<div style="margin-left: 2em;">

Sincerely,

Wm. G. Gaskell
Associate Professor of Education
Central Washington State College

Allan Holmquist
Graduate Student
Central Washington State College

Norm Standley
Graduate Assistant
Hebeler Campus-Laboratory School
(A Department of CWSC)

</div>

(Comment:For this study the term "cooperative team" will be defined as follows: It involves two or more teachers at the same time with the same or different grade levels who join together in an "equal partnership" relationship, each teaching most or all of the areas of the curriculum to a group totaling approximately thirty students or less per every full time teacher in the team.)

(Comment: If more than one "cooperative" team is operating within your school, select the one in which you have had the closest contact in developing curriculum.)

alh

I. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL

(Please check)

School Setting:___city,___town,___suburb,___rural

Community Structure:___professional,___skilled workers,

___unskilled workers

The majority of the people in your community fall in

which of the above stated job classifications._____

Number of elementary schools in the district_____

Total pupil enrollment of elementary schools in

the district _____

Total pupil enrollment in your school_____

Total enrollment and grade designation of each "cooperative"

team approach, and number of staff in each team; and

place a star* before the team being surveyed

Team   Enrollment   Grade Designation   Number of Staff

If known, the number of elementary schools in the district

that are using the "cooperative" team teaching

approach_____

If you know of other elementary schools in the district that

are using the "cooperative" team approach and you

feel they should be surveyed, please list the school's

name, address, and the principal's name.

Number of teacher aides _____

Number of teacher aides assigned to the team being

surveyed_____

Are these aides with the team all day _____

or part of the day_____?

Does the team being surveyed use volunteer help?

_____yes, _____no

Do you have an assistant principal? _____yes, _____no;

intern?_____yes,_____no

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(Please state)

Your name_____

Your age _____ years

Your sex _____

The highest degree you hold_____

Number of quarter hours you have beyond this

degree_____qtr.hrs.

The number of years you have been an

Educator _____ years

The number of years you were a teacher____years

The number of years you have been a

principal ____years

The number of years you have worked in this school

system_____years

Of those, the number of years

as a teacher_____ years

the number of years

as a principal _____ years

The number of years you have been in your

present position _____ years

What proportion of your time is spent in

teaching responsibilities _____ %

What proportion of your time is spent with

teaching responsibilities with the

team being surveyed? _____ %

Were you principal when the team being

surveyed was formed? _____

The number of years the team being surveyed

has been functioning _____ years

Changes (personnel, procedures, curriculum, etc.,)

that have been made in the team from its

initial form to its present form.

Your initial relationship to the team (advisor,

resource person, active participant, etc.)

Changes that have been made between your initial

relationship with the team and your present

relationship with the team.

III. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Directions: In relation to the role you played in
developing curriculum for use in the "cooperative"
team teaching approach in your school, circle the
one symbol to the right of each role that most
closely approximates the extent to which you agree
or disagree that this was one of the roles you
performed.

SYMBOL	MEANING
SA	·Strongly Agree
A	Agree
U	Undecided
D	Disagree
SD	Strongly Disagree

I. INITIATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

	ROLES	SYMBOLS
1.	Made available to staff sources which provided information on current curriculum developments.	SA A U D SD
2.	Provided time for and led discussions of recent curriculum developments at faculty meetings.	SA A U D SD
3.	Wrote up, and distributed to staff, information on curriculum programs within the district.	SA A U D SD

ROLES   SYMBOLS

4. Provided opportunities for
   individual staff members to
   visit other rooms and schools
   for inservice education.   SA A U D SD

5. Provided time for members of the
   staff to attend educational
   conferences.   SA A U D SD

6. Established inservice education
   programs within the building to
   meet the needs of individuals and
   the school.   SA A U D SD

7. Formulated with assistance from
   staff and students, a school hand-
   book incorporating a philosophy by
   which the school operates.   SA A U D SD

8. Supported, stimulated and encour-
   aged innovation within the building. SA A U D SD

9. Supported staff participation on
   existing district committees.   SA A U D SD

10. Formulated policies with assistance
    from staff.   SA A U D SD

    From the ten performance criteria
            stated above, select the
            one that you interpreted
            as being the most important
            for initiating curriculum
            development and the one that
            you interpreted as being the
            least important.

