INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again–beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Crowell, Ronald Alan

THE ROLE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION IN THE MICHIGAN STATE PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Michigan State University PH.D. 1982

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other _____

THE ROLE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION IN THE MICHIGAN STATE PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

by

Ronald A. Crowell

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1982

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION IN THE MICHIGAN STATE PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

By

Ronald A. Crowell

Since 1979 the staff development effort of local and intermediate school districts in Michigan has been enhanced by the implementation of a legislatively mandated and funded state plan for professional staff development. The primary objective of this study was to examine the extent to which state colleges and universities have been involved in the design, development, and delivery of staff development programs and activities through this state plan. A second, related objective was to assess the extent to which departments and colleges of education in state-supported institutions of higher education in Michigan have provided support for faculty involvement in local staff development efforts. Twelve research questions encompassing the two basic objectives guided the investigation.

Two instruments designed to elicit information pertaining to the research questions were used in the study. One questionnaire was used to investigate program delivery at the local level provided through the state program. The other questionnaire was sent to an administrator in each of the eleven departments or colleges of education in Michigan state colleges and universties.

The findings of the study indicated that university personnel still play a substantive role in staff development, but not the dominant role of the past.

They are involved to some degree in all aspects of the state program, but participation is limited to nondecision-making roles in most cases. Another finding of the study pointed out that, when delivering staff development activities, most university personnel function as private entrepreneurs as opposed to officially sanctioned representatives of their institutions. Additional information supported the conclusion that university commitment to staff development is limited. Seven recommendations for policy and action were offered, as well as a number of recommendations for further study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Alfred North Whitehead once said, "Knowledge does not keep any better than fish." I suspect the same is true of dissertations. The memories and friendship of those who encouraged and supported me in this endeavor will last a lifetime, however. And there are some to whom I am especially grateful and who are primarily responsible for the completion of this task.

At Western Michigan University: Tom Ryan, close friend and partner in many endeavors, for providing the personal and organizational support without which this would not have been finished. Sue Timmer, whose unfailing good humor and unerring editorial skill eased the way.

At the Michigan Department of Education: Paula Tissot, who always had time and whose assistance in opening doors enabled this task to move forward.

At Michigan State University: George Ferns, Larry Lezotte, and Pat Demarte, members of my doctoral guidance committee, for their friendship, their interest in this project, and their continued support as the months passed.

Charles Blackman, my advisor, whose deep sense of professionalism and commitment to staff development has served as the guiding model for my continuing personal and professional development. The guidance and encouragement he has provided over the course of this project cannot be adequately acknowledged.

At 2822 Broadway: Chris, Corey, Leslev, and especially Nancy, for their support and patience and understanding as this venture progressed--and particularly for tolerating a card table in the living room for four months.

These people have touched my life in many ways and I owe them all very special thanks. I look forward to doing new things in new contexts with each of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Until recently professional staff development has received relatively little attention or support as a high priority for public education in the United States. Professional development for practicing educators traditionally has been an individual responsibility pursued in various settings as inservice education.[1] Providing inservice programs for teachers has been viewed either as a function of higher education delivered through college courses and workshops or as the responsibility of local school districts accomplished through designated inservice days. Motivation for participation in inservice education has been linked primarily to certification requirements and salary increments.[2] Improved teaching skills often have been a secondary consideration. Although it was assumed that increased teaching skill would result in better education for children, inservice activities have

---

[1]Ben M. Harris, Improving Staff Performance Through In-Service Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980), p. 26.

[2]Ralph W. Tyler, "In-Service Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future," in Improving In-Service Education, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 10.

seldom been conceptualized as part of a systematic approach to the improvement of schools.[3]

For many, this view has now changed. Unprecedented pressures on schools caused by decreasing enrollments and severe economic constraints have produced major changes in the education work place. These factors, coupled with expanding content and mandated programs, place new demands on teachers leading some educators to state that the continuing professional development of school staffs may be the highest priority for American education in this decade.[4] Harris points out that many conditions exist which create great urgency for in-service efforts and concludes that there is a necessity for "a major programmatic effort of the in-service education of personnel in all elementary and secondary schools and colleges."[5] In a recent article Harris acknowledges the present important status of in-service education:

> The growing importance of ISE [inservice education] and the recognition that all personnel can improve their performance capabilities in major ways, combined with the pressures for better education at reasonable costs, makes inservice education development

---

[3]Robert W. Houston, "The Nature of Change in Schools and Universities," in Staff Development and Educational Change, eds. Robert W. Houston and Roger Pancratz (Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980), p. 6.

[4]Roy A. Edelfelt, "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade," The Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974), p. 250.

[5]Harris, Improving Staff Performance, p. 13.

> a logical top priority at local, state, and national levels.[6]

THE UNIVERSITY'S ROLE IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

In the past, the university was the institution which traditionally considered itself the principal designer and deliverer of inservice teacher education. Universities have played the leadership role at both the preservice and inservice level. As Le Baron notes:

> The university school of education has been the traditional supplier of inservice training, usually through course formats or the design/delivery of workshops to meet the needs. Teachers requiring certification have usually found the institute for higher education (IHE) the only source of state approved credits, even when the courses have not contributed directly to the teacher's perceived needs within the particular teaching context.[7]

It is evident, however, that the university's role in inservice education has changed. Many factors appear to be at the root of these changes, one of which is that the university is reaping the negative benefits of the many criticisms being voiced about inservice education. Edelfelt has noted that: "The inadequacies of inservice education have been well documented in recent writings and

---

[6]Ben M. Harris, "The Evaluation of Inservice Education: Taking a Closer Look," The Developer (June 1982), p. 4.

[7]Walt Le Baron, Teacher Corps Reports: Inservice Development Processes (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Contract 300-76-0302, 1977), p. 5.

speeches"[8] and because of their historical role the colleges of education have often borne the brunt of the accompanying criticisms.

Much of the current literature pertaining to the university's role in inservice teacher education has focused on those factors which are creating barriers and constraints to the university's participation in inservice education. David Clark has addressed this topic:

> The negative perceptions of SCDEs (Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education) held by various groups constitute a current problem for all SCDEs. Many practitioners feel that SCDE training programs have not been but should be field based; need to be less general and more targeted to special problems and school populations; have not focused on the specific skills required in the classroom but should do so. Many school people and change agents feel that SCDEs have been unresponsive to the need for solving school problems and have failed to put theory into practice.[9]

In addition to these long-standing criticisms of the university's role, other factors also are affecting university involvement in inservice teacher education. Declining enrollments in schools in the seventies have led to a decreasing need for new teachers and, in many districts, to the termination of teachers. This also has caused a decrease in turnover of employed teachers and

---

[8]Roy A. Edelfelt, "The School of Education and Inservice Education," in Higher Education's Role in Inservice Education, ed. Karl Massanari (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977), p. 2.

[9]David L. Clark, "The Real World of the Teacher Educator: A Look to the Near Future," Phi Delta Kappan (May 1977), p. 683.

resultant increased longevity of teacher staffs.[10]

The effect of these interrelated conditions has been felt uniquely by the university. Students are not entering the preservice stream and, therefore, college of education undergraduate enrollments are dropping. Concurrently, the increased longevity of teachers has resulted in more teachers gaining full certification. In Michigan, as an example, nearly eighty percent of the employed teachers have continuing certification and nearly forty-five percent have the master's degree.[11] There simply are not as many teachers in need of certification and this has significantly diminished the power of the college-controlled, degree/credit-oriented inservice system.

Other factors also are affecting the involvement of the university in inservice teacher education. Issues of governance and control are much more important now than in the past.[12] Joyce has concluded that: "Teachers are unwilling to accept the same quantities of higher education mediated instruction than they have in the past

---

[10]Herbert Hite, "Inservice Education: Perceptions, Purposes, and Practices," in Planning Inservice Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives, eds. Herbert Hite and Kenneth Howey (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1977), p. 3.

[11]Teacher Supply and Demand Report (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1980).

[12]James F. Collins, "Centers for the Education of Teachers: Some Perspectives on Operation and Management" (New Orleans: Paper Delivered at NCSIE Conference, 1976), p. 22.

and are demanding much greater control over the content to which they will be exposed."[13] Howey[14] has noted that the depressed economy coupled with accelerating inflation also has created a severe constraint for the relatively expensive university-based inservice programs.

This litany of factors, negatively reflecting on the university's role, could be carried on to several more issues. The studies and analyses in the literature clearly indicate that the university's role has changed and is diminishing. Collins has spoken to these issues in regard to both preservice and inservice education and has concluded:

> To keep pace--to stay abreast--Teacher Education has to move aggressively and dramatically toward new and different ways of organizing and managing its resources which will produce significant and sorely needed changes in preservice and inservice teacher education.[15]

It is not easy, however, for a teacher education unit to change. Among other factors, the university itself, in the perception of some observers, often serves as an impediment to change. No less a group of authorities than the members of the Commission of Education for the

---

[13]Bruce R. Joyce, Kenneth Howey, and Sam J. Yarger, Issues to Face (Palo Alto, California: ISTE Report I, June 1976), p. 2.

