

1975

A Study of the Sault Ste. Marie Separate Schools' In-school Professional Development Days.

Sam A. Fera

Northern Michigan University, kmcdonou@nmu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.nmu.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Fera, Sam A., "A Study of the Sault Ste. Marie Separate Schools' In-school Professional Development Days." (1975). *All NMU Master's Theses*. 215.

<https://commons.nmu.edu/theses/215>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at NMU Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All NMU Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of NMU Commons. For more information, please contact kmcdonou@nmu.edu, bsarjean@nmu.edu.

A STUDY OF THE SAULT STE. MARIE
SEPARATE SCHOOLS' IN-SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT DAYS

by Sam A. Fera

Presented to the Faculty of Education of
Northern Michigan University as partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
Educational Specialist Degree

Marquette, Michigan, 1975

ProQuest Number: 10804839

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10804839

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was prepared under the supervision of Dr. Henry Prince, Professor at Lake Superior State College and Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Fred Mills, Director of Education for the Sault Ste. Marie District Separate School Board, and Dr. George Richens, Professor at Northern Michigan University.

The writer is indebted to his colleagues for their continued interest and valuable help; to Dr. Prince for the original design and consistent availability; to Dr. Richens and Dr. E. J. Schacht for their encouragement; to Mr. Mills who made the study a reality by providing the resources and his personal support; to the principals and teachers of the Sault Ste. Marie District Separate School Board for taking time to respond to the various requests and questionnaires; and to his secretary for patiently making sense from his poorly written notes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
A. Introduction to the Topic	1
B. Definition of Terms	4
C. Need for the Study	5
D. The Problem	8
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
A. Professional Development - A Brief History - Whose Job Is It?	9
B. The Need for Professional Development	12
C. Conditions Necessary for a Successful Workshop	15
D. Related Research	18
E. Summary	29
II. PURPOSES AND INTENDED OUTCOMES OF STUDY	31
A. Objectives of the Study	31
B. Benefits of the Study	31
C. The Project Format	32
D. Expected Results	33
III. RESULTS	34
A. Introduction	34
B. Results of In-School Professional Development Activities	35
C. Summary of Results	45
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48
A. Conclusions	48
B. Recommendations	49
C. Other Areas Worthy of Study	52

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

	page
Appendices	
A. Initial Letters to Principals	53
B. First Questionnaire	58
C. Interim Report to Principals	62
D. Post Questionnaire	65
E. Pertinent Teacher Comments Re: Professional Development Activity	70
F. Teacher Recommended Activities for Future Professional Development Days	77
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 83

SECTION I - THE PROBLEM

THE PROBLEM

A. Introduction to the Topic

If one were to take a survey of the superintendents or directors of educational districts in Canada to determine the greatest educational need in their system, most of them would say it is the improvement of the teaching-learning process, i.e., professional development of staff. The primary objective of any professional development program should be the improvement of the teaching-learning process.

No person enters the teaching profession fully qualified for the duties and responsibilities to be faced in the classroom. The experiences, the problems and challenges of daily work, if properly assessed, will promote professional growth, but the amount of this growth will depend upon the depth of personal study that accompanies the analysis of these situations. In other words, in order to become competent and to be informed, a teacher must continue to grow professionally at all times.¹

¹ F.J. Gathercole, "The Professional Development of Staff," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. II; No. 3, (Dec., 1962), p. 9.

Rapidly expanding technology and its accompanying explosion of knowledge forces educators to realize that teachers must regularly increase their own effectiveness in the classroom.² Recognizing this need and the fact that elementary school teachers have but a limited amount of time during the regular school day to study matters beyond direct involvement with students, the Ontario Department of Education introduced the concept of professional development days. These days provide the teachers of Ontario with the opportunity to become aware of educational innovations and developments.³

Early in 1973, the Ontario government passed Department of Education Regulation 546/73, School Year and School Holidays, which specified that "a school year shall include 185 instructional days and the remaining (12) school days shall be professional activity days."⁴ Professional activity includes "evaluation of the progress of pupils, consultation with parents, the counselling of pupils, curriculum and program evaluation, professional development of teachers, and

2 J. Comras and R. Masterman, "A Rationale for comprehensive In-Service Programs," Clearing House, Vol. 46; No. 7, (March, 1972), p. 424.

3 Province of Ontario, Ministry of Education Memorandum 1972-73:23, The New School Year Policy, p. 1.

4 Province of Ontario, Department of Education Regulation 546/73, School Year and School Holidays, p. 1.

attendance at educational conferences."⁵

In February of 1973, all school boards and school principals received a Ministry of Education Memorandum No. 1972-73:23 entitled "The New School Year Policy." The memorandum gave boards the authority to set their school calendars. Some of the guidelines were as follows:

- (a) School begins and ends as per regulation.
- (b) The school year will consist of 197 school days.
- (c) Statutory holidays will remain as per regulation.
- (d) By April 30th, a modified school year plan must be submitted to the Regional Office for approval.⁶

School boards were given the power to declare twelve legal school days as professional activity or professional development days for teachers. What was to be done on these days was left to the discretion of the board and its supervisory officer.

5 Province of Ontario, Department of Education Memorandum 1973-74:49, Professional Activity Days: Report on Survey, p. 2.

6 Province of Ontario, Ministry of Education Memorandum 1972-73:23, The New School Year Policy.

B. Definition of Terms

Listed here is the terminology used in this paper.

(a) Professional Development (P.D.) Day, In-Service Workshop and Professional Activity Day are synonymous. These words describe the learning activities which promote professional growth in teachers. They are conducted on school days which the school board designates as professional activity days.

(b) City-Wide P.D. Day. On this day, the district's entire academic staff meets together and participates in the same activity.

(c) Divisional P.D. Day. On this day, the divisions - primary (K to 3), junior (4-6) and intermediate (7-8) - meet together and participate in the same activity.

(d) Grade Level P.D. Day. On this day, the teachers of the same grade meet together and participate in the same activity.

(e) In-School P.D. Day. On this day, professional activities are conducted in each school building and the building principal is responsible for co-ordinating the program.

(f) Family of Schools. In this type of activity a group of schools, in a particular area of the city, meet

together to participate in the same activity. This activity is co-ordinated by the principals of the schools involved.

C. Need for the Study

During 1973-74, the school board adopted the following professional activity days.⁷

1. October 16, 1973 - p.m. only - city-wide
2. November 9, 1973 - all day - city-wide
3. January 16, 1974 - p.m. only - in-school
4. March 7, 1974 - p.m. only - in-school
5. April 17, 1974 - p.m. only - in-school
6. June 22,23,25,26, 1974 - in-school
7. June 24, 1974 - city-wide

Summary

Number of legislated school days.....197

Number of professional activity days..... 8

Number of instructional days.....189

A survey conducted during February and March, 1974, and released by the Department of Education Memorandum 1973-74:49⁸ stated that 93% of the elementary school teachers

⁷ Sault Ste. Marie District Separate School Board Director's Memorandum Modified School Year Plan. (May 24, 1973).

⁸ Province of Ontario, Department of Education Memorandum 1973-74:49, Professional Activity Days: Report on Survey.

and principals regarded professional activity days as satisfactory and very satisfactory. The same memorandum stated that "comments indicate that many parents are not in favour of professional activity days as they are currently constituted."⁹ Parents tend to regard these occasions "... as time off for teachers and are particularly sensitive to babysitting difficulties, lack of information and the different schedules for schools where their children attend."¹⁰ Other parents expressed that "if properly used, the professional activity days would be of benefit to the children through resultant improvement in teaching techniques."¹¹

Local administrators observed that their teachers were 100% in favour of P.D. days and of increasing the number for 1974-75. The board agreed with these observations and increased the number from eight to nine. Five of the nine days were to be spent on in-school activities.

Parents, however, are still speculating whether instructional time lost is benefiting the children of the system. Administrators are dubious of their benefits to teachers.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.

These professional activity days are costing the board \$180,729 in salaries for the nine non-instructional days or \$498 per teacher.¹² The board is concerned with the expense of these days and whether the benefits derived by the teachers and the students are worth it.

P.D. days are so new in Ontario that no local or regional research is available. The only provincial research is listed above and it says nothing about the lasting effects of P.D. days. To date the determining factor in deciding the effectiveness of local P.D. activity has been the pitch, resonance and number of times one hears the words "I really enjoyed that!" or "That was good!" Are P.D. activities supposed to entertain teachers?¹³

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of local P.D. days and to gather information which might answer some of the questions posed above, it is proposed that a study be conducted on an in-school P.D. day, i.e., the afternoon of February 7, 1975.