                    Most important - Number _____

                    Least important - Number _____

II. PLANNING AND PROCEDURAL STAGES OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

ROLES   SYMBOLS

1. Provided information to staff
   regarding factors which influ-
   ence curriculum development.   SA A U D SD

2. Provided information on district
   and legal requirements of curric-
   ulum.   SA A U D SD

3. Included staff in all aspects of
   curriculum development. Curric-
   ulum development, as defined in
   this study, includes planning, selec-
   tion of materials, and selection of
   instructional methods.   SA A U D SD

4. Provided time, money, and facili-
   ties for curriculum meetings.   SA A U D SD

5. Secured needed resources and
   materials.   SA A U D SD

6. Provided professional advice to
   curriculum committees as needed.   SA A U D SD

7. Assisted staff members who have
   district level curriculum
   assignments.   SA A U D SD

8. Participated in district curric-
   ulum assignments.   SA A U D SD

9. Assisted in the development and
   distribution of district curric-
   ulum materials.   SA A U D SD

10. Assisted in organizing curriculum
    laboratories, resource files, test-
    ing materials, and equipment.   SA A U D SD

11. Cooperated with district, county,
    and state representatives, curric-
    ulum coordinators, and supervisors. SA A U D SD

	ROLES	SYMBOLS

12. Recommended for hiring personnel who would complement the curriculum program.   SA A U D SD

13. Included lay people in the development of purposes and goals, and in formulating curricular policies within the district.   SA A U D SD

14. Secured staff participation in school plant planning.   SA A U D SD

From the fourteen performance criteria stated above, select the one that you interpreted as being the most important in the planning and procedural stage of curriculum development and the one that you interpreted as being the least important.

Most important - Number _____

Least important - Number _____

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

	ROLES	SYMBOLS

1. Provided inservice education for affected staff members as needed.   SA A U D SD

2. Conferred with affected staff members.   SA A U D SD

3. Observed the classroom situation, offering assistance and professional advice when needed.   SA A U D SD

4. Discussed curricular developments at faculty meetings.   SA A U D SD

| | ROLES | | SYMBOLS |

<table>
<tr><td>5.</td><td>Assisted in organizing materials centers, resource lists, and procedures for circulation of curricular materials, then detailing this information to staff.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td>6.</td><td>Assisted in establishing procedures for selecting materials.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.</td><td>Assisted staff in locating and selecting resources.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td>8.</td><td>Involved staff in the selection of supplies and equipment.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td>9.</td><td>Provided feedback to the Superintendent's office regarding curriculum programs.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td>10.</td><td>Interpreted the school program to lay people.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>by: a. Distributing materials which explained school curriculum and methods.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>b. Preparing handbooks for parents as necessary.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>c. Conducting group meetings as necessary.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>d. Holding parent-teacher conferences.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>e. Organizing school exhibits.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>f. Supporting school visits by parents.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>g. Creating other means of disseminating ideas to fill gaps such as parent clubs, and study groups.</td><td>SA A U D SD</td></tr>
</table>

From the ten performance criteria on page seven, select the one that you interpreted as

being the most important
for implementing curriculum
development and the one that
you interpreted as being the
least important.

Most important - Number _____

Least important - Number _____

IV. EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM

<u>ROLES</u>   <u>SYMBOLS</u>

1. Included staff and community in
   program evaluation.   SA   A   U   D   SD

   by: a. Conducting group meetings.   SA   A   U   D   SD

       b. Conferencing with individual
           parents, teachers, and
           students.   SA   A   U   D   SD

2. Devised and utilized means of meas-
   uring the educational program.   SA   A   U   D   SD

3. Maintained a file on evaluative
   activities within the school and
   district.   SA   A   U   D   SD

4. Included in the school handbook,
   district or school procedures for
   evaluating all instructional mater-
   ials and resources.   SA   A   U   D   SD

5. Surveyed community opinions about the
   effectiveness of the schools.   SA   A   U   D   SD

6. Cooperated with the Superintendent's
   office in programs of curriculum
   evaluation.   SA   A   U   D   SD

7. Forwarded recommendations from staff
   and community to the Superintendent.   SA   A   U   D   SD

From the seven performance criteria stated
above, select the one that you
interpreted as being the most
important for evaluating curric-
ulum development and the one that
you interpreted as being the
least important.

Most important - Number _____

Least important - Number _____

That concludes the survey, thank you for your time and
cooperation.

APPENDIX C

HEBELER CAMPUS-LABORATORY SCHOOL
(A Department of CWSC)

Dear Principal,

This is a request for your help in an attempt to "find out where we are" in the elementary schools in Washington State. If most of the elementary principals of the state <u>can somehow find the time</u> to complete the survey, we will all have gained. A report on this survey will be prepared and you will receive a copy of it. Please try to clear a block of time and do what you can with the various items. Your effort is appreciated, and be assured it will contribute significantly to elementary education in Washington State. Please use the enclosed envelope to return the survey.