[14]Kenneth R. Howey, "A Framework for Planning Alternative Approaches to Inservice Teacher Education," in Planning Inservice Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives, eds. Herbert Hite and Kenneth Howey (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1975), p. 32.

[15]Collins, Centers for Teachers, p. 22.

Profession of Teaching (CEPT) of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education has stated:

> Higher education has exploited teacher education for its own interests, while granting it low status, misplacing it organizationally and programmatically, and seriously underfinancing it. Even the vigorous development effort of the last 10 years has not produced much change; teacher education still sits on the academic street corner, tin cup in hand, begging for the capital to market its product. ....In consequence, teacher education has existed in a 'no-man's land' between the disciplines on the one hand and the professional school on the other.[16]

This position is not one of strength and makes it very difficult to effect changes which call for more "off-campus" involvement with the profession. In the future, the distinct possibility exists that higher education may be left out of the inservice scene. The era "when Teacher Training was basically in the hands of the colleges or universities and the decisions were almost exclusively made by college professors and/or college supervisors has unmistakably come to an end."[17]

This state of affairs raises an important question: Does the university have an alternative role in inservice teacher education? There are many facets to this question and this descriptive study, focusing on the university's current role in Michigan, relates to one of the possible answers.

---

[16]Robert B. Howsam et al., Educating A Profession (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1976), pp. 57-60.

[17]Collins, Centers for Teachers, pp. 22-25.

The Michigan State Plan for Professional Staff Development funded through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act, provides the context for this study. Primary emphasis is placed on the role and extent of involvement of universities in the program.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to examine the involvement of state universities--specifically departments and colleges of education--in the planning and delivery of programs and activities offered under the aegis of Section 97 of the State School Aid Act during its second full year (1980-1981) of operation. The study is based on two principal assumptions. The first is that state support for the professional development of school staffs is a firmly established policy priority. The second assumption is that state-assisted institutions of higher education are by charter and tradition (through their colleges or departments of education) integral to the instructional support system for Michigan's schools and thus have a definable role in the design and delivery of staff development activities.

The problem examined in this study is related to the university's role in developing and providing services within the state plan for professional staff development. The issues examined include the level, frequency, and form of participation. The context in which this problem will

be addressed is the state plan for professional development as implemented under Section 97 of the State School Aid Act, 1980-1981. In order to adequately assess the involvement of universities, it is also necessary to review the extent to which the state plan has been implemented.

The primary objective which guides the inquiry is to examine the extent to which state colleges and universities have been involved in the design, development, and delivery of staff development programs and activities offered through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act. This objective encompasses the full scope of the Michigan State Plan for Professional Staff Development; policy board functions and staff development activities offered. Data were collected from coordinators of 114 local and intermediate school district policy boards in Michigan. The resource people used in the program are identified only by institutional affiliation. University personnel involved may be affiliated with units other than departments and colleges of education. The findings, therefore, relate to the total college or university and to the full complement of staff.

A second objective is to assess the extent to which colleges and departments of education in state-supported universities in Michigan have, through their staff and through institutional support provided, been involved in local staff development activities. Information collected to meet this objective pertains only to departments and

colleges of education and, in this respect, is more narrowly descriptive than those data collected for the first objective. The findings differ in one other respect. Findings related to the first objective primarily focus on factors associated with program delivery. The findings related to the second objective deal principally with institutional policy and support for the providers of staff development programs and activities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The underlying concern implicit in this study is the future role of the university in providing inservice teacher education. A number of possible alternative roles exist. The Michigan State Plan for Professional Staff Development, which serves as the framework for this study, is one type of organized support for staff development and provides an explicit context to investigate the role of the university.

The goal of the Section 97 program

> in the broadest sense is to augment the existing system of professional growth opportunities.... This new system does not replace existing providers of inservice but is complementary through the provisions of a means for local educators to be more directly involved in defining professional growth experiences which can address locally defined problems.[18]

---

[18] Teacher Supply, pp. 1-2.

The program is based on locally identified needs. It creates a new decision-making procedure centered in a policy board with a majority of teachers as voting members. It encourages collaboration and creates a system which requires each policy board to implement a process to identify resources.

The provisions of the legislation suggest several potential roles for the university and lead to several questions which will be addressed in this study.

Following are the research questions, the data source, and relevant indicators necessary to answer each question.

	Research Question	Indicator	Data Source
1.	How many staff development programs and activities were delivered by staff from colleges and universities under the aegis of the Section 97 program?	Listing of activities delivered by college and university staff.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.
2.	How many of these programs and activities were delivered cooperatively with resource people from other institutions and organizations?	Description of arrangements analyzed by initial request and institutional arrangement.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.
3.	Do university staff who deliver staff development programs represent the institution they work for or do they function as	Listing of university staff arrangements with policy board.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.

	Research Question	Indicator	Data Source
	private consultants?		
4.	What sources of funds, other than those provided through Section 97, are used to pay university staff who deliver staff development programs and activities?	Listing and categorization of financial arrangements.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.
5.	What is the form and function of university staff involvement with local policy boards?	Listing of university staff on policy boards-- categories of functions specified.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.
6.	How are university personnel identified as resource people to deliver programs?	Tabulation of information from questionnaire.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.
7.	Do university staff tend to serve as resources for any specific category or categories of staff development activities?	Tabulation of questionnaire responses.	MDE Form 4674 Follow-Up.
8.	How many department or college of education personnel are assigned part- or full-time to work specifically in professional	Tabulation of interview information.	IHE Interview.

	Research Question	Indicator	Data Source
	staff development programs and activities?		
9.	What mechanisms exist in departments or colleges of education to facilitate the delivery of services to the field?	Description of arrangements noted by higher education representative.	IHE Interview.
10.	Do any fiscal arrangements exist in departments or colleges of education to support involvement in professional staff development activities?	Description of arrangements noted by higher education institutions.	IHE Interview.
11.	What informal linkages or formal relationships have been developed between department or college of education and other people or groups involved in the state plan for professional development?	Description of arrangements noted by higher education institutions.	IHE Interview.
12.	Does department or college of education policy and organization support service to local and intermediate school district staff development efforts?	Description of arrangements noted by higher education institutions.	IHE Interview.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

Scope

This study covers the 1980-1981 school year, the second full year of operation of the Michigan State Plan for Professional Staff Development implemented through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act. The scope of the study is narrowly descriptive and identifies the extent to which university staff were involved in providing services for local staff development programs and activities funded, either fully or partially, through the Section 97 program. More specifically, the role played by the departments or colleges of education in each of eleven state universities in providing staff development services to the field was examined. Staff development activities in 542 of the 574 school districts in Michigan for an entire year are examined. These districts account for 104,364 of the 109,682 professional personnel employed by public schools in the state.

Limitations

The study is limited to the examination of staff development programs and activities delivered during the period July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1981. This represents the period for which data were collected on MDE Form PD 4674--1980-81 Evaluation of Professional Staff Development Activities. Information from this form serves as the background source material upon which this study is based.

The supplemental questionnaire (MDE Form PD 4674 A--Follow-Up of Professional Staff Development Activities) developed for this study and sent to all policy boards was designed primarily to collect information about resource people who delivered programs and activities. In order to insure adequate return and to emphasize the importance of the information, the form was granted status as an official MDE form. In order to meet the requirements of the MDE Forms Office, however, the form could not request information on resource personnel by name; it was requested by organizational connection, if any. The study, therefore, does not attempt to identify the names of people who delivered programs. Information collected from the policy boards refers to resources being connected with a college or university and does not attempt to differentiate departmental affiliation. The information collected from the eleven state universities is limited to questions about staff and procedures in the department or college of education at each university.

A rigorous match between information collected from the local policy boards through the supplemental state form and that collected from the departments and colleges of education has not been attempted. This limits the precision of the findings but should not inhibit their meaningfulness or usefulness since the follow-up procedures provided a thorough check on the accuracy of the information from the primary data source.

SIGNIFICANCE

Questions have been raised about the form and function of higher education's involvement in professional development of school staffs in the changing context of education in the eighties. Departments and colleges of education are searching for new roles, new functions, and new clientele in an era of declining school enrollments and programmatic retrenchment. There are severe constraints impinging on departments and colleges of education which make the search an imperative. The concern for the extent of the university's role in the staff development enterprise goes beyond the pragmatic need to maintain faculty jobs to a more philosophical concern focusing on the nature of the role and underlying questions of what constitutes effective and appropriate practice.

There is broad agreement that the university still has a role in inservice teacher education. Edelfelt,[19] for example, has made nine specific suggestions for teacher education in this respect. Howey[20] has compiled an additional nine benefits for universities which engage in collaborative relationships with local school districts. At this point in time, departments and colleges of education (with their traditional modes of delivery and role definitions) and the Michigan Department of Education

---

[19]Edelfelt, "The School of Education," pp. 2-3.

[20]Howey, "A Framework for Planning."

(focusing resources on the staff development of local buildings or districts) appear to represent two differing facets of the staff development picture. Built into the Michigan State Plan for Professional Staff Development, however, are functions ranging from planning to evaluation which can provide a role for universities. Further, the highly skilled, experienced faculty in universities provide a pool of resources which can help furnish services to local schools and school districts if the mechanism can be found to make these resources available.