12 Interview with Sault Ste. Marie District Separate School Board Controller of Finance, Feb. 1st, 1975.

13 R.C. Cunningham, "Resurrecting Meaningful In-Service Training," Journal of Reading, Vol. XV; No. 7, (April, 1972), p. 486.

D. The Problem

Information was gathered on P.D. days in Sault Ste. Marie. The collection of this data was based on the following null hypotheses:

1. In-school professional activity days are not helpful to teachers.
2. In-school professional activity days do not improve the teaching-learning process.
3. Teachers do not prefer a particular type of P.D. day.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. P.D. - A Brief History - Whose Job is It?

The pattern of organized professional development and in-service activity has changed materially in the last two decades. When the 1940's produced a large school population and the shortage of teachers was rampant, Departments of Education encouraged teachers' institutes and workshops to help teachers with their problems. Local school boards, school superintendents, and teachers' colleges readily cooperated to make teachers more effective in the classroom.¹⁴

Teachers' colleges and universities had no competition in the area of staff development. Teachers and superintendents believed that these institutions of higher learning were responsible for keeping the teaching staff abreast of new ideas. Teachers dutifully attended night courses and summer courses to obtain degrees and credit hours which visibly showed their professional development. School districts showed little resistance and readily accepted additional degrees and certificates as adequate evidence of professional growth.¹⁵

¹⁴ F.J. Gathercole, "The Professional Development of Staff," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. II; No. 3, (Dec., 1962), pp. 9-11.

¹⁵ E.A. Dillon, "Staff Development: Whose Job is It?", Educational Leadership, Vol. XXXII; (Nov., 1974), p. 137.

With the arrival of Sputnik, the educators of America suddenly began to look critically at the quality of teacher education and at their own responsibility for in-service training. As one specific and widespread response to this "consciousness raising" many school districts established professional development programs. Superintendents began to realize that teachers' colleges provided a basic education for teachers but the local district was best able to decide which areas of the teaching-learning process needed development.¹⁶ Thus began the evolution of professional development.

Along with the arrival of teacher militancy, and negotiations for salary and working conditions, a strong determination developed in teachers to control programs which affect the teaching staff. One of these was professional development. Provincial and state teacher organizations have led and are still leading the teachers in this direction. Teachers are becoming more and more unwilling to accept in-service activities of which they have no part in planning or which are forced upon them by their superiors.¹⁷ Gone is the teacher who complacently accepts decisions from "above".

16 Ibid, p. 139.

17 Ibid, p. 139.

Teacher groups want a voice in local professional activity. They believe that professional development of staff should be based on the needs of the individual teacher.

In the evolving process of P.D. it has been proven that the teacher is the key person.¹⁸ Unless the teacher sees a need for improving and unless the teacher is willing to listen and change, in-service activities have no effect on the teaching-learning process.¹⁹

No one can contest the fact that teachers' colleges and universities, school superintendents and teacher organizations have a vital role to play in staff development. But of all the people in the school system, the person who is most ideally situated to organize and facilitate the professional development of teachers is the principal of the school. In his daily association with teachers and children, he should recognize the needs of the school and is in the ideal position to influence the teaching-learning process.²⁰ Professional development and improvement within the school requires an

18 Gathercole, loc. cit.

19 D.M. Adams, "Helping Teachers Cope With Change," Education Canada, Vol. XIV; No. 3, (Sept., 1974), p. 17.

20 F.J. Gathercole, "The Professional Development of Staff," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. II; No. 3, (Dec., 1962), pp. 9-11.

atmosphere in which teachers feel they have the support, confidence and respect of the principal.²¹

In summary, professional development is the responsibility of all the people involved in education. The colleges and universities are responsible for producing a well-rounded teacher who is ready to meet the challenges of today's classrooms. The school district is responsible for determining the needs of the system and providing teachers with time and resources to meet them. The teachers and teacher organizations are responsible for their own professional growth by collaborating with administration, by identifying needs and by planning and organizing P.D. activities.²²

B. The Need for Professional Development

There is a definite need for on-going professional development for teachers within a school district. A number of reasons have been mentioned above, but there are others which require consideration.

Many members of the teaching staff, including administrators, graduated from teacher education courses long ago

²¹ D.M. Adams, "Helping Teachers Cope With Change," Education Canada, Vol. XVI; No. 3, (Sept., 1974), p. 18.

²² E.A. Dillon, "Staff Development: Whose Job Is It?", Educational Leadership, Vol. XXXII; (Nov., 1974), pp. 139-40.

and are out of touch with the new trends and teacher-training techniques of today. Some of these teachers and administrators are familiar with these new techniques but for one reason or another have never received first hand training in using them. Even the best teachers are reluctant to try new methods either for fear of failure in the eyes of their peers and superiors or to avoid admitting ignorance.²³ Bradfield states that "experienced teachers as well as new and inexperienced teachers are concerned about their professional growth and improvement."²⁴ In-service workshops provide opportunities for teachers to take a good look at new trends and ideas. Through observation and personal involvement teachers will lose some of their reluctance to change and perhaps attempt some of the new ideas presented.

School superintendents throughout Canada and the United States readily acknowledge the need for improving the teaching-learning process. Portlow concurs. He states that "rapid changes which continue to occur in our way of living demand major changes in the kind of educational programs provided.

23 S. Kleiman, "A Guide for Effective In-Service Education," The Clearing House, Vol. XLVIII; No. 6, (Feb., 1974).

24 L.E. Bradfield, Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools, (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Books, 1964), p. 62.

New knowledge about the learning process, about educational techniques and about human relations requires an active continuing in-service program."²⁵

In-service programs provide superintendents and school districts with the opportunity to set objectives and deduce means to achieve them. They further provide the opportunity to demonstrate new techniques in learning, to implement a new program, to share ideas, and to promote staff morale. The list in support of P.D. programs is endless.

Because of decreasing enrollments, teacher mobilization has suddenly stopped the annual influx of fresh young teachers armed with current educational theory. No veteran teacher, despite his competence, was exempt from the challenges of these young troopers. The enthusiasm and zeal of the "beginner" strengthened the entire staff and often effected changes which other outside influences could not achieve. Since new teachers are no longer flooding the schools, the experienced teacher is not being indirectly exposed to as many new ideas. Professional activity would fill the gap created by faculty

²⁵ H.R. Portlow, "Professional Development: Top Level Need, Second Level Priority," Education Canada, Vol. XI; No.4, (Dec., 1971), p.p. 61-64.

stabilization.²⁶

Denemark cites some trends which make apparent the need for improved educational programs for teachers. He believes that preparation for teaching is a continuous process throughout the teacher's professional life and as such the teacher must keep abreast of new ideas. He goes on to say that "teachers must continue to grow because of (1) the ever increasing and changing of knowledge, (2) the world's trend toward specialization, and (3) the geographic mobility of our population."²⁷

Professional development of staff is a necessary ingredient of education today.

C. Conditions Necessary for a Successful Workshop

Borg, Langer, and Kelley classify in-service education into three major areas of instruction: "(1) curriculum content, (2) professional knowledge, and (3) classroom skills."²⁸

26 R.C. Cunningham, "Resurrecting Meaningful In-Service Training," Journal of Reading, Vol. XV; No. 7, (April, 1972), p. 485.

27 G.W. Denemark "Continued Growth; Today's Imperative," Educational Leadership, Vol. XX; No. 2, (Nov., 1962), p. 85.

28 W.R. Borg et al., "The Minicourse: A New Tool for the Education of Teachers," Education, Vol. XC; (Feb.-Mar., 1970), p. 232.

Curriculum content refers to subject matter, professional knowledge pertains to pedagogical concepts, and classroom skills deal with the specific teaching skills needed to function in the classroom.

Although workshops date from the 1930's, there were relatively few changes in basic design for some thirty-five years.²⁹ Used to impart any type of knowledge to teachers, this classic model was usually sponsored by colleges and universities, local school districts or teacher organizations, and was virtually the same everywhere in America.

This model provided one day for the professional development of all the teachers in the district or region. Utilizing a broad theme like "Education in the Seventies," a "kickoff speaker" was selected to present the "meat" or theme of the P.D. day. After a coffee break, small group discussions were held. Each group had a group leader and recorder. These groups agreed or disagreed with the speaker, reached a consensus, and reported to the meeting-at-large at the end of the day. This type of in-service had no lasting effects.³⁰

29 E.S. Girault & R.E. Gross, "Resource Personnel Workshops: A Team Approach to Educational Change," Social Education, Vol. XXXVII; No. 3, (Mar., 1973), p. 201.