Sincerely,

Wm. G. Gaskell
Associate Professor of Education
Director, Hebeler Campus-Laboratory
School

I. Information About Your School

(Please check)

School Setting:____city, ____town, ____suburb, ____rural

School Size: ____to 100, ____100-300, ____300-600

____600-900, ____over 900

Organization: ____graded, ____nongraded, ____both

If graded: ____teachers do some exchanging,

____totally self-contained

Consultant and Specialist: Assistance with ____music,

____ art, ____PE, ____Reading, ____FLES, ____Social Studies,

____ Science, ____ Curriculum, ____other (specify)

Number of secretaries and clerks _____

Number of teacher aides _____

Do you use volunteer help for teachers? ____yes, ____no

II. Please check the column that best describes the
    situation in your school and district.

	A Always	B Usually	C Sometimes	D Seldom	E Never
1. The principal is involved in curriculum decisions.					
2. The teachers are involved in curriculum decisions.					
3. Central office personnel are involved in curriculum decisions.					
4. The principal is involved in district administrative policy decisions.					
5. Teachers are involved in district administrative policy decisions.					
6. The principal is involved in the ordering of supplies and equipment.					
7. Teachers are involved in the ordering of supplies and equipment.					

	A	B	C	D	E
	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
8. Inservice education (or training for teachers is a district-wide function.)					
9. Inservice education is tailored to the needs of individuals and schools.					
10. Released time is provided for inservice education.					
11. Teachers are paid directly for their time spent in inservice education.					
12. Teachers earn salary schedule credits for inservice education.					
13. The local professional staff is free to make decisions about what to teach and how to teach it within state and local requirements.					
14. The local district regularly budgets for support of research, experimentation, and innovation.					

	A Always	B Usually	C Sometimes	D Seldom	E Never
15. Individual dif- ferences among pupils are adjusted for, in the instruc- tional program, in planned ways.					
16. The instruc- tional program is evaluated each year.					
17. Children are grouped for instruction on the basis of achievement.					
18. Children are grouped for instruction on the basis of ability.					
19. Children are grouped for instruction in a flexible pat- tern with the task involved and the needs of individuals used as the basis for grouping.					

III. Please check the appropriate responses:

1. School uses: ____standardized achievement tests,

_____group intelligence tests, ____individual intelli-

gence tests, ____school or district-wide achievement tests, ____personality tests, ____aptitude tests,____ other (specify)

2. In reporting pupil progress to parents your school uses: ____conferences, ____report cards, ____both.

3. If letter grades or marks are used, they are in terms of: ____the pupil, ____the class, ____the school, ____the community, ____other (specify)

4. In the area of teacher evaluation:

    a. ____The principal is primarily responsible.

    b. ____Visitations are made by central office person-
       nel for evaluation purposes.

    c. ____The principal observes each teacher about once
       a week.

    d. ____The principal observes each teacher about once
       a month.

    e. ____The principal observes each teacher about once
       a semester.

    f. ____The principal observes each teacher about once
       a year.

    g. ____Teacher-principal conferences are held to dis-
       cuss the evaluation.

    h. ____The teacher receives a copy of an evaluation
       form with no conferences unless requested.

    i. ____The teacher receives no information about the
       evaluation.

5. In the area of administrative evaluation:

    a. ____The principal is never made aware of an eval-
       uation.

b. ____There is a regular procedure in which the principal meets with the superintendent or his agent for evaluation purposes.

c. ____The principal is encouraged to do regular self-evaluations.

6. In the area of guidance, counseling, and testing:

a. ____There is a person assigned to the school for these purposes.

b. ____A central office person(s) is in the school on a regular schedule.

c. ____A central office person is available on request.

d. ____All pupils receive periodic counseling attention.

e. ____Counseling and/or guidance is by referral only.

7. Do you have a library in your school? ____yes, ____no.

8. If so, is it staffed by a librarian? ____yes, ____no.

9. Full time? ____yes, ____no.

10. If there is a library, is it used for more than book shelving and check out? ____yes, ____no.

11. If there is a librarian, is the individual involved instructionally with children? ____yes, ____no.

12. Does the elementary teacher in your community have the same status as the high school teacher? ____yes, ____no.

13. Does your district have a written statement of philosophy? ____yes, ____no.

14. If "yes" to Number 13, has the statement of philosophy been supplemented by specifically worded aims and objectives? ____yes, ____no.

IV.

1. Please list "newer" activities, such as inquiry training, team teaching, structural linguistics, etc., that are taking place in your school.

2. What texts do you use for reading? (listing by company is adequate)

3. What texts do you use for language arts?

4. What texts do you use for arithmetic?

5. What texts do you use for science?

6. What texts do you use for Social Studies?

7. Approximately what percent of school time is scheduled for:

_____Reading
_____Other Language Arts
_____Arithmetic
_____Science
_____Social Studies
_____P.E.
_____Music
_____Art
_____Other (specify)

V. On an average, over a year's time, approximately what
    percent of your time each week is spent:

_____Away from the building at meetings, on district
       business, etc.
_____Teaching
_____Supervising
_____In the office doing administrative work
_____In professional reading
_____Counseling
_____Talking with parents
_____Talking with teachers
_____Planning