This study provides data reflecting the role universities play in a state where the professional development of school staffs is a clear policy priority. Such data provide a useful description of the university's current function in professional staff development which could serve as the basis for decision-making within the university regarding deployment of resources to meet this need. Results of the study, in addition, may be expected to inform state policy makers of ways to facilitate the more effective use of existing resources in higher education.

PROCEDURES AND DATA SOURCES

The outcome of this study is a descriptive analysis of the role that universities play in the state plan for

professional development. To facilitate this analysis and to answer the research questions posed, data were collected from the policy boards responsible for the implementation of the Section 97 program and from the departments and colleges of education in state colleges and universities involved in delivering inservice programs and services to the public schools.

The following data sources were used in this study:

1. The Michigan Department of Education requires each staff development policy board established in accordance with Section 97 to submit an annual evaluation of its professional development activities. The data requested relate to the elements of the state plan specified in Section 97: needs assessment procedures, policy board planning functions, and program delivery. The data provided indicate the extent to which these provisions of Section 97 have been implemented and thereby supply the background and context for this study.

2. A questionnaire focusing on the university's involvement in staff development policy boards and program delivery was developed and sent to all policy board program coordinators. The results obtained served as the basis for the analysis of the university's current role in staff development.

3. In order to confirm the data collected on the questionnaire and provide information necessary to extend the analysis to the accommodations made by departments and colleges of education for involvement in staff development, administrators from eleven state colleges and universities were interviewed by telephone and a brief questionnaire administered.

The eleven colleges and universities included are Michigan State University; Wayne State University; Northern, Eastern, Western, and Central Michigan Universities; Grand Valley State Colleges; Saginaw Valley State College; Ferris State College; Oakland University; and the University of Michigan. Appropriate administrators were identified to assure that necessary and sufficient information was collected not only to answer the evaluation questions adequately, but to expand and amplify the information leading to a more in-depth analysis and useful conclusion.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of clarity, the following definitions are used:

Staff Development: The current high level of interest in staff development/inservice education has brought with it a variety of definitions of these and related terms.

Harris points out that there are many widely used terms that are used "as if they were almost synonymous with the term in-service education."[21] The terms he specifies are "on-the-job training," "renewal," "staff development," "continuing education," "professional growth," and "professional development."[22] To provide consistency in this study, the term "staff development" is used, except where another term may be quoted and discussed.

The definition proposed by the Michigan Department of Education for "staff development" is:

> Staff development is a planned and organized effort to (1) provide teachers and other educational workers with knowledge and skills to facilitate improved student learning and performance commensurate with individual student incentive and potential, (2) meet additional developmental needs of students, and (3) meet the specific needs of staff that may or may not be related to cognitive outcomes.[23]

This definition is used in Chapters III, IV, and V of this study to denote those programs and activities sponsored under the aegis of the Section 97 program.

In Chapter II, Review of Related Literature, the terms "inservice education," "staff development," and "continuing professional development" are often quoted. Discussion of the points made in the literature uses the terms quoted for

---

[21]Harris, Improving Staff Performance, p. 20.

[22]Ibid.

[23]State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan (Lansing, Michigan: Office of Professional Development, Michigan Department of Education, March 22, 1979).

consistency and clarity.

The University: The term "university" refers to any four-year institution of higher education. University staff, as used in conjunction with the information collected through the MDE supplemental form, therefore, refers to the faculty of an institution of higher education without further specification of departmental affiliation.

Department or College of Education: The eleven state colleges and universities queried in this study each have an identifiable department or college of education in their organizational structure. Faculty and staff, when identified as belonging to one of these units, are therefore identified throughout this paper as "department or college of education" staff.

In the review of the literature in Chapter II, the terms "university" and "institution of higher education" often are used synonymously and usually refer to the education unit in the university. The term quoted in the reference being discussed is used for consistency and clarity throughout Chapter II.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This descriptive study is reported in five chapters. Chapter I consists of an introduction briefly summarizing the current state of staff development and the role of the university in delivering staff development services. The purpose of the study and related research questions, the

scope and limitations, a summary of the procedures used, definition of terms, and a statement of the significance of the study also are included.

In Chapter II the literature related to the problem and the study outlined in Chapter I is reviewed. The focus is on the role of the university in providing staff development and historical antecedents of staff development in Michigan.

Chapter III consists of the procedures used, the development of the instruments used, and the method of analysis. In Chapter IV the analysis of the data is presented and examined. The summary of the study, interpretations drawn, conclusions reached, recommendations, and reflections are presented in the final chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature pertaining to topics bearing on this study will be reviewed in this chapter. The studies discussed are part of a much larger general body of literature on professional staff development/inservice education. Nicholson, for example, identified over one thousand documents on the general topic of inservice teacher education catalogued in the ERIC system in the last decade. He also located approximately six hundred journal articles published in the last decade and more than two thousand books, periodicals, and unpublished papers written since 1957.[24] Edelfelt reported that in the two calendar years 1974 and 1975, there were 938 entries from journals and other sources reported in the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. From January 1978 through December 1979 the entries increased to 1387, an increase of nearly fifty percent.[25] This large

---

[24]Alexander M. Nicholson, Bruce R. Joyce, and Donald W. Parker, The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education (Palo Alto, California: ISTE Report III, June 1976), p. 4.

[25]Roy A. Edelfelt, "Six Years of Progress in Inservice Education," Journal of Research and Development in Education (Vol. 14, No. 2, 1981), pp. 112-118.

amount of literature is one indication of the importance currently attached to inservice education. Although as Ream acknowledges, "from its earliest beginnings, inservice education has been a topic of considerable interest with professional educators,"[26] this increasing amount of literature reflects a renewed attention to staff development and a changing educational context.

To examine and understand the university's present and shifting role in the large and complex inservice enterprise revealed through the literature, it is necessary to address the underlying question: "What has determined the university's current role?" Three related areas examined in the literature are especially pertinent to this question: (1) The changing context for professional staff development which encompasses a discussion of the historical purposes of and factors influencing inservice education up to the present, (2) The historical antecedents of professional staff development in Michigan which include the impact of various agencies and their policies, and (3) The nature of the university's role as it is influenced by outside perceptions and internal constraints. These are the three main issues examined in this chapter, especially as they relate to Michigan and as they illustrate the university's current role in inservice education/staff development.

---

[26]Marsha A. Ream, Inservice Education of Teachers (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Research Summary 1966-S1, 1966), p. 24.

THE CHANGING CONTEXT FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Historical Reasons for Inservice Education

The need for programs of inservice education has rarely been contested. In 1957 Corey observed that inservice "activities have been part and parcel of American education for more than a century."[27] Edelfelt and Johnson point out that the introduction of inservice education "as a formal, group activity dates...from 1839"[28] when the first teachers' institute was organized.

The form, purpose, and emphasis of inservice teacher education, however, have developed primarily according to the influence of the various factors contributing to the development and evolution of the total education program.[29] The teachers "institutes," for example, originated during a time when there was a shortage of even

---

[27]Stephen M. Corey, "Introduction," in Inservice Education For Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education, 1957), p. 2.

[28]Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, "A History of the Professional Development of Teachers," in The 1981 Report on Educational Personnel Development, ed. Emily Feistritzer (Washington, D.C.: Feistritzer Publications, 1980), p. 7.

[29]See Herman G. Richey, "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-Service Education," in Inservice Education For Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago, Ill: National Society for the Study of Education, 1957), p. 35; and Tyler, p. 9.

partially trained teachers.[30] This shortage of teachers, coupled with the steady expansion of school systems in this country, was the principal force behind inservice education for much of the next century.[31]

In the view of Harris, "historically, in-service education has been reactive rather than proactive."[32] He continues by documenting that the "growth of normal schools for preservice training was followed by rapidly developing college preparation programs, but the demand for teachers always seemed to outstrip the capacity of these institutions."[33] Further, the first century of inservice experience in this country was influenced by the developing system of certification requirements which led to the need for increased training. These conditions "made it essential that programs of in-service education of the period should be directed toward the most obvious defects of teachers."[34] This conception of a remedial

---

[30]Richey, p. 39.

[31]See Lorrin Kennamer and Gene E. Hall, "Educational Staff Development and Its Implementation: Past, Present, and Future," in Dimensions of Inservice Education, eds. Jerome Freiberg and Rubin Olivarey (San Antonio, Texas: The Texas Teacher Corps Network, 1978), p. 19; Harris, Improving Staff Performance, p. 26; and Richey, p. 35.

