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Chapter I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The Problem

Preparation and certification of administrators at Central Washington University have developed in accordance with the evolution of the Washington State standards of 1961, 1971, and 1978.

The most recent standards from 1978 mandated a collaborative, performance-based approach to preparation and certification of teachers, administrators, and educational staff associates. The standards prompted the review and revision of preparation programs at the various colleges and universities in the state requiring hours of study and active involvement of professional education groups. The result has been additional costs to individuals and institutions including both direct costs in wages and expenses as well as indirect human costs.

This study was undertaken to determine real and estimated costs of the development, implementation, and operation of the program at Central Washington University from 1975 to 1980. Such research is a preliminary step to the evaluative process of the program.

As questions of value and effectiveness arise in relation to any new program, critics and advocates alike are
concerned with the analysis of cost data as it relates to assessment of performance-based preparation programs. What evidence indicates that competency-based programs produce results? What costs do competency-based programs generate over traditional programs: Are competency-based programs cost effective? Additional questions arise as well, of course.

A need to reconstruct the costs incurred at Central Washington University relative to the competency-based administrator preparation program was recognized. Also, as an instrument to record on-going cost-related data was deemed appropriate, this study will include a design for such collection of data.

Importance of the Study

Although a limitation of this study was that it did not assess the program in any definitive way, it provided data on the direct and indirect costs which will be a basis for any future study.

This study provides Central Washington University, other institutions, and school districts data to support appeals to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Legislature for funding. It provides a basis for making decisions as to whether or not this type of program should be pursued by other institutions. The results may also provide impetus for promoting the spread of the competency-based approach to other academic areas.
Significance of the Study

The study will have significance for other groups planning or investigating the feasibility of collaborative, competency-based principals' preparation programs.

Also, extraction of fundamental costs will allow Central Washington University and other agencies to pursue comparisons with more traditional preparation programs and aid in evaluation processes.

Another important result of the study is the suggested instrument for collection of data which can be used at Central Washington University and adapted for use at other institutions.

Definitions of Terms Used

Administrator Preparation Program Unit. An organization informally called the Program Unit which is authorized and required by the Washington State Board of Education and has the authority to develop, review, and revise preparation programs and to recommend these programs to the State Board of Education. Membership includes Central Washington University, members of the Cooperative Washington Education Centers, and representatives from professional organizations including the Washington Association of School Administrators, the Association of Washington School Principals, the Washington Association of Supervision and Curriculum, the Washington Association of Administrators of Special Education, and other professional associations concerned with
administrative roles. ¹

Collaboration. Collaboration requires input and active involvement in the functioning of the program for preparation and certification of principals. At Central Washington University this includes representatives from the Cooperative Washington Education Centers (comprised of school districts), the Association of Washington School Principals, and Central Washington University.

Competency-based. The preparation and certification requirements are expressed in terms of specific skills and learning which prospective principals must demonstrate. The term performance-based is used as a synonym.

Consortium. Representation from Central Washington University, the Association of Washington School Principals, and Cooperative Washington Education Centers had equal responsibility and involvement in developing and governing the preparation program.

Cooperative Washington Education Centers. An organization comprised of the Department of Education, Central Washington University, and member school districts, who, together, subscribe to and benefit from cooperative program activities, personnel sharing, and other related activities.

Direct Costs. Direct costs include specific documented costs such as travel, lodging, materials, and salary.

Indirect Costs. These costs are the human costs such as individual energy, the effects on the quality of job performance, and stress.

Minimum Generic Standards. Standards set by the State Board of Education for school administration including knowledge and skills in seven areas--knowledge of the field, building administration and management, activity coordination, auxiliary services, staff personnel management, and student personnel. 2

Open-system Concept. A concept which allows input from a variety of sources and encourages individual difference, variety, and change. 3

Parity. Equal power, responsibility, value and input from the various groups collaborating on the program. 4


4 A New Approach to Teacher Education and Teacher Certification (Olympia, Washington: SPI, 1972, p. 1. (Mineographed)
Performance-based. This term is used as a synonym for competency-based and relates to the behaviors which can be demonstrated rather than being limited to academic content.

Policy Board. The governing body determines direction and procedure for the principals' preparation program and consists of eight members equally representing the Washington School Principals, the Cooperative Washington Education Centers, and Central Washington University. 5

Program Development. This committee is responsible for development, review, or initiation of program proposals which are referred to the Policy Board. 6

Selection and Evaluation. The on-going function of the program to prepare principals uses collaboration among a consortium of agencies. The responsibilities involve the approval or rejection of applicants' admission to the program, evaluation of applicants' success in the program, and recommendations that administrative certificates be granted. 7

Organization of the Study

This study includes a brief review of the history of

5 A Program for the Preparation and Certification of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 31.

6 Ibid., p. 32.

7 Ibid, pp. 33-34.
certification of principals in the State of Washington and the corresponding preparation program at Central Washington University. A review of the available literature related to specific costs of competency-based preparation programs follows the historical review.

A questionnaire was developed and distributed to forty participants in all phases of the program. The findings from the questionnaires provide the critical section of the study. The study concludes with a summary and recommendation for a process to be used for future record-keeping.
Chapter 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The competency-based program for preparation and certification of school principals at Central Washington University is the natural result of the evolutionary development of the certification of administrators through Central's history as well as the mandates received from the State Board of Education in the 1971 and 1978 guidelines.

Trends in preparation programs, according to a summary of a UCEA Commission report, have been toward the stating of the purpose of preparation in more specific, operational terms, attempting greater flexibility in preparatory programs, attaining more clearly defined program structure, and providing quantity and variety in field experiences. These trends were reflected in the program developed at Central.

Development of Administrator Certification

Separate administrative credentials did not exist in

---

the State of Washington prior to 1934; consequently, administrators received essentially the same preparation as classroom teachers. After 1934, a credential was required for administrators of high schools. In 1938, the State Board of Education attempted to delineate the college coursework and to list the criteria to be met for certification. Certification programs prior to 1949 were based on a specified number of courses prescribed by the State. The State Board of Education endorsed regulations in 1949 which established the program approval approach and placed responsibility for the substance of the programs on colleges and universities.