30 J.E. Nagle, "Staff, Development: Do it Right," Journal of Reading, Vol. XVI; No. 2, (Nov., 1972), p. 124-25.

During the last decade all kinds of in-service models developed. Almost all of the founders of effective in-service education programs claim that certain ideal conditions must prevail for a workshop to have a lasting influence and to effect a change in teacher behaviour. The P.D. thoughts of Cunningham,³¹ Adams,³² Kleiman,³³ Bradfield,³⁴ Muskopf and Moss,³⁵ Tilles and Lahart,³⁶ Morr,³⁷ and Portlow³⁸ are very similar. They are as follows.

The activity should be conducted when the teacher is fresh and removed from the daily classroom situation.

31 Cunningham, loc. cit., pp. 485-87.

32 D.M. Adams, "Helping Teacher Cope With Change," Education Canada, Vol. XIV; No. 3, (Sept., 1974), pp. 16-19.

33 Kleiman, loc. cit., pp. 372-74.

34 Bradfield, loc. cit., pp. 62-64.

35 A. Muskopf & J. Moss, "Open Education - an In-Service Mode," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. LXXIII; No. 3, (Dec., 1972), pp. 117-124.

36 C.R. Tilles & D.E. Lahart, "Teachers Teaching Teachers In-Service Training in Environmental Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, (Mar., 1975), pp. 160-62.

37 C.F. Morr, "Professional Development & Inner City Problems," Education Canada, Vol. XIV; No. 4, (Dec., 1974), pp. 20-21.

38 Portlow, loc. cit., pp. 61-64.

The participants must be involved in identifying the need and theme of the workshop, the planning, implementing and evaluating of the workshop.

The workshop must be practical and useful to the teachers. It should center around curriculum, professional knowledge or teaching skills.

Outside specialists may be used for completely new ideas, but the peer-group influence is just as great.

Workshops should be based on need, not whim.

In-service education should be outwardly and financially supported by superintendents.

A successful workshop is thoroughly planned, implemented and evaluated.

Adams summarizes it by saying that "confidence, trust, support and personal experiences play an important role in an individual teacher's ability to decide to assume a new attitude toward learning and to experiment with new ideas."³⁹

D. Related Research

In-service education has been called everything from "an essential and integral part of the progressive school system" to "a complete waste of valuable time." Hunkler's

39 Adams, loc. cit., p. 18.

review of the literature reflects this view.

J.A. and Ruth Izzo in a study of the re-education of elementary school teachers concluded that in-service programs were an effective means of helping teachers acquire sufficient background in modern mathematics. Moreover, Dosset in a study of sixty-seven elementary school teachers found that those teachers who had completed a mathematics in-service workshop had a better understanding of mathematics than those who had not completed the workshop. However, in reflecting the opposite view, Hand, in a study of 348 elementary teachers found that the achievement of first, third and sixth-grade students whose teachers were in-service participants did not differ significantly from those students whose teachers were not in-service participants. Furthermore, Creswell, in an article concerning the effectiveness of mathematics workshop concluded that college courses are far more effective in preparing teachers to teach modern mathematics than are the present kinds of in-service programs.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ R. Hunkler, "An Evaluation of a Short-Term In-Service Mathematics Program for Elementary School Teachers," School Science and Mathematics, Vol. LXXI; No. 7, (Oct., 1971), p. 650.

Other researchers, Girault and Gross,⁴¹ Bradfield,⁴² Felker, Goering and Lindern,⁴³ Longmore,⁴⁴ and Adams,⁴⁵ express evidence to show that P.D. can be of little value to teachers. In the introduction to their new workshop model, Girault and Gross state that they had "reached the conclusion that long-term carryover (from workshops) in terms of significant change in education was pretty minimal." Further, "the morass that characterizes numerous school systems when it comes to fundamental change has so engulfed most teachers that after a year, even in their own classes, there is a serious retrogression. New insights and approaches gleaned... are rapidly lost."⁴⁶ (These authors supported their statements by quoting conclusions from the American Institutes for Research Project Impact)

41 E.S. Girault & R.E. Gross, "Resource Personnel Workshops: A Team Approach to Educational Change," Social Education, Vol. XXXVII; No. 3, (Mar., 1973), pp. 201-207.

42 Bradfield, loc. cit., pp. 63-64.

43 D.W. Felker, J. Goering and K.W. Lindern, "Teacher Rigidity and Continuing Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXII; No. 4, (Winter, 1971), pp. 460-63.

44 A.J. Longmore, "Retraining Teachers--points to ponder," Education Canada, Vol. IV; No. 4, (Dec., 1974), pp. 18-19

45 Adams, loc. cit.

46 Girault, loc. cit., p. 201.

Bradfield states that the planning of professional growth activities by supervisory leaders must involve purpose, procedures and evaluation. In doing this the total situation of the teacher must be considered in determining the most effective means of helping him. In order to help teachers improve their methods of teaching, their procedures and the effect they are having on their learners, the entire individual situation must be studied. Bradfield claims that "unless such things as conferences, meetings, bulletins, demonstrations, visitations and professional readings are used for specific purposes and adapted to needs, they are certain to be considered little more than routine. Techniques should be flexible enough to meet the specific needs of each teaching-learning situation."⁴⁷ Bradfield believes that the organizers of professional development activities are not doing the above and in view of this, in-service workshops are useless.

Felker, Goering and Lindern claim that "rigidity or inflexibility," which characterized the American teacher of the early 1900's, is still present today. They go on to state that "Felker and Smith found that teachers with experience were less flexible in their approach to educational problems,"⁴⁸ than teachers without classroom experience.

47 Bradfield, loc. cit., p.63.

48 Felker, loc. cit., p. 18.

These authors believe that teachers become inflexible because the universities emphasize organization and control as the number one ingredient of a good teacher. In addition, administrators have a built-in bias for the teacher who has good control. Because institutions of higher learning are encouraging rigidity and administrators are reinforcing it, teachers who are inflexible and resist innovation are produced.

Rigid and inflexible administrators tend to breed rigid and inflexible teachers who are promoted to positions where they are rigid and inflexible administrators. The process is self-perpetuating. The result of this process is that change and reform are not encouraged. Thus, in-service education will have little effect on the teaching staff of the rigid administrator.

Longmore supports the views of Felker et al. He believes that:

Short term in-service has little effect on long-range teaching. In a recent survey two-thirds of the urban school systems in Canada expressed dissatisfaction with current professional development or in-service programs. The major concerns were (1) no legal requirement to have teachers participate in professional development, (2) the lack of co-ordination of professional development programs, and (3) the lack of finances to support adequately

a professional development program.⁴⁹

In Adam's article he states that "a number of recent studies indicate that the main reason actual changes in children's learning have been slow has to do with one factor - the classroom teacher."⁵⁰ Unless the teacher is receptive to changes, even well-financed and carefully designed programs have little or no effect.

Adams uses the experiences of the Ford Foundation's Comprehensive School Improvement Program to support his view. In explaining their lack of success the C.S.I. Program cited conservatism of teachers as the major roadblock to reform. It was reported that teachers who were exposed "to working examples of new techniques were reluctant to pay more than lip service to the ideas generated by a successful innovation. In fact, it was reported that attempts to change teacher's attitudes often resulted in an increased resistance to new ideas."⁵¹

The conclusions of Weber's study of obstacles to be overcome in a teacher in-service education program supported Adam's views. Weber found that there were two major problems

49 Ibid.

50 Adams, loc. cit., p. 18.

51 Ibid.

to be overcome: the workload pressures of teachers and "an unprofessional attitude among teachers."⁵²

From the above comments one might conclude that professional development activities are of little value to teachers. Au contraire, many authors and researchers have opposite views.

Pickerl's study, of in-service education in the Westside, Nebraska Schools, pointed out some of the values to be gained from programs designed for continued professional growth of teachers. His study revealed that teachers, who participated in a program of professional development, grew professionally in increased ability to provide for pupil differences, to plan together, to use instructional materials, to use group processes and to make the school more democratic. He concluded that the in-service programs resulted in improved classroom procedures, curriculum materials, individual instructions, grouping practices and teaching skills.⁵³

In 1959, Winger conducted a study to determine how educators viewed in-service programs. This study showed that

52 C.A. Weber, "Obstacles to be Overcome in a Program of Educating Teachers In-Service," Educational Administration and Supervisors, Vol. XXVIII, (Dec., 1942), p. 47.

53 G.E. Pickerl, "A Study of the In-Service Education Program in the Westside Community Schools," (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers' College, 1960).

teachers and instructional leaders believe that in-service education programs improve the quality of instruction and that they are necessary to school programs. Winger specified that teachers preferred programs which were centered around teaching methods and subject matter preparation.⁵⁴

In his 1974 study to determine the effectiveness of in-service programs, as perceived by the givers and receivers of these programs, Winn⁵⁵ verified Winger's finding. He stated that the reasons for the in-service program's "success" were

- (a) that the program was both child and product oriented,
- (b) that it improved professional growth,
- (c) that it promoted valuable social interaction with university and community teams of instructional peers, and
- (d) that it will result in eventual monetary and greater employment opportunities.