[32]Harris, Improving Staff Performance, p. 26.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Richey, p. 38.

process of inservice education designed to correct the deficiencies of teachers was the predominant view of the purpose of inservice well into the twentieth century.[35]

Improving the teaching staff to meet upgraded certification requirements assumed added importance after the turn of the century. From the First World War until the 1930s inservice teacher education was strongly affected by the establishment of quantitative standards for teaching certificates.[36] During this period, inservice programs "were not aimed primarily at helping teachers meet new requirements but rather at filling gaps in college degree requirements."[37] Edelfelt and Johnson state that the "modern system of inservice education, dominated by state regulations and school district requirements, is a product of two twentieth century movements, ...the credentialling movement...and the professional standards movement."[38]

The conditions following World War II, which created another acute shortage of teachers, again focused the efforts of inservice education on filling gaps and meeting

---

[35]See Corey, p. 2; Kennamer and Hall, p. 16; and Glen C. Hass, "Inservice Education Today," in Inservice Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1957), p. 14.

[36]Tyler, p. 10.

[37]Ibid., p. 13.

[38]Edelfelt and Johnson, "A History," p. 9.

certification requirements. In the 1960s the national curriculum projects and the emergence of potent societal forces also influenced the purposes for inservice teacher education.[39] But, as Harris[40] concludes, in this period the great urgency for inservice efforts remained driven by the need for many more teachers.

Writing in the "Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education" in 1957 (which was devoted to inservice education), Richey summarizes the purposes of the previous century of inservice education: "Historically, the changing program of in-service teacher education has been formulated in response to the demand for more and more teachers and the contemporary conception as to the relative importance of the various needs of teachers."[41]

Renewed Interest and Activity in Inservice Education

Until the sixties and into the early seventies inservice teacher education appears to have been guided more by these historical roots than by the calls for reform which were beginning to be sounded. Edelfelt and Lawrence, writing in a book which was the product of a national

---

[39]Tyler, pp. 13-14.

[40]Harris, Improving Staff Performance, p. 29.

[41]Richey, p. 36.

conference on reconceptualizing inservice education, state:

> In-service teacher education today bears a close resemblance to the concepts that have shaped it historically. It is usually required of teachers. Content and approach are prescribed by universities and school districts. Course credits are mandated by state regulations and school district policies. Although intentions have usually been good, too often programs are low level, piece-meal, and patchwork. Teachers achieve advanced degrees, credits for salary increments, and higher levels of certification, but the effort yields too little in the improvement of teaching or school program.
>
> In sum, in-service education has been the weakest and most haphazard component of teacher education. Even the most charitable would have to admit that it has not been nearly as effective as it might have been, considering the expenditure of time, effort, and resources.[42]

Statements such as this are indicative of the problems of in-service teacher which were beginning to be voiced in the sixties and which accompanied the renewed interest in inservice education. Edelfelt and Johnson trace the current interest in inservice education to a series of national conferences beginning in 1964 on the problems of teachers in service sponsored by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) and from the entry of the federal government in the professional development scene.[43]

---

[42]Roy A. Edelfelt and Gordon Lawrence, "In-Service Education: The State of the Art," in Rethinking In-Service Education, eds. Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), pp. 13-14.

[43]Edelfelt and Johnson, "A History."

This renewed interest brought inservice practice into sharp focus. Many writers argued that little energy and relatively few resources in the past had been devoted to the development of a sound conceptual base or to the research necessary to examine the long-term effects of inservice work.[44] Programs designed to meet teachers' actual classroom needs and to increase their competence were seldom found. Rubin concluded that the educational system had "not made an adequate effort to provide the support essential to the continuing education of teachers."[45]

In summarizing a series of articles dealing with improving inservice education in the early seventies, Rubin also stated that:

> The conceptions set forth....lead to three fundamental conclusions: teacher professional growth has not been taken seriously, it lacks a systematic methodology, and it has been managed with astonishing clumsiness. It is not surprising, therefore, that teachers have grown accustomed to its impotence, and that administrators have come to regard it as a routine exercise in futility.[46]

Brody analyzed the state of affairs in the early seventies:

> The condition of present-day in-service programs is analogous to a survival kit, providing quick help to the beleaguered,

---

[44]Louis J. Rubin, "Teacher Growth in Perspective," in Improving In-Service Education, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971).

[45]Ibid., p. 247.

[46]Ibid., p. 245.

> ill-prepared teacher facing a problem situation. In other professional disciplines, such as engineering, law, and medicine, where the pre-service curriculum is designed to provide basic concepts, theories, technologies, and problems of practice, the function of the in-service program is to present theoretical and practical developments as they occur."[47]

Harris also has noted that the approach to inservice teacher education tended to be "casual or sporadic."[48] Rubin concurs and points out another problem: "Relegated to a position of minor importance, staff development has been managed with such casualness that only rarely can one find authentic concern matched with a hardheaded assessment of results."[49] He goes on to assert that a "majority of in-service training programs also are either so prescriptive that they insult the teachers intelligence or so vague that they constitute an exercise in futility."[50]

Harris chronicled the evolving set of concepts and methods of in-service education from 1940-1975 and found

---

[47]H. S. Brody, "In-Service Teacher Education: Paradoxes and Potentials," in National Symposium: Critical Issues in Teacher In-Service Education, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1976), p. 4.

[48]Harris, Improving Staff Performance, p. 29.

[49]Louis J. Rubin, "The Case for Staff Development," in Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers, ed. Thomas J. Sergrovanni (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1975), p. 35.

[50]Ibid, p. 37.

the results "hardly reassuring."[51] He concluded that:

> Despite a long history of recognition as an essential part of the ongoing operation of the school program, in-service education seems constantly ensnared or diverted by less fundamental, but seemingly more urgent, developmental efforts.[52]

Edelfelt and Lawrence noted that: "the deplorable situation today exists probably not so much by design as by neglect."[53] Similar criticisms of inservice practice were made by many writers and researchers in the sixties and seventies.[54]

By the middle of the last decade, however, considerable energy was being directed to the development of mechanisms and methods for delivering more effective inservice programs to teachers. Much of the increasing amount of literature on inservice education referred to in the introduction to this chapter consists of reports of

---

[51]Harris, Improving Staff Performance," p. 29.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Edelfelt and Lawrence, p. 14.

[54]See Dwight W. Allen, "In-Service Teacher Training: A Modest Proposal," in Improving In-Service Education, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 109; Marvin M. Becherman, "Educational Change Agents: An 'Inside-Outside' Team," Educational Leadership (March 1973), p. 530; Corey, p. 1; Hopkin M. Davies and John T. Aquino, "Collaboration in Continuing Professional Development," Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1975), p. 274; and Kenneth R. Howey, "Putting Inservice Teacher Education Into Perspective," Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1976), p. 102.

successful inservice practice and descriptions of model processes and procedures.[55]

After many years of inattention and few attempts to adequately conceptualize inservice education or to monitor the outcomes, writers and researchers also began to focus their energies on these areas of neglect. A number of investigators and observers attempted to categorize and analyze the wide array of inservice functions and purposes. Edelfelt[56] described five different purposes for inservice education:

1 Degrees, credential, licensure;

2. School improvement;

3. Professional improvement;

4. Retraining, and

5. Personal professional development.

For each of these purposes he proposed six related variables:

1. The process by which the purposes are accomplished. For example, workshops, formal study, counseling, or individual choice.

2. The setting in which the process takes place.

3. The sanctions or authority (state laws, state policy or regulation, district policy).

4. The standards of control such as certification requirements or school district criteria.

---

[55]Nicholson, Joyce, and Parker, p. 4.

[56]Roy A. Edelfelt, "Inservice Education: Alive With Interest and Fraught With Problems," Inservice (September, 1976), p. 2.

5. The rewards for participation.

6. The motivation for participation.

Joyce[57] suggested five general contexts for inservice teacher education. These are:

1. Job-embeded. This refers to the training and learning that goes on while the teacher is actually working, through committee work, team teaching, interaction with others, and reading and curriculum analysis. This takes place on site and during working hours.

2. Job-related. Inservice of this type is not accomplished as part of the teacher's job but is closely related, such as workshops. This may be off-site.

3. Credential-oriented. This is the most traditional mode and is usually accomplished at the university through regular for-credit course work.

4. Professional-organization related. As teachers strive to become professionals, the organization provides specific opportunities for inservice education, such as workshops, conventions, and course work.

5. Self-directed. This approach to inservice assures the teacher has certain professional needs which s/he fulfills on her/his own.

Lawrence[58] reviewed ninety-seven studies which met his criteria for effective inservice programs and was able to suggest seven dichotomous approaches to the management of inservice activities. His typology also implies that the variables are attributes of successful programs as identified in his study:

---

[57]Joyce et al., pp. 14-18.

[58]Gordon Lawrence, "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education," Inservice (February 1977), pp. 1-8.

1. Individualized vs. group programs.

2. Active vs. passive roles for participants.

3. Demonstration or simulation vs. information-giving techniques.

4. Participants work together vs. working alone.

5. Long-term vs. one-shot program efforts.

6. Teacher-planned vs. preplanned programs.

7. Self-initiated vs. mandated programs.

Another classification scheme developed by Howey[59] deals with six reasons why teachers engage in inservice teacher education:

1. Transitional, as induction activities to allow for movement from generalized preservice education to the assumption of a specific role.

2. Job-specific, as a response to typically reoccurring needs and problems in one's situation.

3. System related, as a response to more dramatic changes in society, and in turn schools, which mandate role reorientation or redefinition.