In the Fall of 1947, Central Washington developed a specific program in school administration in response to authorization by the 1946-47 Legislature which allowed the state colleges to offer a Master of Education Degree.

The next major step in the evolutionary process occurred with the 1956 State Board of Education requirements

---

9 *Records of Proceedings of State Board of Education. (Olympia IV, June 19, 1933)* State of Washington.


for administrative credentials. These requirements established a new provisional administrative credential and mandated an internship in addition to coursework.

Washington State 1961 and 1971 Guidelines

The thrust of the standards of 1961 strengthened the academic preparation of teachers, required more cooperation between school organizations and colleges and universities, and promoted more flexibility in program planning.\textsuperscript{13}

National trends and changes in education which included consortium approaches to problem solving, broad participation and decentralized responsibility and accountability gave impetus to the development of the Cooperative Washington Education Centers at Central Washington University in 1969 and the Washington State 1971 guidelines. The 1971 guidelines encouraged "broad participation, honored the open-system concept, and decentralized the responsibility and accountability for preparation and the outcomes of preparation." The guidelines and standards provided for colleges and universities, school organizations and professional associations to form consortia to plan and carry on preparation programs. These guidelines emphasized the following principles:

\textsuperscript{13} Guidelines and Standards (1971) \textit{loc. cit.}
a. Preparation should be related to performance and performance related to the objectives of the professional and his clients.

b. Preparation should be individualized and give recognition to personal style.

c. Preparation programs should be planned and developed in a participatory manner by those affected.

d. Preparation is a career-long continuing process.  

These guidelines were very similar to those guidelines and models which grew out of the NASSP six-year project entitled "The Administrative Internship in Secondary School Improvement." The NASSP-PSSAS Purdue Conference recommended that administrative specialized skills be acquired through field experiences in the schools rather than in the university setting and that processes be defined as behavioral outcomes—both aspects are fundamental to performance-based programs. This recommendation was published in a tentative report in 1971 entitled "The Pre-Service Preparation and Continuing Development of Secondary School Administrators."  

Thomas J. Sergiovanni took issue with the emphasis on specific training for administrators in a more recent

---


position paper. Sergiovanni stresses the importance of qualitative and substantive issues in administrative preparation programs rather than training for task instrumental activities. He advocates the "educating mode" in a university setting as of primary importance for the school administrator as opposed to the "training mode" of the field setting. 16

The preparation program as conceived and implemented at Central Washington University includes both the course requirements in the university setting as well as the application and demonstration of skills in the field setting. The current program grew out of the efforts of the Cooperative Washington Education Centers who were interested in the area of preparation of school administrators. The Cooperative, comprised of representatives from Central Washington University and member school districts formed the Administrative Training Task Force which first met in May of 1976. Out of this meeting came a proposal for a consortium-type committee that would conform to the 1971 State Guidelines and the proposed 1978 Guidelines. 17


17Task Force on Administration Preparation, Charles McNurlin, Chairman, May 5, 1976.
Washington State 1978 Guidelines

The 1978 Standards, adopted by the State Board of Education in May, 1978, reflected extensive study and input from various groups. While the 1961 Standards encouraged voluntary involvement among agencies, and the 1971 Standards required collaboration among a consortium of agencies, the 1978 Standards required cooperative arrangements within "program units" and responsibility for coordination was assigned to the college or university.18

The 1971 Standards required competency objectives in programs with consortia-defined competencies. The 1978 Standards included "minimum generic standards." The programs had to include "outcomes" relevant to these generic standards. The 1978 Standards combined the academic concept of 1961 Standards for preparation programs with the experience and competency concepts of the 1971 Standards.19

The 1978 Standards stipulated that the following agencies shall be involved in the program and that the representatives and their authority be identified:

The school organization representative shall represent the interests of the board of directors and school

---


19 Ibid., p. 1
administrators and shall seek input from program development from students, parents, and citizens.

The college or university shall be represented by a chief administrator for professional preparation and shall be designated by the president of the institution to seek input from faculty in education and other departments, students, and interest groups.

Professional organizations for administrator preparation shall include representation from the specialized associations including the Association of Washington School Principals for principals' preparation programs.20

All programs must comply with the State guidelines by 1983. A five-year timeline was given. The standards have become tighter through the evolutionary process and now include generic competencies for continuing certification.21

Program for Principals' Preparation at Central Washington University

Central Washington University's Department of Education, Division of School Administration, took the initiative for establishing a structure for developing a

---


program unit as required by the 1978 Standards. A description of the unique program developed by Central was considered appropriate to this study as it affected the costs and specifics included.

The unit included the Cooperative Washington Education Centers, the Washington Association of School Administrators, the Association of Washington School Principals, and the Washington Association for Curriculum and Supervision. The program unit was responsible for the development of the new "Program for the Preparation and Certification of School Administrators" which included certification for the principalship and program administrators of curriculum and supervision, and special education.\textsuperscript{22}

The program unit is governed by a policy board which includes two members appointed by each participating agency. The members serve for three years on a staggered expiration basis. This group formulates policy for governing the program unit.\textsuperscript{23}

A program development committee representing each specific area of preparation is also included in the program unit. The committee membership is equally divided among each agency and serves for three years on a staggered

\textsuperscript{22}A Program for the Preparation and Certification of School Administrators, op. cit, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 31.
expiration basis. 24

A selection and evaluation committee, comprised of the same equal membership and same terms of office, screens candidates initially and makes final judgements regarding certification. 25

The by-laws, which were developed through a consortia, govern the program unit and serve to establish structure and procedures. 26

The University is responsible for providing candidates in principals' preparatory programs with a broad background, including prerequisite theory and knowledge. Prior to the field experience as an intern, the basic administrative courses must be completed. These courses, field experiences, and other educational opportunities have been cooperatively developed to meet the 1978 generic standards as identified and defined by the State Board of Education. 27

The program at Central Washington University is a competency-based administrator preparation program. The

24 A Program for the Preparation and Certification of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 32.

25 Ibid., pp. 33-34.

26 Ibid., p. 29.

27 Ibid., p. 2.
competencies and skills identified for the program were
developed and refined by the program development committees
and University faculty members.