The instructors felt that ample space was provided and materials and information were adequate. They perceived

54 H.D. Winger, "Orientation and In-Service Education in Second and Third Class School Systems of Pennsylvania," (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959).

55 U.R. Winn, "Assessment of How In-Service Recipients, In-Service Instructors and Decision Makers Perceive a Teacher-Training In-Service Program in a Model Neighborhood Area," University of Pittsburgh, 1974. Dissertations and Abstracts International. Vol.35; No. 8, (Feb., 1975).

the mixture of degree and non-degree classes as beneficial to students and instructors.

From the administrative viewpoint, this arrangement brought professional and non-professional personnel from various levels together to share a common goal. All administrators interviewed expressed the opinion that such relationships do not create any problems and they should combine their efforts to provide better schools in the community. "The study concluded that the participants (teachers, students and administrators) involved in the program reacted generally favorably to the program."⁵⁶

A similar study, which based its conclusions on teachers and university specialists, was conducted by Jacquith in 1973. Jacquith's conclusions were more definite than Winn and Winger. He asserted that:

1. Most of the competencies developed for this study would be acceptable objectives for in-service education.
2. Involvement of teachers in the selection of objectives and the organization of methods for in-service education were closely associated with teacher-willingness to participate in in-service education.
3. Most teachers and principals perceived in-service education at the local building level as the most preferable method of in-service education.
4. The apparent unwillingness of university specialists to become involved in in-service education and their general preference for developing competencies in on-campus

56 Ibid.

classes suggested that effective consultants for in-service education might be experienced teachers or administrators, and university specialists in specific competency areas.

5. On the basis of perceived importance and willingness for in-service education, the most probable areas for successful in-service education would be in the teaching strategy or diagnostic categories of competencies.⁵⁷

A study designed to assess a consumer education in-service program in relation to the teaching behavior of home economics teachers in South-eastern Ohio was conducted by Slater in 1974.⁵⁸ She proved that the education program was effective in terms of statistically significant changes in teacher behavior related to a gain in knowledge. She also found an increase in the number of weeks consumer education was taught and an increase in the use of methods and materials presented at the institute. However, this same study showed no statistically significant change in teacher attitude or student achievement.

A study which concluded that an individualized in-service training program designed to meet the unique needs of a school can apparently meet those needs with lasting

57 C.E. Jacquith, "An Analysis of perceptions of Junior High School Teachers, Principals, and University Specialists Concerning In-Service Education," University of Michigan, Dissertations and Abstracts International, Vol. 34; (Oct., 1973), 1485A.

58 S.T. Slater, "Assessment of a Consumer Education In-Service Program in Relation to Teaching Behavior of Home Economics Teachers," Ohio State University, 1974, Dissertations and Abstracts International, Vol. 35; No. 8, (Feb., 1975) 4026B.

effects was conducted by Merryman in 1973.⁵⁹ The purposes of this study were to determine the lasting effects of in-service education and to identify the elements which gave this effect. The study resulted in the following observations:

(1) It appears that an in-service training program can result in greater utilization of media by most teachers over an extended period of time.

(2) A training program that includes the teaching of media production skills can apparently result in teachers producing some of their own audio-visual resources over an extended period of time if they are provided with the necessary materials and time.

(3) The role of the principal in giving continuous support to the objective of a media in-service program seems to be a crucial factor in determining the extent to which teachers will continue to make greater use of media.

(4) Following an in-service training program, it appears that most teachers will continue to utilize audio-visual hardware to a greater extent if there is a sufficient quantity of equipment in the school to meet the needs of all teachers, and if that equipment is easily accessible.

(5) When teachers are taught the skills of operating audio-visual equipment and producing their own materials, it appears that immediate application is important for these skills to remain stable.

(6) Certain elements of individualization appear to be effective in bringing about change in utilization of media by classroom teachers, if they are built into the training program.

(7) No matter how successful an in-service program might be in bringing about change in most teachers, it appears that there are always a few who resist change and cling to their traditional methodology.

(8) It appears that relatively few teachers will pursue additional in-service experiences in educational media to any great extent, through workshops or graduate college courses.

59 D.P. Merryman, "A Case Study of Individualized In-Service Training of Teachers in Educational Media," (unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1973), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 34; (Oct., 1973), I755A.

(9) With the rapid changes taking place in the field of educational media and technology, it seems that teachers need in-service support at the local school level, on a continuing basis.

(10) If classroom teachers have continued, over an extended period of time, to utilize the knowledge and skills acquired in one individualized in-service program in educational media, it is likely that teachers in other districts in the nation would increase their media utilization if they received a similar in-service training experience.⁶⁰

While the foregoing is not an exhaustive review of the literature, the research evidence available in support of and in opposition to the validity of P.D. activities is representatively presented here.

E. Summary

In-service development is of concern to the whole staff of the school system. Teachers must be concerned with improving their own teaching competence. Principals must be concerned with improving their administrative and supervisory competence. Both should be concerned about their continuing general education for this can contribute to the effectiveness of their service. Specialist consultants, supervisors and superintendents cannot ignore their own professional development. On the one hand, they must exercise professional leadership while on the other hand, as personnel under their direction grow, they must be able to modify their own techniques

60. Ibid.

and procedures. Of real significance is the cumulative effect of a vital in-service development program. It serves to stimulate and to motivate throughout the system, and benefits accrue to all who are involved.

SECTION II - PURPOSES AND INTENDED OUTCOMES OF STUDY

PURPOSES AND INTENDED OUTCOMES OF STUDY

A. Objectives of the Study

This study has several objectives. They may be classified into primary and secondary.

The primary objectives are:

- (1) to determine the effectiveness of in-school P.D. days, and
- (2) to prove that in-school P.D. days are valuable and necessary to improve the teaching-learning process.

The secondary objectives are:

- (1) to ascertain the types of P.D. activities preferred by the teachers, and
- (2) to solicit suggestions which would be helpful in the organization and arrangement of professional activities.

Briefly, this study is aimed at obtaining data which could be used to conduct professional activities helpful to teachers. This data would be shared with other Ontario educators.

B. Benefits of the Study

As has been mentioned above, professional activity days are new to the Province of Ontario. No Ontario guidelines are available as to what should be done on these days.

The short-range benefits of this study will be:

- (1) to provide data which will be used to plan and conduct future P.D. activities, and
- (2) to clarify the views of teachers and principals regarding P.D. days.

The results will be shared with other educators in Ontario and perhaps serve to encourage further research.

C. The Project Format

The afternoon of February 7, 1975, was an in-school in-service P.D. day co-ordinated by the building principal. The intent was to determine the utilization of this afternoon by the principal, the teachers and/or the principal and teachers together.

To accumulate data, building principals were contacted before February 7, 1975, and asked for their objectives and plans for that P.D. afternoon. From their objectives and plans for the afternoon a questionnaire was prepared for the principal to determine the activities of the afternoon and their effect on the teachers. The principal was asked to distribute, collect and return these questionnaires as soon as possible.

Eight weeks later, on April 7, 1975, each principal was asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the February 7 in-service. His answer was based on his personal observation. He and all members of his staff were also asked to fill out a post-questionnaire based on the February 7 questionnaire. The purpose of the April 7 questionnaire was to determine the lasting effects of the February program. Answers to this questionnaire were matched with those of February 7.

D. Expected Results

This study was intended to investigate whether in-school in-service days are:

- (1) more valuable than city-wide in-service days,
- (2) fulfilling the objectives set by the principal and the staff,
- (3) assisting teachers in growing professionally,
- (4) giving teachers and principals some school-time to perform routine tasks, and
- (5) improving teacher awareness of educational happenings and effectiveness in the classroom.

It was expected that these outcomes would be identifiable.

SECTION III - RESULTS

RESULTS

A. Introduction

Prior to the actual in-service day, twenty-three out of twenty-seven principals had responded to the soliciting letter of January 15. Questionnaires, particular to each school, were prepared, and ratified or amended by the building principal.

On the afternoon of February 7, the participating schools filled in their questionnaires and returned them before February 15.

Completed questionnaires were received from twenty of the original twenty-three schools. A total of 160 (out of a possible 240) questionnaires were returned. The questionnaires were collated, tabulated and assimilated. On March 20, following interim report letters were sent to the participating principals. On April 6, the post-questionnaires were delivered.

By April 15, responses were received from sixteen of the twenty schools which participated in the first questionnaire. A total of 114 (out of a possible 160) questionnaires were returned. At this point one might note that twenty-three principals responded to the original letter of solicitation, twenty schools and 160 teachers responded to the first questionnaire, and seventeen schools and 114 teachers returned

the second questionnaire. This declining participation leads the author to speculate that either more than 50% of the teaching staff and 40% of the principals were not interested in this P.D. survey, or that the author did not convince them of its importance.