4. General professional development, as a matter of staying current professionally without regard to immediate transfer or application of one's specific situation.

5. Career progression, as a means of changing role or responsibilities.

6. Personal development, as a process of understanding and enhancing the person in a professional role.

---

[59]Howey, "A Framework for Planning," p. 32.

Obviously, inservice education is conceptualized along a variety of lines; differing elements and differing characteristics seem to be important depending on the specific context. Nicholson notes that "(1) there is very little hard research [on inservice] available, and (2) what does exist is not very useful."[60] In reviewing the state of inservice education in the early seventies, Edelfelt and Lawrence made the following comment:

> There has never been a broad scheme of inservice education with a clear concept of purpose, appropriate undergirding of policy, legitimacy in commitment, and fixed responsibility for attaining agreed-upon goals.[61]

Hite points out, however, that there does seem to be agreement on two particular views: (1) "there is consensus among clients of inservice education (teachers) that inservice education in the past has been less than satisfactory, to say the least,"[62] and (2) "The professional development of practicing teachers is more important to more education agencies now than ever before."[63]

---

[60]Nicholson, Joyce, and Parker, p. 3.

[61]Edelfelt and Lawrence, p. 11

[62]Hite, "Inservice Education: Perceptions," p. 3.

[63]Ibid.

Federal Initiatives Influencing Inservice Education

During the sixties and early seventies, federal government initatives provided the mandates and incentives for much of the developmental work in inservice education. Although the federal government's involvement in inservice education dates back to the Vocational Education Act of 1917 (The Smith-Hughes Act), most people point to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as the government's first major effort.[64] Other major federal programs which support or supported various aspects of inservice education/professional development include the National Science Foundation instituted in 1954, the Higher Education Act in 1965, a series of laws and amendments throughout the sixties supporting professional development of special education teachers, and the Education Professions Development Act in 1967.[65] The Education Professions Development Act was the first "comprehensive legislation for educational personnel development and also the first legislation that concentrated on education personnel development, mainly inservice personnel."[66]

This act spawned many of the programs (27 programs in

---

[64]Edelfelt and Johnson, "A History," p. 44.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Ibid.

all[67]) which have had direct impact on our current understanding of inservice education and on current inservice practice. Two of the most well known programs which have been particularly important were the Training Teachers of Teachers (TTT) program and the Teacher Corps (which was brought under the Act). In 1976 the National Council of States on Inservice Education (NCSIE) was organized under the sponsorship of the Teacher Corps.[68] Seventeen states with major commitments to inservice education, as well as five national teacher and administrator organizations, are members of the NCSIE.

Two other public laws which have directly influenced the present context of inservice education were P.L. 94-482, authorizing federal teacher centers in 1976, and P.L. 92-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975. Many of the reports cited in this chapter are the direct result of programs and developmental work sponsored by these federally legislated mandates.

The Present Context for Inservice Education

The issues and factors discussed in the previous sections provide the necessary background for an understanding of the present context for inservice education. As early as the beginning seventies the literature was sprinkled with warnings of the changing

---

[67]Ibid., p. 45.

[68]Hite, "Inservice Education: Perceptions," p. 7.

context in education and the need to wrestle with the problems and issues facing education. In the last decade many writers have been discussing the changing forces driving the schools to recognize an increasing need for inservice education.

Fisher in 1974, for example, recognized these problems: "Education--at all levels and of all types--is faced with pressures and problems much greater and more complex than the pressures and problems that accompanied the growth and expansion of the sixties."[69] The demands that Fisher listed at that point in time included society's demand for greater accessibility to education, the demand for more relevance in educational goals, for more accountability, increased productivity (cost effectiveness and efficiency), and demonstrable measures of educational outcomes.[70]

Such demands are accompanied by pressures and circumstances which have created a complex, paradoxical situation in education. Educators are facing challenges which are unparalleled in our history and which forcefully impact the present context of inservice education/staff development.

---

[69]Floyd B. Fisher, "Coordination: The Need in Continuing Education," Adult Leadership (March 1974), p. 289.

[70]Ibid.

These challenges have compelled a belt tightening that some writers feel will remain with education for the foreseeable future. As Fisher observed:

> The unprecedented rate of growth has slackened and in some cases has virtually stopped. We live in a period of scarce dollars, of declining markets for the present products of our institutions, of shrinking percentages of college-age youth."[71]

Factors such as these are seen by several writers as some of the primary reasons for the interest in staff development which characterizes the late seventies and early eighties. Dillon summarizes the factors most writers include in their analyses:

> The reasons for the increased emphasis on staff development are: (a) the declining birthrate and resultant decline in teacher turnover, (b) public dissatisfaction with the achievement of many students, and (c) general societal pressures that impinge on schools.[72]

Carey and Marsh also note that "public schools are increasing their efforts in inservice teacher education to serve a maturing teacher population in a context of declining budgets and increased external demands."[73] Hendee focuses on declining enrollments: "Today, declining enrollment presents educators with a startling new

---

[71]Ibid.

[72]Elizabeth A. Dillon, "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise," Educational Leadership (December 1976), p. 165.

[73]Lou M. Carey and David D. Marsh, University Roles in Inservice Education: Planning for Change (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1980), p. 1.

dimension and challenge. Over the next few years, staffs must be provided ways to change their teaching field from a unidimensional to a multidimensional one."[74] Sandefur discusses these same factors which he says emphasize the need for rethinking inservice education programs for teachers:

> 1. Shrinking school enrollments and the present supply of teachers make it more difficult to obtain teaching positions.
>
> 2. Teacher mobility has been reduced and teachers are more stable in their positions.
>
> 3. Increasing teacher professionalization and the developing strengths of their professional organizations have an impact on inservice education. Teachers are a significant political and professional voice. They have won the right to negotiate for salaries, improved working conditions, and a role in governance. They demand a voice in the conduct of their professional programs.[75]

Davies and Aquino concur that these are the major reasons for the increased emphasis on inservice education. They list the reasons as:

> ...(a) declining preservice enrollments; (b) lack of school renewal obtained through the yearly influx of new personnel; (c) concern of teachers for their own professional development; and (d) concern of the public, manifested through their representatives in politics and

---

[74]Raymond E. Hendee, "Toward Effective Staff Development Plans and Programs," Educational Leadership (December 1976), p. 164.

[75]J. T. Sandefur, "We Can Change--We Must Change," Inservice (January 1979), p. 13.

> legislatures, for the upgrading of American education.[76]

Hite also cites (1) economic pressures and declining enrollments..., (2) concerns with quality education with an increasingly older, fully certified staff at the state level, (3) demands for retraining to meet specific needs, such as for multi-cultural education and mainstreaming, at the district level, and (4) the political position of teacher organizations, as some of the reasons for the increased importance of inservice education.[77]

Other writers emphasize a somewhat different perspective in their analyses of the changing context of education and resultant increased emphasis on inservice education. Nicholson specifies three forces which have converged to bring about a changing scene: (1) "the influences of the recent English concern with the revolution in inservice education and in schooling," (2) "increased teacher militancy," and (3) "the general disenchantment of the public with the educational establishment."[78] Powell has listed several factors which underscore the recognition for continuous professional development, including the knowledge explosion, new technological developments, new approaches to teaching, and increasing specialization within many

---

[76]Davies and Aquino, p. 1.

[77]Hite, "Inservice Education: Perceptions," p. 4.

[78]Nicholson, Joyce, and Parker, pp. 34-36.

fields.[79] Gallegos, on the other hand, asserts that "the growing interest in staff development for public school teachers...is not necessarily what it seems."[80] He argues that:

> ...the flurry of activity surrounding staff development (i.e., inservice training) is to a large extent due to economic and political pressures with a direct relationship to power, to the control of salaries granted, and, in the case of higher education, to survival.[81]

Many of the factors discussed by the previous authors are included in what Neale, Bailey, and Ross have dubbed "a new reality"[82] for education. In a comprehensive analysis of school improvement strategies, they contrast the period of enormous growth and optimism about the role of education which existed between 1950 and 1970 to a new context for school improvement since 1970, which they call the "Age of Slowdown."[83] They include a broad context in their analyses:

> As the 1970s unfolded, dramatic changes in the educational scene brought about 'a new reality'

---

[79]Douglas R. Powell, Continuing Teacher Education: The University's Role (Evanston, Illinois: Occasional Paper Number Six, Center for the Teaching Professions, Northwestern University, April 1974), p. 1.

[80]Arnold M. Gallegos, "Politics and Realities of Staff Development," Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1980), p. 21.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Daniel C. Neale, William J. Bailey, and Billy E. Ross, Strategies for School Improvement (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981), p. xi.

[83]Ibid., p. 49.

> for schools....Very different conditions have emerged as a context for American education. World-wide resource shortages produced inflation and reduced economic growth. School enrollments nationally began to decline. Disillusionment about the role of schools in social progress was common, and schools were criticized for declining test scores.[84]

The factors presently affecting, and in some ways controlling, the inservice scene and the university's role in this scene are themselves part of a much more encompassing web of circumstances. If teacher educators are to gain a fundamental understanding of the current context affecting the staff development effort, these circumstances also must be considered.