The competencies, developed from the minimum state
generic standards, and on-the-job activities for the intern
which demonstrate competency have been written and published
in a three-volume booklet entitled "A Program for the Pre-
paration and Certification of School Administrators."

**Literature on Cost Factors in Competency-Based
Preparation Programs**

The literature indicates that competency-based
teacher education programs preceded competency-based admin-
istrator preparation programs and stimulated a comparable
movement for the latter. Therefore, most studies which
have been conducted analyzing costs of competency-based
preparation programs have focused on teacher preparation.

Some conclusions regarding competency-based teacher
education (CBTE) or performance-based teacher education
(PBTE) and some information gained from those studies have
relevance to competency-based administrator programs due to
certain features which performance-based programs have in
common. Regardless of whether teacher or administrator

---

focused, there are two types of costs: developmental and operational.

The developmental costs are "start-up" expenses resulting from providing preparatory training for personnel, defining competencies and working out procedures and devices for monitoring and managing the program. The size of these costs depends on the size of the program.\(^{29}\)

The operational costs of PBTE require more elaborate assessment procedures and more extensive recordkeeping than for traditional programs. This writer feels other operational costs which the literature contends is generally required of PBTE have not necessarily been true for competency-based administrator preparation. Among these are more extensive instructional materials and equipment and more released time to school personnel supervising clinical experience.

Fiscal and human resources are two fundamental needs which Theodore Andrews contends a state agency requires if it wishes to develop competency-based teacher education and certification.\(^{30}\) This writer concludes that these two resources are fundamental to the preparation of administrators


as well.

Studies have shown that competency-based teacher education programs cost more money. Bruce Joyce estimates that one totally competency-based program with the appropriate technological support would cost between five and six million dollars to develop at one institution. 31

Herbert Hite did a similar analysis for a competency-based teacher education program in Washington State. He saw a rise of 150 percent in program costs as compared with traditional programs. In both studies, a significant amount of the cost appears as faculty time required in the development of the programs. 32

Herbert Hite, Western Washington University, also, writes that cost may be the critical factor in determining if any institution will embark on performance-based teacher education. The three principal cost factors are program development, individualization of instruction, and the involvement of school personnel. 33

The costs are determined by the scope of the program.


32 Ibid., p. 38.

If the entire academic experience meets competency standards, the costs would be enormous. A limited and less costly approach is to include only the professional education program.

Once the scope of the program is determined, the competencies must be defined as well as the means for demonstrating the competencies. As competency-based programs are apt to focus on performance roles, the program will be largely field centered.

Hite contends that both the criteria and expected levels of performance on these criteria have much to do with the program costs. "Faculty can manipulate the cost of the program to a significant degree by adjusting their expectations to what they will accept as evidence of competency."34

Another cost is for released time for involvement of school personnel. Individualized instruction costs vary depending on whether or not a faculty design their own materials or use others.35

A study on costs of new teacher education and certification was requested in 1972 by the Washington State Legislature. The Office of the State Superintendent of

---


35 Ibid., p. 223.
Public Instruction conducted a study of five institutions with preparation and certification programs based on competency and managed by a consortium of schools, teachers' associations, and colleges. The consensus was that the 1971-72 prototype PBTE programs were more costly than traditional programs. Hite writes that the WWU experience suggests that the costs of developing and designing PBTE programs lessens as the programs become fully operational.36

Donald F. Enos of the University of Texas at Austin reports on comparison of costs of competency-based versus non-competency-based teacher education in preparation of elementary teachers. The study took place at San Diego State University, San Diego, California, from September 1, 1974, to October 15, 1975. He found that

...in the most conservative sense...the CBTE program is at least $1,044 per student teacher more cost effective than the non-CBTE program...The data generated by this study indicate that a CBTE training program can constitute a significant improvement over traditional programs of teacher education. The innovative CBTE program was worth the dollar cost as well as the considerable effort involved.37

Dr. Lillian Cady recommended sources, particularly


from the University of Washington, to this writer. Although courteous replies were received, no one had done research of a similar nature. Dr. Clifford Foster of the University of Washington supplied a copy of an internal evaluation of performance-based consortium-managed teacher certification program. This program is the Northline-University of Washington Teacher Certification Consortium. While interesting, it did not contribute cost analysis information. The thrust was rather to validate statistically evulative information which had been previously obtained through more subjective processes. The study succeeded in that it validated that the management system was functional and did produce well-qualified interns who hold favorable attitudes toward their preparation experiences. The study statistically validated the strengths and credibility of three basic Northline dimensions--the program characteristics, the management system, and the program product.  

38 Norma Dimmitt, Northline--University of Washington Teacher Certification Consortium, (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington, June, 1979), pp. 61, 64.
Chapter 3
THE MATERIALS AND METHODS USED AND GROUPS STUDIED

The materials used in this study were the minutes of task force and committee meetings and rosters of membership for those groups. These were obtained from the files of the Cooperative Washington Education Centers.

From this background source, dates and purposes of the various meetings were obtained. Some cost data was available as initially participants were asked to supply this.

A questionnaire was devised for the purpose of obtaining individual direct costs of involvement in the development, implementation, and maintenance phases of the program. The questionnaire, (see Appendix B, on page 48), was mailed in February, 1981, to forty individuals whose names appeared on the rosters of the task force and committees. (Rosters appear in Appendix A, on page 43). A second mailing was necessary in May, 1981. Of the forty mailed, thirty-two responded. No responses were received from three whose involvement, according to the Cooperative Washington Education Centers' records, came very early in the process either on the initial Administrative Task Force or the Administrative Training Committee. Letters were received from three persons who disclaimed any real
involvement. Two others could not be contacted due to lack of forwarding addresses.