B. Results of In-School P.D. Activities

(1) School A

Ten S_1 questionnaires were received from this school. From these, six of the teachers reported that the following points were gleaned from the afternoon session:

- (a) there are other methods of teaching words when regular phonics has not worked,
- (b) children are individuals and should be helped as individuals,
- (c) sight and drill should be used along with phonetic skills.

Ten S_2 questionnaires were received from this school and six of the respondents stated that they used or tried (a) and (b) above.

The implication here is that the in-school P.D. activity was successful for 60% of the respondents.

(2) School B

Six S_1 's were received from this school. Five of the respondents stated that they learned how to:

- (a) use stations in physical education,
- (b) conduct a typical physical education lesson,
- (c) plan ahead for physical education,
- (d) use variety in physical education lessons,
- (e) encourage competition with self.

Five S_2 questionnaires were returned and all five stated that they tried (a) above, four tried (b) and (d) and three used (c).

The implication here is that 100% of the respondents gleaned something from the in-school P.D. activity.

(3) School C

Six S_1 's were received from this school. All the respondents stated that they learned:

- (a) how to use the video-cassette and other audio-visual material in regular lessons, and
- (b) that they prepared a metric unit.

Six S_2 questionnaires were returned. All respondents used their metric units, three used the video-cassette and

three used more audio-visual material in their regular lessons.

The implication here is that 100% of the respondents used one activity learned from the February 7 workshop and 50% used two.

(4) School D

Five S_1 and four S_2 questionnaires were received from this school. The S_1 respondents stated that they learned:

- (a) methods of reinforcing metric terminology, and
- (b) ways of providing opportunities for children to speak out in class.

All of the S_2 's received stated that they used (a) and (b) above.

The implication here is that 100% of the S_2 respondents used two of the ideas gleaned from the in-school activity.

(5) School E

Four S_1 questionnaires were received from this school and all of the respondents stated that they:

- (a) organized a metric unit, and
- (b) studied the audio-visual material available and co-ordinated it with units in other subjects.

Three S₂ questionnaires were returned and three of the respondents stated that they tried (a) and used (b).

The implication here is that the in-school P.D. activity was successful for 100% of the S₂ respondents.

(6) School F

Six S₁ responses were received from this school.

Five of the respondents said that they learned that:

(a) drama should be used spontaneously and in an every day situation,

(b) drama can be used to help the timid child.

Six S₂ questionnaires were received and four of the respondents stated that they used drama spontaneously in the every day situation.

The implication here is that 67% of the teachers gleaned one idea from their workshop, and that for them the workshop was successful.

(7) School G

Six S₁ questionnaires were received from this school and these six stated that:

(a) they gleaned the use of spontaneous drama in everyday situations, and

(b) studied the use and application of the school science equipment.

There were six responses to the S₂ form. Six respondents stated that they made greater use of the science equipment available and four found creative drama in the everyday situation very helpful in implementing programs.

The implication here is that 100% of the respondents applied one idea from the workshop and 80% tried two ideas. Thus, for these the workshop was successful.

(8) School H

From this school, sixteen teachers responded to S₁ and all sixteen teachers stated that they studied behaviour modification in the light of teacher consistency, high expectations and positive reinforcement.

There were sixteen responses to S₂. Fourteen of the respondents stated that they attempted to be positive and consistent in their use of behaviour modification. These same teachers stated that if the children knew that the teacher had high expectations of them, they usually met them.

The implication here is that this workshop was successful for 88% of the S₂ teachers.

(9) School I

Eight S_1 responses were received from this school. All eight respondents stated that they had a clearer view of the uses of audio-visual material and the Audio-Visual centre and they intended to try some of them.

Of the six S_2 responses received from this school, four stated that they made greater use of the Audio-Visual centre's material and facilities.

The implication is that, for 67% of the S_2 respondents, this P.D. activity was successful.

(10) School J

Eight S_1 questionnaires were received from this school and all eight prepared or reviewed a unit plan in some subject area.

Four S_2 forms were returned. The four respondents stated that they made use of the prepared unit plans and this gave them time for other things.

The implication here is that 100% of the S_2 respondents made successful use of the P.D. activity.

(11) School K

Thirteen S_1 forms were received from this school. Each respondent spent part of the time preparing or planning teaching units or teaching aids and the rest of the time in teacher-parent interviews.

Eight responses to S_2 were received and six stated that they made use of the prepared units. Five of the respondents stated that they benefited from the parent-teacher interviews by becoming more aware of the child's background and obtaining a wider understanding of his problems.

The implication here is that 75% of the S_2 respondents made use of the planned units and that 63% of them benefited from the parent-teacher interviews.

(12) School L

Seven S_1 questionnaires were received from this school. The seven respondents stated that due to the parent-teacher interviews, they developed a closer parent-teacher relationship and became more aware of the backgrounds of their students.

Seven S_2 forms were returned from this school. The seven respondents stated that the closer relationships with parents and the greater awareness of student backgrounds made

- (a) discussed the pros and cons of continuous progress, and
- (b) prepared a spring or Easter unit.

Three S_2 questionnaires were returned, of these, all three had implemented (b) above and no one mentioned (a).

The implication here is that all three (or 100%) respondents derived some success from the workshop.

(15) School 0

Eight respondents completed the S_1 questionnaire. All of the respondents stated that they:

- (a) attended a meeting in which they co-ordinated the vocabulary and symbols of the social studies or mathematics, or language courses, and then
- (b) planned a unit in one of these areas.

Eight S_2 forms were received. All eight respondents stated that they used the uniform vocabulary and symbols agreed upon. Four implemented the unit prepared while the other four were intending to implement the unit prepared.

The implication here is that all of the respondents (100%) found the workshop successful.

(16) School P

Six S_1 questionnaires were returned from this school and all six stated that they spent the afternoon talking to parents.

Six S_2 forms were received and all six stated that because of the talks with parents, they understood their students a little better than before.

The implication here is that the activity was 100% successful.

(17) School Q

Five S_1 questionnaires were received from this school and all five stated that they spent the afternoon discussing the open area school and their particular situation.

Four S_2 questionnaires were received from this school and all four stated they profited from the afternoon's discussion because they realized that other open area schools had similar problems.

The implication here is that for the four respondents the activity was 100% successful.

C. Summary of Results

Table I.
Summary of In-School P.D. Activity.

School	No. of S ₁ Received ¹	No. of S ₂ Received ²	No. Benefited	% Success based on S ₂ Responses
1	10	10	6	60%
2	6	5	5	100%
3	6	6	6	100%
4	5	4	4	100%
5	4	3	3	100%
6	6	6	6	100%
7	6	6	6	100%
8	16	16	14	88%
9	8	6	4	67%
10	8	4	4	100%
11	13	8	6	75%
12	7	7	7	100%
13	14	12	10	83%
14	7	3	3	100%
15	8	8	8	100%
16	6	6	6	100%
17	5	4	4	100%
Total 17	135	114	102	89% Average

From the Table I chart one can readily see that the P.D. activity for the afternoon of February 7, 1975, was highly successful for 102 of the 114 S₂ respondents.

Table II.
Summary of Types of P.D. Days Preferred

Rank Order	Family of Schools	City-Wide Your Grade Only	In Your School You Alone	In Your School Divi-sional	City-Wide All Grades	City-Wide Divi-sional	In Your School With Staff	Other
First	7	39	33	21	2	14	44	4
Second	13	17	33	45	3	15	29	1
Third	14	29	26	29	7	20	30	1
Fourth	42	34	10	20	5	25	30	1
Fifth	26	27	16	21	13	33	17	1
Sixth	33	8	18	11	21	43	18	0
Seventh	15	3	19	6	86	10	4	0
Mean Rank	4.55	3.18	3.47	3.21	6.4	4.36	2.84	N.A.
Order of Preference	6th	2nd	4th	3rd	7th	5th	1st	

Table II above indicates the rank order of P.D. activities preferred by the S₁ respondents, 44 out of 141 respondents marked "In Your School With Staff" as their first choice for P.D. activity. 29 out of 141 checked this as their second choice and 30 as their third choice. The mean rank of this

response is 2.84 and it places as first choice.

39 out of 157 respondents preferred "City-Wide Your Grade Only" for P.D. activities; 17 made this their second choice and 29 their third. The mean rank of this response is 3.18 and places as second choice.

21 out of 153 respondents selected "In Your School Divisional" as their first choice. 45 opted for this as their second choice and 29 made it their third selection. The mean rank of this response is 3.21 and it places as third choice.