Dole,[85] for example, discusses a number of ideological and values issues impacting education, specifically teacher education, today. Included in these issues are the effects of the conservative swing in the U.S., the related value changes, and the current political scene. In Dole's view, such fundamental conditions have eroded traditional faith in teacher education and have profound implications for practice.

The challenges and issues which emerge from the interaction of all the various factors provide the context for inservice education/professional development in the eighties. In overview, the effects of these converging

---

[84]Ibid., p. xi and p. 49.

[85]Carl J. Dole, "Conservatism in America: What Does it Mean for Teacher Education?," Journal of Teacher Education (July/August 1981), p. 15.

circumstances have had a major impact on the nature, direction, governance of, and support for, professional staff development.[86]

Summary

In this section the changing context for professional staff development was discussed. Inservice teacher education historically has developed according to the various demographic, political, and policy factors affecting the teaching force. The development of teacher institutes, the impact of the developing certification system, and the parallel professional standards movement were discussed. The continued shortage of adequately trained techers was the predominant factor influencing staff development practice during the initial 150 years' history of the organized education system in this country.

The renewed interest in staff development which began in the sixties then was considered. Inservice education's inadequacies were recognized and many proposals for change, new inservice models, and various analyses were offered during the sixties and the early seventies, and the literature discussing these issues was reviewed in some detail. Included in this discussion were the various federal initiatives also influencing the inservice education enterprise during this same period.

---

[86]Edelfelt, "Six Years of Progress."

Much of the developmental and conceptual work spawned by the renewed interest in inservice education and federal initiatives has had a direct impact on current understanding of inservice eduction and on current practice. Also influencing current practice, however, was the changing social, economic, and educational context of the seventies. Pressures and problems impinging on education, such as the teacher surplus, a maturing teacher force, declining enrollments, and severe economic constraints, were discussed in light of their influence on the present staff development effort.

The changed context for inservice education described here presents departments and colleges of education with unique challenges. This study may serve to provide information which can be useful as these challenges are confronted in the eighties. Particularly important as background for this study are the next two sections of this chapter: The Historical Antecedents of Professional Staff Development in Michigan and The Role of Higher Education in Providing Professional Staff Development.

THE HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN MICHIGAN

Although in many respects the Michigan experience mirrors the national experience, the state has been especially strong in its support for professional staff development. The historical factors leading to the current state of affairs regarding professional staff development

in Michigan are reviewed in this section.

The Beginnings of Certification and Teacher Education

The writers of the constitution were silent on the subject of education and, therefore, under the provisions of the Tenth Amendment, it became a function of the states.[87] Although the states did not move rapidly to take control over local common schools, state school systems eventually began to emerge and with them the inevitable responsibility for assuring an adequate supply of qualified teachers and a beginning concern for teacher preparation.

The present preservice and inservice endeavors, as they are related to the state school system, developed simultaneously with the development of centralized controls over teacher education and certification; a process "not fully and universally accomplished until about the middle of the twentieth century."[88] This is a situation which came about through the circumstances of history and to understand it, it is essential to review the past briefly.

Cremin notes that the development of teacher education can be divided into four distinct periods.

---

[87]T. M. Stinnett, "Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation," in Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, eds. Edgar Fuller and J. B. Pearson (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1969), p. 383.

[88]Ibid.

> The first of these is the Colonial period (1600-1789) during which there was little interest in popular education and virtually no interest in teacher education per se. A second period embraces those years between 1789 and 1860 when Americans laid the foundations of their state public school systems--particularly at the elementary level--and established the first normal schools to meet the growing need for professionally prepared teachers. A third period covers the years from 1860 to 1910, a period when the vast expansion of elementary and secondary education was reflected in the increase of normal schools, the early evolution of the teachers college, the introduction of teacher education into liberal arts colleges and universities, and the development of educational programs for teachers in service. Finally, the fourth period covers the years since 1910 when rising enrollments, expanding curricula, and the growing efforts of state agencies and professional groups to raise educational standards have led to the upgrading of virtually every phase of teacher education.[89]

The last three periods are germane to this review, although the emergence of teacher "training" as a state effort did not begin until the initiation of the state normal school movement in 1839 with the establishment of the first normal school in Massachusetts. The normal school at Ypsilanti, Michigan, established in 1849, was the sixth opened in the United States.[90]

Certification, which is considered by many educators the end product of formal teacher education, followed essentially the same path as the development of teacher education. In Michigan's early history certifying teachers

---

[89]Lawrence A. Cremin, "The Heritage of American Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education (June 1953), pp. 163-170.

[90]Stinnett, p. 388.

was strictly a local matter. Township school inspectors issued one-year certificates which were good only in the township granted. Age or educational limitations were not imposed and no uniform way to determine competency existed.[91] From this helter-skelter beginning, attempts were made to provide certifying standards and practices almost as soon as the state appointed a superintendent of schools. The State Superintendent in the 1840s--Ira Mayhew--proposed different grades of certificates for teachers, granted on a statewide basis, which would give teachers an "incentive to upgrade themselves educationally."[92]

Teacher Institutes

Superintendent Mayhew initiated the first teachers' institute in the state in 1846.[93] The purpose of the institute was to provide educational experiences for teachers and continued, in different forms, as a basic inservice vehicle in Michigan through the 1960s. "Varying in length from a few days to six weeks, the institutes provided an opportunity for teachers to review the subjects taught in school and to study methods of teaching."[94]

---

[91]James P. Pearson and Edgar Fuller, eds., Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1969).

[92]Ibid, p. 605.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Stinnett, p. 388.

As Carey notes:

> During most of the nineteenth century, and to a degree during the first few years of the twentieth, teachers in the common schools were generally immature, poorly educated, and superficially trained. The main purpose of in-service education was to correct such deficiencies, and teachers' institutes became the chief means of accomplishing this end.[95]

During 1907-1909 State Superintendent Luther L. Wright established the pattern for summer training institutes which was followed into the sixties. In 1910 the state normal schools held summer institutes in which 3,300 teachers participated. Two other summer institutes, one sponsored by the Upper Peninsula Education Association and the other by the Michigan State Teachers Association, attracted 5,000 participants. Additionally, the 143 independent county institutes operating in Michigan provided summer experiences for 11,543 teachers. Thus, approximately seventy percent of the state's teachers attended summer institutes in 1910.[96]

The county institutes increased for a period of time and then, as World War I caused many teachers to seek other jobs or go into the service, the institutes decreased until the twenties when they again flourished. Although county institutes reached their peak in the thirties and declined after World War II, state institutes continued to be held each fall,

---

[95]Carey and Marsh, p. 2.

[96]Pearson and Fuller, p. 605.

> authorized by the state board and conducted by the Michigan Federation of Teachers, the Detroit Board of Education, and the Michigan Education Association.
>
> By 1965, however, a great many educators were seriously questioning the meaningfulness of teacher institutes. The state board appointed a 12 member committee, consisting of representatives from various educational and professional organizations, to review the purpose and need for these institutes and to make policy recommendations. Many believe that the local school districts should be given the responsibility, with individual districts determining whether time should be used for in-service training or institutes, or whether any such training should be held.[97]

This view, no doubt, reflected the perceived value of the institutes in the changing social and professional milieu of the early sixties. The massive amount of federal money pouring into education was providing many more opportunities for teachers to be involved in new developmental and demonstration projects, thereby diminishing the perceived need for the older inservice mechanisms.

The Entry of Higher Education and the Centralization of Certification

In the century prior to the 1930s higher education did not automatically assume a leadership role (or even a very important role) in preparing teachers for the public schools. The establishment of a chair of science and art of teaching at the University of Michigan in 1879 marked the first direct involvement of higher education in the

---

[97]Pearson and Fuller, p. 607.

preparation of teachers.[98] The summer institute sessions provided the vehicle for higher education to enter the inservice market.[99] Edelfelt and Johnson trace the university's inservice endeavors into the early twentieth century:

> As the trend toward more education for teachers continued, spurred by the credentialling movement and the push for higher educational standards, the university became the dominant force in the inservice effort as well as in preservice preparation of teachers.[100]

The centralization of certification and upgrading of certification requirements are key to the role played by the university in the preparation and continuing professional development of teachers. Centralization of the granting of certification was completed in 1935 when the Michigan legislature passed an act reducing the granting authorities from five to one--the State Board of Education.[101] This act also required the State Board of Education to prescribe courses of preservice study leading to "degrees in connection with several institutions of the state."[102] The long-term effect of this

---

[98]Ibid.

[99]Robert E. Grinder, Virginia Boyle, and Lou M. Carey, "Teacher Education's Professional Development in the Context of Emerging Field Experiences," in The Institutionalization of Change and Inservice, ed. Paul R. Walker (Bellingham, WA: Far West Teacher Corps Network, 1978), p. 14.

[100]Edelfelt and Johnson, "A History," p. 6.

[101]Pearson and Fuller, p. 608.

[102]Ibid.

legislation and the attendant policy of the state education agency was to make the degree-granting institution the principal provider of credit courses for certification and inservice education.