The groups studied were professional educators actively involved in public education in the State of Washington. Seven were professors at Central Washington University. Fifteen were district-level administrators (superintendents and others), and sixteen were building-level administrators. (An additional person counted in the original forty was a graduate student at Central Washington University at the time of his involvement. His whereabouts are currently unknown.) The Association of Washington School Principals was a represented group; however, this professional organization's representatives have been counted as building administrators.

Certainly a larger number of educators have been indirectly involved in the three major phases of the program than the forty individuals listed. There were many who gave input, provided a sounding board, and received reports from representatives of their organizations. As it was virtually impossible to estimate the time and personal costs incurred for those involved informally and in some secondary capacity, this study was limited to those who actually participated by attending meetings, gathering data, and developing or implementing the program.

The minutes of task force and committee meetings revealed the following pertinent meetings in the developmental
stages of the administrative preparation program:39

May 4, 1976 Administrator Training Task Force
   Established

October 14, 1976 Administrator Training Consortium
   Committee and Administrator Training
   Task Force

November 12, 1976
January 7, 1977
February 16, 1977
February 25, 1977
April 8, 1977

The program proposal was accepted by Central Washington University and the Cooperative Washington Education Centers in a meeting in June, 1977. Subsequent approval by the Association of Washington School Principals and the Superintendent of Public Instruction in April, 1978, concluded the developmental phase of the project.40

An important initial meeting in the operational process was a joint meeting on December 14, 1979. Expenses for this meeting were defrayed by a grant specifically obtained by Central Washington University for that purpose.

While the maintenance phase was on-going, meetings


40 Ibid.
in 1980 were indicative of the requirements for operation of the program. Quarterly meetings of the selection and evaluation committee were necessary. The policy board and program development committees met annually and as needed.

The questionnaire was devised to obtain direct costs or cost estimates. The questionnaire requested information on the value of personal time, travel expenses, meals, lodging if necessary, and who defrayed the expenses.

From the responses, it was possible to determine out-of-pocket costs although, unfortunately, not in all cases were accurate records kept.

The questionnaire did not request indirect costs such as the extra work load, consequences from time loss on the job, and stress; but several respondents indicated that considerable personal time had been devoted to the project. These factors are certainly worthy of consideration; but as assessment would be difficult, they were omitted from the study.

Also omitted from the study were the university's costs for coursework and professional expertise. These are on-going costs of a traditional preparation program. To date, revisions within the professional preparation courses have not been mandated. Any revision of course requirements has been part of the continuing effort to improve instruction rather than to affect the competency-based preparation program.

A final section of the questionnaire requested subjective responses from participants regarding the nature of
their involvement and their evaluation of the value and result of their part in the process.
Chapter 4

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The thirty-two participants who completed and returned the questionnaire were involved in the various phases of the program. Three individuals participated in all phases; seven participated in two phases.

Twenty-two respondents were involved in the developmental phase. Some of these participants were part of the original task force which initiated the program. Preliminary study, defining the structure to be used, developing guidelines, writing and refining criteria for competencies were all part of the developmental phase. During this phase, eighteen served two or more years. Of this group seven were Central Washington University professors, seven were district-level administrators, and eight were building administrators.

Eleven respondents indicated they participated in the implementation phase. These included three district administrators, three building administrators, and five Central Washington University representatives. During this phase the program became functional, was further refined, was approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the guidelines were made available to prospective applicants and others.
The maintenance or operational phase began in 1979. This date is used as applicants began to be screened through the appropriate committee, and the competencies were to be demonstrated during the principal internship. Participants in the last phase included three Central Washington University professors, four building principals, and six district administrators.

The study was initially limited to 1975 through 1980. The questionnaire responses, however, revealed one participant who gave the involvement date as beginning in 1973. Thirteen gave the date as continuing into 1981.

The nature of the questions and the responses dictated that the data from the study had to be presented as totals. Separating the information into totals by phases of participation was not considered appropriate as respondents themselves did not provide the data in that manner. Compilation of the data appears in Table I, Summary of Participation and Costs, on page 30.

The questionnaire requested time expended by participants. The responses indicated that a total of 222 work days annually were devoted to meetings for the preparation program. An additional 1028 hours annually, or 128 and one-half days annually, were donated to other related activities such as preparation and planning.

The totals of expenses appear low as some respondents did not complete the items as requested, notably one in the developmental phase and one in the maintenance phase. Eight
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>PAID BY</th>
<th>TIME VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Principal</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-76, 77</td>
<td>5 days / additional</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Principal</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>608.00</td>
<td>Dist./self</td>
<td>3240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professor</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1965-70</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professor</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>361.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1974-76</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-77</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Principal</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1979-81</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>608.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>3240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Principal</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>516.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1776.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Principal</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-77</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Principal</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1975-77</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Unknown</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Implementation/Main.</td>
<td>1978-80</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1581.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1978-81</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>136.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Implementation/Main.</td>
<td>1978-81</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Principal</td>
<td>Implementation/Main.</td>
<td>1978-81</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>387.80</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1978-81</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Principal</td>
<td>Implementation/Main.</td>
<td>1978-81</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>89.20</td>
<td>Prof. Org.</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Implementation/Main.</td>
<td>1978-80</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>no records</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dist. Administrator</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>no records</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Principal</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>372.24</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>1200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Principal</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Professor</td>
<td>All phases</td>
<td>1975-78</td>
<td>no records</td>
<td>no records</td>
<td>Prof. Org.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Professor</td>
<td>Development/Implement.</td>
<td>1975-78</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Professor</td>
<td>All phases</td>
<td>1975-78</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>1500-2000</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>4800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Principal</td>
<td>Development/Implement.</td>
<td>1975-78</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>no records</td>
<td>2700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Professor</td>
<td>Development/Implement.</td>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>no record</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>2500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Professor</td>
<td>All phases</td>
<td>1976-79</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>no costs</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTALS

| 222 days annually | 1028 hours | $6093.24 | $115,927.73 |
others did not have records, did not recall, or left the items unanswered for unspecified reasons.