The mean rank of "In Your School Alone" is 3.47, of "City-Wide Divisional" is 4.36, of "Family of Schools" is 4.55, and of "City-Wide All Grades" is 6.4. The above placed fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh respectively.

When studying the mean ranks of the second, third and fourth places a mean difference of .29 is noted. The difference between sixth and seventh places is 1.45. There is no doubt that the respondents chose "City-Wide All Grades" as their last choice.

Appendix E presents pertinent teacher comments which support their selection.

SECTION IV - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

Upon reviewing the results of the questionnaires as found in Tables I and II, the following conclusions can be stated:

- (1) In-school professional activity days are helpful to teachers.
- (2) Teachers do prefer a particular type of P.D. day.

Because of the limitations of the study and the lack of in-school follow-up to the afternoon of February 7, 1975, P.D. activity, it cannot be concluded that in-school professional activity days improve the teaching-learning process. The results of Table I indicate that 89% of the teachers responding profited from the P.D. activity. But, this study does not provide any empirical evidence to conclude that the teaching-learning process has, in fact, improved.

Table I shows that 102 of the 114 respondents stated that they derived some success from the in-school workshops. These 102 represent approximately one-third of the staff of the Separate School Board. Can it then be concluded that most of the staff benefited from the P.D. day? A more intensive effort should be made to involve a higher percentage of the teachers.

Table II shows that approximately 160 teachers do have a preference as to the type of P.D. activity performed. These 160 respondents represent approximately one-half of the staff of the Separate School Board. Then it can be implied that teachers do prefer some types of P.D. activity over others and that they are willing to participate in all types occasionally.

Thus it appears that the first and third null hypotheses were rejected, but the second one was upheld.

B. Recommendations

Many recommendations can be inferred from the material collected in this study. The following are suggested.

1. Teachers want practical answers to help solve problems. Winger's findings were similar. He stated that teachers want something which can be used in their classrooms.⁶¹ They want first-hand involvement in any P.D. activity. To accomplish this, the activities require small groups of people. Therefore, P.D. days should be devoted to in-school activities.

⁶¹ H.D. Winger, "Orientation and In-Service Education in Second and Third Class School Systems of Pennsylvania," (unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959).

Jacquith's study concurs with this recommendation.⁶²

2. Many teachers react with little excitement at the suggestion of an impending P.D. day. This may stem from the fact that previous P.D. activities have been poorly planned, mandatory and repetitious, outside their field of specialty or simply boring. Some P.D. activities have been poorly planned and often held because they were on the school calendar. Other P.D. activities have been conducted without determining a need. The mandatory and repetitious activity implies that everyone is in need of training; and this is not always the case, especially if the topic is outside one's field. A study conducted by C.E. Jacquith concluded that teacher willingness to participate in in-service education was closely associated with teacher involvement in the planning and organizing of the activity.⁶³ Thus it would appear the P.D. activities should develop from a need in the system or school. The teachers should assist in the planning and organizing of the activity. The presentation should include practical experiences and participation.

62 C.E. Jacquith, "An Analysis of perceptions of Junior High School Teachers, Principals, and University Specialists Concerning In-Service Education," University of Michigan Dissertations and Abstracts International, Vol. 34; (Oct., 1973), 1485A.

63 Ibid.

3. The school board, the teachers' organization and the Ontario Department of Education, all have a special role to play in the professional growth of teachers. Each of the above must fully co-operate with the other to ensure successful professional activities. Dillon supports this recommendation.⁶⁴

4. In their responses the teachers stated that in-school activities were helpful to them. Their statements implied that in-school activities should be structured. They recommended that the staff should have some choice in the type of activity and that the P.D. day should be carefully planned. Denmark⁶⁵ and Portlow⁶⁶ believe that a continuous P.D. program for teachers is required.

5. It would seem that a well-planned program of learning experiences, providing practical opportunities for the teaching staff, would help to keep the teachers abreast of new ideas.

64 E.A. Dillon, "Staff Development: Whose Job Is It?", Educational Leadership, Vol. XXXII; (Nov., 1974), p. 139-40.

65 G.W. Denmark, "Continued Growth; Today's Imperative," Educational Leadership, Vol. XX; No. 2, (Nov., 1962), p. 85.

66 H.R. Portlow, "Professional Development: Top Level Need, Second Level Priority," Education Canada, Vol. XI; No.4, (Dec., 1971), pp. 61-64.

6. The most important consideration is that staff development programs must have specific purposes which are clear to all involved. It is suggested that one follow an approach which has relevance and meaning for the participating personnel.

7. It is recommended that appendices E and F be studied to assess the teachers' reasons for the types of P.D. activity preferred and to determine the needs that the teachers believe are present.

C. Other Areas Worthy of Study

1. Does P.D. activity improve the teaching-learning process?
2. If the money presently being spent on P.D. were used to provide resources in the classroom, would it improve the teaching-learning process?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLES OF INITIAL LETTERS TO PRINCIPALS

SENT TO 27 PRINCIPALS

Our Lady of Lourdes School,
319 Prentice Avenue,
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

January 15, 1975

Dear Mr. _____,

I am presently working on a research paper to obtain my Educational Specialist Degree from Northern Michigan University. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your assistance.

The topic of my paper is, "In-school In-Service on P.D. Days." My aim is to determine how we are using our in-school professional days.

"Are they benefiting the classroom teacher?"

"Are they helping to improve classroom instruction?"

"Are they facilitating the administration of the school?"

"Are they giving teachers necessary time to perform routine tasks?"

etc.

In other words, "Are they valuable?" I would like to prove to the public that P.D. days are being wisely used and that we can use more.

I have already cleared this research paper through local channels. With your co-operation I will be able to achieve my aim. Copies of my findings will be made available to you.

My first step is to ask you for an outline of the activities you and your staff will be conducting the afternoon of February 7, 1975. I would like to know the objectives of the afternoon, and how you plan to go about achieving these objectives. Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

Once I have an outline of your activities, I will prepare a questionnaire based on your outline. The questionnaire will be for you and your staff - i.e. one for each participant in the P.D. day. It will ask questions about the afternoon. Prior to running off the questionnaire I will contact you personally to see if it meets with your approval. It can be revised.

Some points to note

- (a) No names of teachers, etc. will be used on any part of my paper or questionnaire.
- (b) I will be the only person reading the questionnaire. They will be kept in strictest confidence.
- (c) Names are not to be written on anything.

(d) You don't have to be doing anything spectacular to be helpful.

Would you please complete one copy of the enclosed form and return it to me as soon as possible?

I would like to thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to read this note. I would also like to thank you for helping me do my research paper.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

Our Lady of Lourdes School,
319 Prentice Avenue,
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

January 15, 1975

Dear Principal,

Please complete this form as soon as possible.
Would you please return it to me at the above address? I
will use this information to compile the questionnaire for
your school.

Thank you.

1. Name of School. (Adequate space provided.).....
2. Objectives for the afternoon of February 7, 1975.
(Adequate space provided.).....
3. How do you and your staff intend to achieve these objectives?
(e.g. Film, staff meeting, divisional meeting, guest speaker,
etc.) (Adequate space provided.).....
4. Is there a timetable for the afternoon? If so, would you
list it below please? (Adequate space provided.).....

Thanks again for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

APPENDIX B

FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

SENT TO 23 SCHOOLS

Our Lady of Lourdes School,
319 Prentice Avenue,
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

February 3rd, 1975

Dear Mr. _____,

I have enclosed the survey sheets for your staff. Would you please distribute them sometime during the afternoon? When you distribute them, would you impress 100% co-operation upon your staff because my aim is to increase the number of P.D. days for our staff? I need their co-operation to achieve this aim. Would you also inform them that everything is confidential and no names are necessary? Thanks.

After they are completed, would you mail them to me as soon as possible? Once I have them I will collate the information and present you with summary of your staff's choices and comments.

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

S₁ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY SURVEY (FORM A)

INSTRUCTIONS - Please write all answers on this paper. If there isn't enough space, write on the back or add sheets.

Thanks.

1. You have spent all or part of this afternoon working in your room or interviewing parents. Please write what you did. Please be explicit. (Adequate space provided.)....
2. Please write how this professional development time helped you to improve your effectiveness as a teacher. Please be specific. (Adequate space provided.).....
3. Which type of professional development day do you prefer? Please rank them from 1 to 7 or 8 in order of preference.
 Family of schools together - City-wide all grades -
 City-wide your grade only - City-wide divisional -
 In your school you alone - In your school with staff -
 In your school divisional - you may
 add anything in this space.
4. Please give reasons for your first 3 choices in question 3 above. Please begin each choice by stating the choice. (Adequate space provided.).....
5. Comments of any kind re: P.D. days will be appreciated.