While certification and degree requirements were centralized and formalized in the mid thirties, other legislative and institutionally sponsored efforts were developing which also were to have impact on professional staff development in Michigan. These efforts were reflective of a philosophy focused on local decision-making rather than centralized control.[103] One important program implemented in the fall of 1935 was the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program, sponsored by the State Department of Public Instruction.[104]

Comparable to the current state of affairs in Michigan, the early thirties was a time of stressful social, economic, and educational conditions. Declining economic support for education occurred simultaneously with increasing demands for the schools to help solve societal problems.[105] Although the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program "grew out of efforts to mobilize citizen

---

[103]Edward Taylor Spink, The Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program: A Descriptive Study of State Leadership in Curriculum Development (1935-1968) (East Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974), p. iv.

[104]Ibid.

[105]Ibid., p. 28.

support for refinancing education,"[106] it is particularly germane to the background of the study reported here since it was a central effort in the attempts in Michigan to garner widespread cooperative support for educational improvement beginning in the thirties and continuing over the next three decades.

Local Involvement in Educational Policy

Spink notes that in the mid thirties the State's educational philosophy "drastically changed to a...new philosophy based on cooperation and local autonomy as the state education agency encouraged curriculum development in the local school district."[107] In a 1960 review of the program, Bartlett emphasized that this program was "built around the concept of the strength of the democratic operation as opposed to centralized, autocratic state school administration."[108] The Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program was "one method employed by the State Department of Public Instruction to implement a policy of providing service to local school districts."[109]

---

[106]Ibid., p. ii.

[107]Ibid., p. 21.

[108]Lynn Bartlett, The Old and the New Faces of the Michigan Curriculum Program (Lansing, Michigan: Department of Public Instruction, 1960).

[109]Ibid.

In the Cooperative Curriculum Program inservice education of teachers was one of three major emphases which prevailed throughout its thirty-three-year existence.[110] The program was conceived as a statewide program to improve instruction in the schools in Michigan[111] and as such logically involved inservice education as it developed. In 1936 the initial Curriculum Steering Committee presented four long-range needs for future committee consideration. One of these four primary needs concerned the provision that "should be made, if any, for in-service training through study groups throughout the state in order that teachers may understand current issues and trends in the curriculum."[112]

From the earliest, teachers were encouraged to share innovative practices through the Curricular Bulletins published by the program.[113] These later provided the basis for inservice activities at local levels.[114]

The Curricular Bulletins also served as a dissemination mechanism for the curriculum materials published by the State Department of Public Instruction. Since the teacher had to evaluate the usefulness of the material presented in

---

[110]Spink, p. 21.

[111]Ibid., p. 48.

[112]Ibid., p. 54.

[113]Ibid., p. 334.

[114]Spink.

the bulletins, the Curriculum Steering Committee found it necessary to stimulate inservice education activities which could aid teachers in implementing these curricular ideas.[115] This link between the Cooperative Curriculum Program activities and related inservice education for teachers remained a part of the functional operation of the Program throughout its existence. The committees initiated through the Program sponsored conferences and conducted workshops for teachers until the very end of its existence in 1968.[116] In fact, participation in many aspects of the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program was, by the Program's nature, participation in inservice activities. Spink concludes that:

> The experiences provided in committee meetings, planning sessions for conferences and workshops, preparing publications, and other committee activities provided an inservice education activity for the individuals serving in the program.... Inservice education was one of the first concerns identified and continued to be a major thrust of the program throughout its history. Based on the belief that teachers should be an integral part of curriculum development at the local level, the program sought ways to upgrade and improve their skills.[117]

Other activities, either part of or closely associated with the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program, implemented during this same general time period

---

[115]Ibid., p. 69.

[116]Ibid., p. 303.

[117]Ibid., pp. 321-323.

(1935-1965) also reflected the State's emphasis on local action and curriculum development by administratiors and teachers. The August Working Conference, for example, was one approach to curriculum development where local educators worked together "cooperatively and effectively to make intelligent decisions with the aid of professional consultants."[118] Beginning in the summer of 1938 "workshops of six-weeks duration were held for, and especially geared to, the needs of those schools participating"[119] in the initial phases of this program. Beginning in 1940 the August Working Conference was held for at least one week each year for fourteen years.

The purpose of the August Working Conference was focused on curriculum development and change--the workshop process used resulted in personal professional development for the participants. As Stroud points out, "By means of the processes employed, the participants were able to extend their knowledge base in personal and meaningful ways."[120] In this respect the program provided one of the most important professional development activities sponsored by the State during this period.

---

[118]Sarah Jane Stroud, The Michigan August Working Conference as a Method of Curriculum Development (East Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966), p. 26.

[119]Ibid., p. 86.

[120]Ibid., p. 163.

Although the August Working Conference was discontinued after fourteen years, the discontinuance can be viewed as a measure of its success. Many schools were beginning to hold preschool inservice workshops and it was concluded that it was no longer necessary to conduct statewide workshops.[121]

The final three years of the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program (1965-1968) was "an intensive evaluation period"[122] for the Program and, in the broader context, a period of significant change in the policies of the Michigan Department of Education. Spink quotes a speech reviewing the role of the Michigan Department of Education in curriculum development in which Ferris Crawford identified 1970 as "the final closing of an educational cycle which has taken approximately fifty years to complete."[123] The Program was based on a "philosophy of local development of the school curriculum"[124] and provided the means for developing local leadership and stimulating local curriculum development and inservice education.

However, the adoption of a new State constitution (providing for an elected Board of Education and appointed State Superintendent of Public Instruction), coupled with

---

[121]Spink, p. 14.

[122]Ibid., p. 69.

[123]Ibid., p. 9.

[124]Ibid., p. 234.

"continued attacks on the philosophy of local control,"[125] had a profound impact on educational policies related to inservice education in Michigan in the late sixties and early seventies. Federal legislation giving the State more regulatory functions, and the final phase of the centralization and upgrading of certification, also contributed to the changing nature of State policies during this period. Spink notes that, although new curriculum committees replaced the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program in 1968, these committees were not reappointed in 1969 by the then Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction, John Porter.[126]

Thus, the primary State policies and mechanisms (as well as the related social and political circumstances) supporting inservice education for many years in Michigan underwent radical changes during a relatively short period of time. The resulting shifts in policy and program are described in the remainder of this section.

The Emerging State Role-- The Late 1960s

The policies and procedures which were to influence the State's role in inservice education/staff development from the late sixties to the present time had their genesis in a new State Constitution, ratified in 1963, which made provision for the appointment of a Superintendent of Public

---

[125]Ibid., p. 237.

[126]Ibid.

Instruction by an elected State Board of Education. In 1969 the State Board of Education appointed Dr. John Porter to the post of Superintendent. From the outset, Dr. Porter proved to be an advocate of school improvement in Michigan through centralized direction and control.

Dr. Porter's position effectively became the policy of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE). State education policies advocating centralized control were clearly counter to the espoused philosophy of the past decades championing local autonomy and local decision-making. The effect of this change is difficult to document except in the rather abrupt cessation of the committees and activities of the past and the negative attitude expressed toward the Michigan Department of Education in the early seventies. Spink quotes Whan who found that "...at the present time the MDE is viewed as inhibiting change rather than stimulating change at the local level."[127] Spink also reports that "regardless of Department intentions, local district personnel do sense a state takeover," [that] "local districts do accept the need for a strong partner in the department of education" [but] "the present partnership is not viewed in a positive manner" [and that local responsibilities are] "being eroded away by the MDE assuming too much responsibility."[128]

---

[127]Ibid., p. 15.

[128]Ibid., p. 16.

During Dr. Porter's early tenure and through his insistence, the MDE implemented a system of accountability for schools and school personnel, charging them with the responsibility for providing quality education for all students. An emphasis on teacher quality was the recognized key to this effort and, therefore, the need for increased staff development emerged. Excerpts from a Michigan Department of Education description of the "Michigan Approach" present this emphasis as state policy:

> The Michigan Department of Education in recent years has concluded that one of the major keys to success in developing satisfactory schools is the retraining and upgrading of staff....teachers should have the skills to bring student learning up to stated expectations....As a result, professional development activities have emerged among the most important educational activities in the State of Michigan....The Michigan Department of Education is advocating a process of professional development which has as its underlying assumption that schools can make a difference.[129]

Renewed Interest in Professional Staff Development

As early as 1970 the State Superintendent called for programs for the professional development of school staffs as a necessary aspect of his push for school improvement.[130] From that beginning the push for

---

[129] Professional Development of School Staffs (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, October 1976), p. 1.