Actual costs incurred and reported by participants totalled $6,093.24. These costs were predominately for travel expenses, mileage, meals and occasionally for lodging. These costs were paid by school districts for fifteen persons. Central Washington University defrayed the expenses for professors. One individual shared in paying the expenses. The Cooperative Washington Education Centers and the professional organizations helped meet the costs for their representatives.

The largest cost incurred was that of the total dollar value attributed to professional time. The final total for this item was $115,927.73 for all phases encompassed by this study.

The single professional area to which the greatest costs may be attributed was to the University's staff. The seven professors involved responded with the following data. An annual total of 134 days was devoted to the program. Seven hundred and forty additional hours were necessary. The expenses totalled $2,860 and the value of professional time was $87,000 for the entire project.

Conclusions

The greatest number of participants were involved in the developmental phase of the program. Thus far, more time has been devoted to the developmental processes as well. Due to these factors, it may be concluded that the most expensive phase to date is the "start-up" period.
The costs for continuation of the program appear minimal. Meetings are limited to quarterly one-day sessions for the screening and evaluation committee. As the policy board and the program development committees meet on a need basis, their operating costs are nominal.

Another means of demonstrating the minimal continuing costs is by extracting the data for those most recently involved. Those include thirteen participants. Using the totals for these thirteen individuals yields the following costs: Sixty-nine days were devoted annually to the program; 466 additional hours were required; $3,331.90 is the actual total cost for expenses incurred.

While no attempt has been made to do a cost-effective study, another means of placing the costs into perspective is by noting the number of applicants serviced by the program since its development.

According to the *Program Approval Standards Documentation*, May, 1982, (see Table II, page 33) 384 have completed the administrative preparation program at Central Washington University in the five-year period from 1976 to 1981. Of these 173 were prepared for the elementary level and 211 were secondary level. A per student cost for the preparation program can be derived by using the 384 as a realistic total for persons serviced by the University's program.41 The total dollar figure from the responses to

---

41 Larry Wald, ed. *Program Approval Standards Documentation* (for OSPI visiting team) Ellensburg, WA: CWU, May 1982, Appendix B.
Table II

Statistical Data on Professional Preparation Programs

Key:  
A = Admitted  
C = Completed  
*P = Placed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (7-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Staff Assoc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Dis. Spec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Resource Spec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Placement Bureau statistics on "Alumna seeking administrative positions"

the questionnaire $122,020.97 may be used as a base. The resulting per student cost for the program would be about $317.75.

Although the focus of this study was not an objective evaluation, items in the questionnaire did elicit subjective responses from participants. A listing of these remarks is included in Appendix D on page 52.

The overwhelming number of positive responses would indicate that in the opinions of participants, this collaborative, competency-based approach is valid. Twenty-six responded with positive comments. Four were negative in tone. Two others did not respond to the items.

Positive comments included entries such as "an improved program developed," "this program now allows more concentration on individual needs," and "it raised and standardized internships and their requirements."

Most negative responses were in relation to the personal contributions of the participants. Comments included statements that "my involvement was negligible," "I wasn't active," "valuable if seriously pursued," and "the legislature needs to fund the activity, otherwise we should abandon it."

The final question was "Will the time involved and the added costs clearly demonstrate that the product perform measurably better on the job?" The word "clearly" apparently affected responses negatively. Although the answers varied from "no" to "yes," the affirmative answer dominated.
Only eight answered unequivocally "yes"; some other representative answers were "only time will tell," "if the competency program is truly being followed at the district level," and "I hope so." Other participants indicated the need for careful follow-up and attempts to measure the on-the-job performance.
Chapter 5
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Preparation and certification of administrators at Central Washington University has become an unique and sophisticated procedure. The current program, which was consortia-developed and competency-based, provides prospective administrators preparation balanced between campus-based theory and philosophy study and field-centered training and experience.

The greatest costs of developing the program were in the "start-up" phases. All indications were that maintenance costs of the program are not prohibitive. The major costs incurred were in the total value of professional time devoted to the project. It is to be expected that this will continue to be the most significant cost item. As long as individual participants and the institutions they represent feel that the task is valuable and the time well-spent, however, the program should be able to function.

This study did not evaluate the effectiveness of competency-based programs in relation to traditional programs. The participants in the study, however, indicated that the consortia approach was of value as it promoted dialogue among the various agencies and professional groups. A
majority of the respondents indicated that the program has significant potential for increased effectiveness of administrators on-the-job.

Recommendations

This writer concurs with the participants who recognized the need for a complete and in-depth evaluative study of the program and the on-the-job performance of practitioners who have met the minimum competencies. Only then will the approach be objectively validated. Undertaking a significant evaluative study such as this may be difficult. It would be costly and the economic conditions may not be conducive to it. Also obtaining a control group as a sample may present problems because all preparation programs in the State must be competency-based by the Fall of 1983. The study, however, would be worthwhile and is recommended.

A practical recordkeeping system is also recommended for future Central Washington University program unit needs. A two-part form, 8½" x 5", on mark sensitive paper would expedite the process. One copy would be for individual or district use, or could be given to whatever organization defrayed the expenses. Central Washington University would retain a copy for records for any future data collection or evaluation. The form would be simple, easily and quickly completed by participants at each meeting. It would request participants' names, committee or board assignments, meeting purpose, date of meeting, expenses incurred--mileage, meals, lodging, materials, and the hours required away from the job.
A sample form is included in Table III, Data Collection Form, on page 39.