Thank you for your co-operation. (Adequate space provided)..

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

code.....

S₁ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY SURVEY (FORM B)

INSTRUCTIONS - Please write all answers on this paper. If there isn't enough space, write on back or add sheets.

Thanks.

1. Please write the topic or topics of the afternoon session.
2. In the space below, please write some of the teaching points, teaching ideas, teaching concepts or teaching methods that you gathered and that you intend to use in your classroom. Please be specific. (Adequate space provided.).....
3. Which type of professional development day do you prefer? Please rank them from 1 to 7 or 8 in order of preference.

Family of schools together -	City-wide all grades -
City-wide your grade only -	City-wide divisional -
In your school you alone -	In your school with staff -
In your school divisional - you may

add anything in this space.
4. Please give reasons for your first 3 choices in question 3 above. Please begin each choice by stating the choice. (Adequate space provided.).....
5. Comments of any kind re: P.D. days will be appreciated. Thank you for your co-operation. (Adequate space provided.)..

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

code.....

APPENDIX C

INTERIM REPORT TO PRINCIPALS

SENT TO 20 SCHOOLS

SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

.....Principal
 School
 Street
 Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

Our Lady of Lourdes School,
 319 Prentice Avenue,
 Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

March 25, 1975

Dear Mr. _____,

The following is an interim report regarding the in-school professional development day survey that I am conducting.

Your teachers listed several points which they intended to use in their classrooms. Of the several points listed more than 50% of your staff listed the following.

- A. Regarding Behaviour Modification - (1) that positive reinforcement type of behaviour modification lasts longer, (2) that Teacher-Student confrontations and student labels should be avoided.
- B. Regarding Metric Introduction - (1) that they become familiar with the use and amount of metric material in the school.
- C. Regarding the type of professional development preferred (1) in-school divisional - first, (2) in-school with staff - second, (3) in-school alone - third.

I was wondering if your classroom supervision verified the points in A and B. If you get a chance, would you keep your eyes open for the above points? Would you let me know of your findings? I'll be sending a second questionnaire to you and your staff sometime in early April. The purpose of the questionnaire will be to see if the teachers really used the points listed in A and B above.

Thanks for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

APPENDIX D

POST QUESTIONNAIRE

SENT TO 20 SCHOOLS

Our Lady of Lourdes School,
319 Prentice Avenue,
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

April 3rd, 1975

Dear Mr. _____,

Enclosed with this letter you will find a follow-up survey to my original February 7th survey. As you are aware, the purpose of the follow-up survey is to verify and support the findings of the first survey. Thus, the completion of the follow-up survey is just as important and perhaps more important than the original. I need and depend upon your support in this undertaking.

Would you please distribute the enclosed S₂ forms to your staff members and ask them to complete them as soon as possible?

I know I can count on you for your continued co-operation and support.

If you have any questions, please call me at 254-2751.

Thanks again for helping out.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

S₂ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY (FORM A)

Dear Teachers - This is a follow-up questionnaire. It is a follow-up to the February 7th afternoon survey. That P.D. day was conducted in the individual schools and the survey was on the afternoon session only. This survey follow-up is based on the results of that afternoon session. (This has nothing to do with the morning session.)

INSTRUCTIONS - Please write all answers on this paper and turn it in to your principal as soon as possible. If there isn't enough room on this paper, write on the back or add sheets.

Thanks.

1. During the afternoon of February 7, 1975, you and your staff conducted a P.D. in-service program on the following topic(s). (The topics of the afternoon were listed here.)
2. In the space below, please write some of the things you did during the afternoon of February 7. List the things which made you a more effective teacher or helped you with your regular teaching duties. Please be specific.
(Sufficient space provided.)
3. In the original February 7th survey, many teachers indicated that they preferred to have P.D. days in their schools. Please suggest some activities that you would like to see conducted in school P.D. days. The suggestions don't have to be earth shattering. (Adequate space provided.).....

4. What other ideas or activities or programs would you like to see done for future P.D. days? Comments of any type will be appreciated. (Adequate space provided.).....
This is the last survey that I will ask you to complete.
Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

code.....

S₂ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY (FORM B)

Dear Teachers - This is a follow-up questionnaire. It is a follow-up to the February 7th afternoon survey. That P.D. day was conducted in the individual schools and the survey was on the afternoon session only. This survey follow-up is based on the results of that afternoon session. (This has nothing to do with the morning session.)

INSTRUCTIONS - Same as form A.

1. Same as form A.
2. In the space below, please write some of the teaching points, teaching ideas, teaching concepts or teaching methods or activities that you gleaned from the February 7th, p.m. in-service and used or tried in your classroom. Please be specific.
3. Same as form A.
4. Same as form A.

This is the last survey that I will ask you to complete.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Sam A. Fera.

code.....

APPENDIX E
PERTINENT TEACHER COMMENTS
WHICH SUPPORT THEIR SELECTION
OF TYPES OF P.D. ACTIVITY

PERTINENT TEACHER COMMENTS

A. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"In your school - you alone."

1. Can do all those things you would like to do with no students around that you wished you had done before the students arrived.
2. Conduct parent-teacher interviews at a convenient time and with no pressure of time.
3. Could prepare units or long range plans.
4. Could evaluate a set of workbooks or children's work.
5. Could perform menial tasks like bulletin boards, displays, clean cupboards, etc.
6. Could plan forthcoming activities.
7. Could have conference with the principal, superintendent, consultant or a fellow teacher.
8. Could do research.
9. Could just think.
10. Could check out material available at Audio-Visual centre and co-ordinate it with our programs.
11. Could evaluate new and old programs.
12. Could preview films, filmstrips, etc.
13. Could prepare outlines.
14. Could work on new curriculum.
15. Could study textbooks.

16. Could do professional reading.
17. Could familiarize, more completely, myself with courses of study.
18. Could prepare report cards or bring records up to date.
19. Could think about students and write meaningful anecdotal comments.
20. Time to catch up and breathe.

B. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"In your school with staff."

1. Can deal with problems which are particular to your school.
2. Can talk about all those things you never have time for at regular staff meetings.
3. Can deal with the priorities set by the individual staff.
4. Every staff has different interests, strengths, weaknesses and needs. Could deal with any one of these.
5. Can discuss ways to improve our morale, our in-school situation, our discipline or our efficiency.
6. More time to think and discuss in depth.
7. More time for freedom of exchange.
8. More relaxed and free to state what is really on your mind.
9. Not as formal.
10. You are with people you know and understand.
11. Can handle current problems.

12. Can evaluate school programs.
13. Can set up or introduce new programs.
14. Can share.

C. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"In your school divisional."

1. Time to become familiar with programs in pre- and post-grades.
2. Could co-ordinate programs and avoid repetition and overlapping.
3. Could plan units, integrated studies, special programs.
4. Can learn from the other teachers in my school.
5. Discussions are more personal and relevant.
6. Involvement essential because of smallness of group.
7. Time to evaluate tried programs.
8. Could evaluate and compare the progress of my own teaching strategies.
9. Time to share and learn from teachers you know and respect.
10. Could co-ordinate divisional activities and course of study.

D. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"Family of schools together."

1. Can share ideas which have been successful in the area.
2. Can discuss problems common to the area.

3. More teachers but not too many teachers to curtail personal discussion and involvement.

4. Enough teachers to learn new ideas, and discuss them in detail.

5. A good group with whom to share.

6. Small groups but large enough for idea sharing.

7. Can discuss socio-economic factors of the area.

8. Can do many of the things presented in B.

E. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"City-wide your grade only."

1. Have a common base from which to begin discussion.

2. Can discuss common problems pertaining to courses of study, teaching methods, and textbooks.

3. Can pick up ideas which are relevant to your situation because you teach the same material.

4. Can get to know other teachers of the same grade.

5. Can become aware of problems of other teachers and discover that many are similar to your own. Discover that you are not alone.

F. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"City-wide divisional."

1. It is worthwhile to share. You cannot grow as well alone.

2. Group is smaller than all grades and more homogeneous.

3. Smaller than one large group yet large enough to exchange ideas.
4. Provides the opportunity to hear numerous ideas from a wider base.
5. Can co-ordinate programs.
6. Can introduce new courses.
7. Can present innovations in education.

G. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"City-wide all grades."

1. To present or introduce new developments in the system and problems common to the whole system.
2. Provides the opportunity to get to see and meet many of the teachers with whom you have a common goal.

H. Some of the Teachers' Reasons for Selecting -
"City-wide all grades."
(Their last choice.)

1. Do not wish to spend a half-day of precious time doing an activity from which I am learning nothing new.
2. Do not want to be entertained. Want new insights and ideas or some type of intellectual challenge.
3. P.D. days are successful if new ideas are presented to teachers and P.D. days are not successful if old ideas are repetitious and old topics are rehashed.