The forms would be available at the beginning of each meeting. The recorder would distribute them as names were recorded in the minutes. Before business convened, a copy would be collected. The time required would be minimal. The information could be transferred to a summary chart, if desired, at a later time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses Incurred:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______ miles @ _______ = _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______ meals = _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______ day's lodging = _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Involved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______ Hours/Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table III
Data Collection Form

PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

_____ Policy Board
_____ Program Development
_____ Selection/Evaluation Committee

Participant's Name      Meeting Date

Meeting Purpose

Expenses Incurred:

Time Involved:
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APPENDIX A

Participants in the Competency-Based Program for Preparation and Certification of School Principals
### Appendix A

**PARTICIPANTS IN THE COMPETENCY-BASED PROGRAM FOR PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**

**CWU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Responsibility on Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Clayton</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banick, Ronald B.</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batali, Joseph Jr.</td>
<td>Program Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigby, Walt</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton, Dr. Robert</td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conner, Gary</td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crum, Dr. Wes</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensign, Mary Lou</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goetschius, Dr. Donald</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Dr. John</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Jerry</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauge, Larry</td>
<td>Selection and Evaluation Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoerlien, Paul</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosman, Dr. Stan</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaeger, John K.</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Mary Ann</td>
<td>Selection and Evaluation Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump, Gene</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautensleger, Con</td>
<td>Selection and Evaluation Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder, Paul</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay, Jack</td>
<td>Selection and Evaluation Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNurlin, Charles A.</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallery, John</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Tom</td>
<td>Program Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, Al</td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, Douglas</td>
<td>Program Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsley, James</td>
<td>Selection and Evaluation Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter, Dr. Conrad</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, Dennis</td>
<td>Director, Cooperative Washington Education Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, Donald</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Dick</td>
<td>Program Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Responsibility on Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root, Steve</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland, Frank</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruebel, Dr. Roy</td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders, George</td>
<td>Program Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiler, Walt</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon, Sue</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr, Dr. Dean</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, Jim</td>
<td>Administrator Training Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Jim</td>
<td>Administrator Training T.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Dr. Madge</td>
<td>Administrator Training Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Cover Letter
February 1, 1981

Dear

Since 1976, Central Washington University has been developing and implementing a competency-based program for preparation and certification of school principals. As you have been involved in this process, your assistance is needed and requested for evaluating program costs.

For a thesis study, I am reconstructing the activities in the program development and compiling and analyzing the direct and indirect costs incurred in the project. This information will be beneficial to the faculty in administration at Central Washington University, the Program Unit, and to the Cooperative Education Centers as a basis for comparison and evaluation of the program which will be undertaken at some later date.

Although some of the information requested was recorded during the initial phases of the project, the data is incomplete. Your completion of the attached informal questionnaire will be helpful. The information gathered will be used anonymously, and the data will be revealed as totals and averages. Individual responses will be treated confidentially.

The compiled data will be available, however, to participants in the program development and implementation phases upon request.

Please complete the questionnaire and return to me by April 15, 1981, in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. Sue Shannon

enclosure

Please Note: Personally Identifiable Information was redacted due to privacy concerns.
APPENDIX C

Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name_____________________________________________________

Current Address__________________________________________

Please answer these questions relative to the time period of your involvement in the development, implementation, and/or maintenance phases of Central Washington University's Competency-based Program for the Preparation and Certification of School Administrators.

Professional position at time of your involvement in the program:_________________________________________________

Place of employment (school or school district):_________ _______________________________________________________

Specific responsibility on project:__________________________

Phase of project:  Development________

Implementation_____

Maintenance_______

Time Expended:

Specific years served (i.e. 1975-1976):____________________

Meeting days and/or estimated hours served per year:____

Other time devoted to project (planning, preparation, etc.):____________________________________________________
Costs Incurred (approximate as accurately as possible):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Paid by Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Self, Dist., etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  Travel:  
  (Means)  
  Costs  
  Meals:  
  Lodging:  
  Other:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Paid by Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Self, Dist., etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  Travel:  
  (Means)  
  Costs  
  Meals:  
  Lodging:  
  Other:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Paid by Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Self, Dist., etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  Travel:  
  (Means)  
  Costs  
  Meals:  
  Lodging:  
  Other:  

(Continue on back if necessary)
Salary Value:

In view of your time spent on these activities, what total dollar value would you attribute to the effort upon your professional time?

Evaluation (Please comment):

Do you believe your contribution to have been worthwhile in view of the outcome:

Of what value is the program to the profession?

Having been an active participant in these activities, how do you feel about the collaborative nature of the program?

From your prospective, do you think that the collaborative effort had made a difference in the direction and quality of the program? If so, how?

Will the time involved and the added costs clearly demonstrate that the product perform measurably better on the job?

Other comments:
APPENDIX D

Follow-Up Letter
May 29, 1981

Dear

In February I wrote to you explaining the thesis study I am undertaking on the competency-based program for preparation and certification of school principals at Central Washington University. I requested your assistance in providing information related to your involvement in the program.

The nature of the study requires that I have responses from all people who were involved in the developmental stages of the program.

In the event you did not receive the questionnaire, I am enclosing a copy of the form.

Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. Sue Shannon

enclosure
APPENDIX E

Letters and Responses
February 17, 1981

Dr. Fred Giles
Department of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dear Sir:

According to Dr. Lillian Cady, SPI, you have completed a study of costs of the competency-based teacher preparation program at the University of Washington.

For a thesis study, I am reconstructing the activities in the development of the program for school administrators at Central Washington University and will be compiling and analyzing the direct and indirect costs incurred in the project.

As your study is of interest to me, I would like very much to read it. If it is available, how may I obtain a copy?

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. Sue Shannon
February 17, 1981

Dr. Cliff Foster
Department of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dear Sir:

According to Dr. Lillian Cady, SPI, you have been involved in the development and evaluation of competency-based programs for the preparation and certification of school personnel at the University of Washington.

For a thesis study, I am reconstructing the activities in the development of the program for school administrators at Central Washington University and will be compiling and analyzing the direct and indirect costs incurred in the project.

As your experience appears to be relevant to the study that I am doing, I would appreciate receiving any information you may have available on the topic and any suggestions of other sources which you may recommend.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. Sue Shannon
Ms. G. Sue Shannon

March 11, 1981

Dear Ms. Shannon:

I am responding to your request to Professor Fred Giles and myself about the development and evaluation of competency-based programs for school personnel.

To this end, I am sending you a copy of an internal evaluation of a performance-based, consortium managed teacher certification program. This program, The Northline-University of Washington Teacher Certification Consortium is currently in operation and will be phased out with the approval of the University's teacher certification program under the 1978 Certification Guidelines - probably Autumn Quarter 1981.

Also you may wish to consult the following sources if you are not already aware of them.


(2). Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations. by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. PFTE Series: no. 16. February 1974. (Has a section on costs and funding).


Please Note: Personally Identifiable Information was redacted due to privacy concerns.
Time does not permit my going into further depth on your question, however, I hope these references will prove useful to you.

Best wishes for success in your study.

Sincerely,

Clifford D. Foster
Professor of Education

c.c. Dr. Frederic T. Giles
Enc. (1)
February 17, 1981

Dr. Dale Bolton  
Department of Education  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dear Sir:

According to Dr. Lillian Cady, SPI, you have been involved in the development and evaluation of competency-based programs for the preparation and certification of school personnel at the University of Washington.

For a thesis study, I am reconstructing the activities in the development of the program for school administrators at Central Washington University and will be compiling and analyzing the direct and indirect costs incurred in the project.

As your experience appears to be relevant to the study that I am doing, I would appreciate receiving any information you may have available on the topic and any suggestions of other sources which you may recommend.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. Sue Shannon

Please Note: Personally Identifiable Information was redacted due to privacy concerns.
March 24, 1981

Ms. C. Sue Shannon

Dear Ms. Shannon:

Thank you for your letter of February 17. I am sorry, but from the brief description of your thesis project I do not feel I can adequately give you any information or suggest other sources of information.

If you could be more specific regarding your request then perhaps I could respond.

Sincerely,

Dale L. Bolton
Professor
Educational Administration

Please Note: Personally Identifiable Information was redacted due to privacy concerns.
February 17, 1981

Dr. Norma Dimmitt
Department of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dear Dr. Dimmitt:

According to Dr. Lillian Cady, SPI, you have been involved in the development and evaluation of competency-based programs for the preparation and certification of school personnel at the University of Washington.

For a thesis study, I am reconstructing the activities in the development of the program for school administrators at Central Washington University and will be compiling and analyzing the direct and indirect costs incurred in the project.

As your experience appears to be relevant to the study that I am doing, I would appreciate receiving any information you may have available on the topic and any suggestions of other sources which you may recommend.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. Sue Shannon
Dear Sue:

In examining your recent inquiry, I am not certain that any of my experience in competency-based program development would be of value to you. All of my works focused on teacher preparation.

May I suggest Dr. Howard Johnson, 309 Miller, DQ-12, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195. He now is in charge of the administrator certification program and was involved somewhat in the development of their competency based approach.

Also, if you have specific questions, I'd be happy to try to respond.

Sincerely,

Norma M. Dimmitt, Ed. D.
Director, Certification and Student Services

Please Note: Personally Identifiable Information was redacted due to privacy concerns.
APPENDIX F

Responses to Evaluation Questions
Appendix F
RESPONSES TO EVALUATION QUESTIONS

I. Do you believe your contribution to have been worthwhile in view of the outcome?

1. yes
2. very definitely
3. usually
4. yes
5. yes
6. yes
7. yes
8. yes. I believe it is vital that candidates be screened carefully for administrative credentials.
9. yes
10. yes. But as department chairman, I did not devote the time to this task that was given by many others.
11. yes
12. yes
13. --
14. yes
15. function is important; another administration could make the same contribution as I, but it is a worthwhile endeavor.
16. yes
17. yes, an improved program developed.
18. I hope so.
19. Indeed yes.
20. no
21. yes
22. --
23. Since I have not been directly involved for sometime, I cannot evaluate the outcome.
24. yes
25. no
26. yes. Although it is difficult to see whether the program is actually being following (sic) statewide.
27. yes, both personally worthwhile from value derived from interchange of ideas in development process, and, worthwhile that I feel that the final outcome is a valuable outline of process for Principal preparation.
28. yes
29. no
30. very definitely
31. --
II. Of what value is the program to the profession?

1. Makes program training period more realistic and focuses it on performance rather than just knowledge about the job.
2. It is making a major contribution to the concept of collaboration.
3. I feel it will improve the quality of the people who complete the program.
4. I believe that it has resulted in better prepared principals.
5. It provides professional preparation for those who wish to supervise and to develop curriculum.
6. My involvement was in the program's infancy, but it seems to me the process was well on its way to a necessary program articulation in areas such as internship prerequisites, master's degree requirements and school strikes.
7. It provides professional preparation for those who wish to supervise and to develop curriculum.
8. The program should help in the selection of candidates who will be an asset to the profession. It should help insure quality in the administrative ranks.
9. I believe this program is responsible for CWU's reputation as a leader in principalship training.
10. It is an essential program which provides professional leadership in curriculum, staff development, student education and management, public relations, and appropriate expenditure of public funds.
11. It is helpful in reviewing people who seek admission to the profession.
12. The program did cause the colleges to examine their programs from a "consumer" point-of-view.
14. Improved, hopefully, better prepared candidates.
15. To serve as a screening tool.
16. Each person is different and having varying experience. This program now allows more concentration on individual needs.
17. It raised and standardized internship and their requirements.
18. The program helps to prepare principals to meet the needs and challenges they will meet on the job.
19. Valuable if seriously pursued.
20. Strengthens administrator preparation program.
21. --
22. At the time I was involved I thought it would be a great value.
23. It is a better training model and procedure than the one I was subjected to during the very early 1960's when interning just started. From that perspective, the training program is superior.
24. Credentialing of principals is an extremely important process. This program has been organized and is being
followed to see that the credentialing of principals is properly done. This is more than I can say for other programs, such as superintendents.