4. City-wide P.D. days leave me resentful and disturbed over the time wasted if I do not learn anything or the topic does not apply to me.
5. I am sick of city-wide - they are a waste of time.
6. Would like to see less city-wide P.D. days, as I usually do not gain much from these.
7. The smaller the group, the more beneficial it is because you have more opportunity to share and exchange and learn.
8. City-wide P.D. days are not helpful because topics are too general.

APPENDIX F
TEACHER RECOMMENDED
ACTIVITIES FOR FUTURE
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS

TEACHER RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES

A. In-School Activities (in no special order).

1. Conduct parent-teacher interviews at your leisure and without the pressure of time.
2. Discussion and implementation of standards of behavior.
3. Uniform school policies - grammar and math symbols - problem solving - marking symbols - report cards, etc.
4. Staff meeting to discuss all those things for which you have no time.
5. Behavior Modification - a practical way.
6. Co-ordinate programs.
7. Time to read and become familiar with available material and share this material with other teachers.
8. Time to study, compare and select texts.
9. Aims and Objectives of the school.
10. Evaluation of curricula.
11. Research and plan preparation.
12. Use time to (1) plan individual programs, (2) to assess and organize the vast amount of resources available, (3) to set up activity centres, (4) to prepare student reports, (5) to prepare various units, (6) to co-ordinate ordering of supplies, (7) to study new courses, outlines, and programs, (8) to plan and put up bulletin boards, (9) to mark work, (10) to catch up.

13. Have brain storming sessions.
14. Plan and co-ordinate fieldtrips.
15. Have divisional meetings.
16. Do something you need to do.
17. Drama in the classroom and the gym.
18. Diagnosis and Remediation of all students.
19. How to increase teacher involvement.
20. To hit or not to hit? How do I get him to listen?
21. An encounter or retreat with staff.
22. Deal with current problems.
23. Specialists conduct in-school workshops.
24. Follow sequential development of skill subjects through the grades.
25. Organize C.P.T.A. presentations.
26. Let staff decide what they would like to do.
27. The use of evaluation.
28. The value of review and drill.

B. Outside the Individual School Activities
(in no special order).

1. The relevant role of the teacher in society.
2. Sharing ideas with neighbouring schools.
3. Role of principal and vice-principal in a school.
4. Art workshop with Ed Tate.

5. Poetry - how to teach it.
6. The slow learner.
7. Punishment - Discipline - Control - What do I do if?
8. Current innovations.
9. Effective methodology in mathematics, reading, science, etc.
10. New aids and resources available.
11. Ways to help children see, observe and learn.
12. Effective Behavior Modification.
13. Physical education and health - Where does the health come in?
14. The art of professionalism.
15. Changing society, changing students - Are schools changing?
16. Superintendents and specialists give demonstration lessons with students present.
17. How to introduce social studies skills and concepts and how to test these.
18. The changing attitudes of students.
19. Fewer lecture presentations, more "This is how I do it." and "Let's try it now."
20. Involve more parents and trustees in P.D. activities.
21. Should be practical to teacher-learning situation.
22. Art workshop.
23. Philosophy of education of our board.

24. What do parents expect of the school and is the school doing this?
25. Families of schools meet to discuss similar problems and strategies.
26. A workshop to teach female teachers how to coach sports.
27. Presentations on modern trends:
 - team teaching
 - open schools
 - psychology of age groups
 - behavior modification
28. Current film followed by a discussion.
29. Make greater use of our own teachers who excel in a particular area.
30. Workshops in which teachers participate as students do.
31. Have all P.D. activity at one time and get it over with. It is interfering with my teaching.
32. Involve community people in education - doctor, lawyer, truck driver, parent, etc.
33. Involve grass roots in planning.
34. No new topics - perfect the ones we have.
35. Workshops related to specific areas (e.g. Grade 5 - Family Life) and much participation by the teacher.
36. K-13 P.D. day.
37. Let us do something intellectual.

38. Religion - ideas - activities - themes.
39. Drama.
40. Musical operettas and other plays.
41. Panel discussions.
42. Role playing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Dennis M., "Helping Teachers Cope With Change," Education Canada, (Sept., 1974), pp. 17-19.

Arena, John E., "How to Individualize Instruction," Educational Technology, (Nov., 1974), pp. 43-45.

Borg, Walter R. et al., "The Minicourse: A Tool for the Education Teachers," Education, (Feb., Mar., 1970), pp. 232-38.

Bradfield, L.E., Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools, Columbus: Merrill Books, 1964.

Busselle, Samuel M., "Training Teachers to Work in Open Space," The National Elementary Principal, (Sept., 1972), pp. 87-90.

Comras, Jay and Masterman, Robert, "A Rationale for Comprehensive In-Service Programs," The Clearing House, (Mar., 1972), pp. 424-26.

Cunningham, Richard C., "Resurrecting Meaningful In-Service Training," Journal of Reading, (April, 1972), pp. 485-87.

Denemark, G.W., "Continued Growth, Today's Imperative," Educational Leadership, (Nov., 1962), pp. 82-87.

Dillon, Elizabeth A., "Staff Development: Whose Job Is It?," Educational Leadership, (Nov., 1974), pp. 137-140.

Felker, Donald W., Goering, Jacob, and Lindern, Kathryn W., "Teacher Rigidity and Continuing Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, (April, 1971), pp. 460-63.

Gathercole, Frederick J., "The Professional Development of Staff," The Canadian Administrator, (Dec., 1962), pp. 9-12.

Girault, Emily S. and Gross, Richard E., "Resource Personnel Workshops: A Team Approach to Educational Change," Sorral Education, (Mar., 1973), pp. 201-207.

Hunkler, Richard, "An Evaluation of a Short-Term In-Service Mathematics Program for Elementary School Teachers," School Science and Mathematics, (Oct., 1971), pp. 650-53.

Jacquith, Charles Evans, "An Analysis of Perceptions of Junior High Middle School Teachers, Principals and University Specialists Concerning In-Service Education," Dissertations and Abstracts International, (Oct., 1973), 1485A.

Kleiman, Stanley, "A Guide for Effective In-Service Education," The Clearing House, XLVIII, (Feb., 1974), pp. 372-374.

Longmore, A.J., "Retraining Teachers: Points to Ponder," Education Canada, IV, (Dec., 1974), pp. 18-19.

Merryman, Donald, "A Case Study of Individualized In-Service Training of Teachers in Educational Media," Dissertations and Abstracts International, Vol. 34; (Oct., 1973), 1755A.

Morr, C.F., "Professional Development and Inner City Problems," Education Canada, XIV, (Dec., 1974), pp. 20-21.

Muskopf, Allan and Moss, Joy, "Open Education: An In-Service Model," The Elementary School Journal, LXXIII, (Dec., 1972), pp. 112-124.

Nagle, John E., "Staff Development: Do it Right," Journal of Reading, XVI, (Nov., 1972), pp. 124-27.

Pickerl, G.E., "A Study of the In-Service Education Program in the Westside Community Schools," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers' College, 1960.

Portlow, H.R., "Professional Development: Top Level Need, Second Level Priority," Education Canada, XI, (Dec., 1971), pp. 61-64.

Province of Ontario. The New School Year Policy. Ministry of Education Memorandum, 1972-73:23.

Province of Ontario. School Year and School Holidays. Department of Education Regulation, 546/73.

Province of Ontario. Professional Activity Days: Report on Survey. Department of Education Memorandum, 1973-74:49.

Sault Ste. Marie District Separate School Board, Modified School Year Plan. Director's Memorandum, (May 24, 1973).

Sault Ste. Marie District Separate School Board.
Personal interview with Controller of Finance, (Feb. 1, 1975).

Slater, Shirley, "Assessment of a Consumer Education In-Service Program in Relation to the Teaching Behavior of Home Economics Teachers," Dissertations and Abstracts International, Vol. 35; No. 8, (Feb., 1975), 4026B.

Tilles, C.R. and Lahart, D.E., "Teachers Teaching Teachers: In-Service Training in Environmental Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, (Mar., 1975), pp. 160-162.

Weber, C.A., "Obstacles to be Overcome in a Program of Educating Teachers In-Service," Educational Administration and Supervisors, XXVIII, (Dec., 1942), pp. 41-49.

Winger, H.D., "Orientation and In-Service Education in Second and Third Class School Systems of Pennsylvania," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959.

Winn, Ulysses R., "An Assessment of How In-Service Recipients, In-Service Instructors and Decision Makers, Perceive a Teacher Training In-Service Program in a Model Neighbourhood Area," Dissertations and Abstracts International, Vol. 35; No.8, (Feb., 1975).