27. The project was to develop a comprehensive outline for the preparation of school administrators. Through the process of identifying competencies achieved, I feel the outline shows accountability that should be required for any person desiring to be certified as a school administrator.

28. Specific direction in professional preparation due to competency-based program increases opportunity.

29. If instituted as described, is of great value.

30. I felt this project identified specific competencies needed by future principals, rather than theoretical experiences.

31. --
III. Having been an active participant in these activities, how do you feel about the collaborative nature of the program?

1. It is a must, from my point of view. The three-way mix in decision processes led to better decisions and to greater acceptance of the program.
2. It is the strongest component.
3. I think it is positive.
4. Excellent, valuable cooperation.
5. We had excellent cooperation and participation. Also, we had excellent backing from districts and professional organizations.
6. I have a positive feeling about the collaborative nature of the program. The participants took their roles seriously.
7. Limited participant; like the collaborative nature of the program.
8. I feel the interaction and varied points of view help strengthen the program.
9. valuable
10. It is good but very time consuming and expensive in comparison to older program.
11. okey
12. Open discussions and ideas help the total profession grow.
13. Good, although not cost-effective I'm afraid.
15. An important quality of the program.
16. Excellent
17. Only way to go.
18. Very sound procedure for joint input of professors and practitioners.
19. Very well carried through.
20. Yes, the legislature needs to fund the activity--otherwise we should abandon it.
21. Excellent cooperation with CWU.
22. --
23. Excellent
24. Good
25. I wasn't active.
26. Very positive.
27. Strongly positive. It is the way to develop a document that assists in providing more of a guarantee that our school administrators are properly qualified.
28. Good
29. Believe the process is important but am not sure of commitment from all involved.
30. Very good.
31. --
IV. From your prospective, do you think that the collaborative effort has made a difference in the direction and quality of the program? If so, how?

2. Screening candidates, developing standards and policies, shared decision-making.
3. It has provided everyone with a clearer understanding of what needed to be done.
4. Yes, most of the competencies were developed from ideas presented by public school representatives.
5. Yes, it has brought into focus the kinds of skills needed to do the job in the schools. It has made the program prepare the student in practical as well as in theoretical ways.
6. I like to think so because of the program articulation I mentioned above which evolved from the efforts of both the University staff and the school district personnel.
7. Yes, improved dialogue.
8. It is not clear at this time. Scrutiny over time would allow decisions to be made in this area.
9. Anytime this type of mixed group functions, the outcome is positive.
10. Yes. More thorough screening of candidates, more clearly defined objectives and program purpose, more stringent demonstration of professional competencies during internship, more complete records.
11. ?
12. The quality of candidates and the requirements to enter are more closely screened.
13. Uncertain.
14. Wenatchee School District intends to put more emphasis on its in-district administrative training program, both in dollars and administration time.
15. Hopefully, no data to support as yet.
16. Much of the material developed is being used in my district.
17. --
18. In cases where the competency guidelines are really being followed, yes. I have the feeling that standards still vary in different districts.
19. It enables the prospective principal to combine theory with practice and to practice on the job while still dealing with theory in the classroom.
20. It could, if all were equally committed.
21. Yes, our cooperative of some 20 districts/agencies have a direct investment in the process.
22. --
23. No direct involvement for 4 or 5 years so cannot say.
24. Yes, better commitment by all segments involved.
25. --
26. Yes, in that there has been significant consultation with practitioners in the field to develop a program that is going to meet the needs of future administrators.
27. The input from college and active administrators on several levels provided a broader view of the required training.

28. Yes, mutual input creates better total results.

29. Am not sure.

30. Very definitely. I feel that, as a former principal, I understood the specific competencies needed by the interns, as opposed to the "university" point of view.

31. --
V. Will the time involved and the added costs clearly demonstrate that the product perform measurably better on the job?

1. I certainly think so. I have no comparative data to prove this point, however.
2. I am not sure but think so because the quality of the candidates is much improved.
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. It has thus far. The program was accepted for certification in the spring of 1979, and has been growing since then.
6. This is, of course, the reason for the Program Unit. Better job performance is the goal, but there is no way I can say anything is "clearly demonstrated," having been removed from the project for a year.
7. Can't say for sure, but it should make some improvement.
8. Only time and close followup could attempt to measure this factor.
9. I believe it will.
10. Too early to tell. An effort must be made to research this question. The end result may not justify the added time and expense.
11. ? It has been very difficult to deny an applicant the opportunity to try for a credential. Our primary task is to make sure all criteria is met.
12. We can only hope so.
13. No
14. With Wenatchee's structured program, we have no doubt that our interns will be better prepared for administrative positions.
15. Hopefully.
16. Yes.
17. Time will only tell. Also, it is important to have an on-going program for those on the job.
18. If the competency program is truly being followed at the district level, yes.
19. That is difficult to say but in my opinion our principals are very able to tackle the challenges which await them on the job. I am 100% sold on the CWU program for developing administrators.
20. No. Collaboration does improve communication and articulation between public schools and higher education.
21. I hope so.
22. --
23. Hopefully this will occur. I think that any professional program that is continually trying to update their efforts should benefit the profession.
24. Yes
25. --
26. I would think so in that the preparation is a performance-type experience. My main concern, however, is that as the administrator moves from the provisional to the standard credential, that course work and actual work experience requirements are collectively and equitably met.

27. Time and cost were not the important ingredient for success. The "product" was good because of the individual's input, the leadership providing efficient organization and the diversity of experience represented. Time and cost were involved in getting the variety of individuals together.

28. Yes
29. No
30. Yes, I believe it will.
31. --