[130] "Evaluation of Professional Staff Development" (Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished memorandum, Michigan Department of Education, 1981).

a state plan for professional development went through a series of position papers, council reports, legislative proposals, and task force recommendations. MDE initiatives began with proposals for budget support for local programs:

> In 1971 and 1972 the State Board of Education endorsed proposals for state support of locally defined staff development programs. Such requests were not successful. In 1973 the Department of Education developed a position paper and proposed statue authorizing a statewide network of teacher centers. In Fall of 1974 the State Advisory Council for Teacher Preparation and Professional Development rejected the 1973 position paper and instead adopted a series of guidelines for staff development center programs. Although the Council endorsed state support for such programs a concern was expressed for the need for local response to staff development needs.
>
> In a separate yet related action in 1974, the State Superintendent made a series of recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Governor as a result of the work of a state task force concerned with the accountability issue. Since this concern originated with Detroit, the State Superintendent proposed that a professional development center be authorized for Detroit. With the support of the State Board of Education and the Governor, Michigan's first state funded professional development center became a reality and began operation in March, 1976.[131]

Two additional "outstate" professional development centers were funded and began operation in the fall of 1977. In 1977 the Michigan Department of Education presented a State Plan for Professional Development to the State Board of Education. Funding was delayed and in 1978 a special

---

[131] Staff Development of Educational Personnel (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1977).

appropriation to the MDE supported an independent study to define a statewide system for professional development which would allow more control by local educators, meet locally identified needs, and be cost effective.[132]

This study (known as the Bettinghouse report) was directed by an independent contractor who worked with an advisory group made up of fifty percent teachers as well as representatives of many of the other groups who had a stake in the development of a state-supported professional staff development plan. This is an especially important action since the position of the Michigan Education Association (MEA) during this same time period (the late sixties to late seventies) also has had an important impact on staff development policy and practice.

While the state education agency was advocating accountability and increased centralized direction and control, the MEA, and its parent organization, the National Education Association (NEA), were pursuing policies of increased teacher control at the local level and governance of the profession. In 1974, for example, the NEA published a statement of priorities for instruction and professional development.[133] The theme throughout this

---

[132]Erwin P. Bettinghouse, ed., A State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan (Lansing, Michigan: Study submitted to the Michigan Department of Education, 1978).

[133]Douglas Ward, Local Associations Eye Instruction and Professional Development (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1974).

discussion of thirteen priorities was governance and control over the instructional and staff development programs by the teaching force.

In the staff development area, however, the professional association's position complemented the Michigan Department of Education; both were strong advocates but with differing views of practice. The MEA's "Platforms" of the early seventies consistently called for strong, cooperatively developed programs of staff development funded through state aid.[134] An NEA Resolution (74-22) in 1974 stated: "The National Education Association recognizes the need for the continuing career development of educators and supports in-service training."[135]

O'Keefe notes, however, that the approach to inservice espoused by the NEA in the early seventies was

> a break from the traditional past....In-service education, the NEA contends, must be substantially more than extension courses offered by a neighboring university. While these responses can undoubtedly be helpful, the most valuable and least used resources exist in the (teachers) peer group.[136]

Agne and Ducharne argue that the professional association's impact was particularly important during the

---

[134]"MEA's Platform," Teacher's Voice (April 30, 1973), pp. 2-3.

[135]Inservice Education: Infopac No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: NEA, Fall 1974).

[136]William O'Keefe, "Some Teacher-Centered In-Service Programs," Today's Education (March/April 1974), p. 39.

late sixties and early seventies. They state that:

> Much of the current intensive reexamination of inservice and continuing professional development is a result of growing desire by teacher organizations to assume a meaningful role in governance of the profession.[137]

The convening of the Bettinghouse group, therefore, brought together groups with differing, sometimes competing, agendas and strategies to work together on a common goal; providing increased staff development for teachers. Recommendations of the study were accepted by the State Board of Education and endorsed by the Governor and the Legislature which included funds to implement the proposed system within the 1979-1980 School Aid Act (Section 97).

Staff development thus implemented is intended to focus on needs of teachers at the local level. The plan provides for state control of the disbursal of funds and monitoring by a state agency but also for local control of the funds and local decision-making by a representative policy board with a majority of teacher members.

Professional development of school staffs with an emphasis on local decision-making clearly has returned as a priority for educational policy in the State. It is the result of a blend of compromise and collaboration and has received generally favorable acceptance. Its importance is

---

[137]Russell Agne and Edward Ducharne, "Rearranging the Parts: A Modest Proposal for Continuing and Inservice Education," Journal of Teacher Education (March/April 1977), pp. 16-19.

underscored by the fact that fiscal support has been preserved by the legislature at a time when allocations in most program areas have been slashed.

This decade-long series of events leading to the present emphasis on, and support for, professional development may have been a fortuitous circumstance for the future of education in Michigan. As discussed in the previous section, since 1970 "very different conditions have emerged as a context for American education"[138] as compared with the massive support for and optimism about the role of schools in the period from 1950-1970. The "age of slowdown" described by Neale requires new strategies for the improvement of schools. One of three strategies posited by Neale as "required" is "a focus on improving the use of existing human resources."[139] The Michigan Plan for Staff Development was designed to take cognizance of such requirements. In this respect, one initial outcome of the implementation of the State Plan for Professional Development is to recover, in this one area at least, a strong pool of human resources from the Michigan educational community working in concert for the improvement of schools.

---

[138]Neale, Bailey, and Ross, p. 49.

[139]Ibid., p. 3.

The professional development of school staffs, as conceived in the state plan, provides the mechanism for reforming and rebuilding the instructional support system for public education. Success of the plan is predicated on the establishment of a system which makes staff development activities available to every school staff member and provides for full participation of all stakeholders in education in Michigan. As of 1980, ten states have developed and implemented statewide plans for professional development. Michigan is one of only a handful of states to provide funds specifically designated for professional development.[140]

Summary

Following a general discussion of the factors leading to the current context for inservice education, the factors specifically important in the Michigan situation were described in this section. Historically, the Michigan experience mirrored in many respects the national scene; the factors leading to increasing centralized state control over teacher preparation were reviewed in this section.

The role played by various educational institutions in support of teachers' needs and their preparation during the first century of the certification movement in Michigan were examined in some detail. Final centralization of the

---

[140]Emily C. Feistritzer, The 1980 Report on Educational Personnel Development (Washington, D.C.: Feistritzer Publications, 1979), p. 90.

certification process occurred in 1935, a period like the present, when many social and economic constraints also were affecting education. A program which grew out of this context in 1935 and which influenced the staff development effort for the next thirty years--the Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program--was discussed in relation to its emphasis on inservice education. This program also reflected a state emphasis on local autonomy and cooperative planning which were the guiding philosophies in Michigan for thirty years.

The abrupt shift in this position, following the appointment of a new State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is documented and the impact of Dr. Porter's policies was briefly reviewed. The remainder of this section chronicled the development of policies and programs in the seventies which lead to the current emphasis on and support for staff development as a state policy.

THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

This study is concerned with the role which departments and colleges of education currently play in the development and delivery of staff development programs and activities in Michigan. Traditionally, departments and colleges of education have played a central role in providing in-service education to public school staffs. The history of this involvement was described briefly in

the previous sections of this chapter in connection with the changing social and educational context for professional development.

As the emphasis placed on the inservice education of teachers has changed, the role of the university as the primary source of programs and activities also has changed significantly. LeBaron commented on aspects of this change by recognizing that while the "IHE retains an important role in the design and delivery of inservice, the focus of power for planning and designing programs is shifting to the local school district and to the organized profession."[141] Perspectives on the nature of the current role of universities in providing inservice education, major issues involved, and potential future roles discussed in the literature will be the focus of this section.

Perspectives on the Nature of the University's Mission and Role in Professional Staff Development

The changing role of departments and colleges of education in the inservice education/staff development enterprise is one of the major issues confronting

---

[141]Le Baron, p. 5.

university staff today.[142] Other analysts have noted that the key concern in inservice teacher education is the role of the university.[143] The issue appears not to be whether departments and colleges of education have a role but, as Ferver states, "their role in relation to other institutions, agencies, organizations and individuals who also have a legitimate role to play in the education of a profession and improvement of educational institutions."[144] Ryan underscores this issue by noting that there is no single role for departments and colleges in inservice education.[145] Rather, the role is complex and lacks clarity.

Powell developed several questions to guide his study which are particularly germane to this chapter:

---

[142]See David D. Marsh and Lou M. Carey, "The Involvement of Universities in Inservice Education: An Organizational Analysis," in The Institutionalization of Change and Inservice in Schools and Colleges of Education, ed. P. R. Walker (Bellingham, Washington: Far West Teacher Corps Network, 1978), p. 44; Jack C. Ferver, "Coordinating SCDE Programs," Journal of Research and Development in Education (Fall 1981), p. 26; Margo Johnson, Inservice Education: Priority for the '80s (Syracuse, New York: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1980), p. 45; Bert Y. Kersh, Faculty Development for Inservice Education in the Schools (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1978), p. 4; Howey, Inservice Into Perspective.

[143]See Powell, p. 2; Robert W. Houston and Jerome J. Frieberg, "Perceptual Motion, Blindman's Bluff, and Inservice Education," Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1979), p. 7.

[144]Ferver, p. 26.

[145]Thomas F. Ryan, "Speculations on Higher Education's Role in Inservice," Inservice (January 1979), p. 5.

> To what extent should universities contribute to the formal education of teachers in service? In what form and what setting might the involvement of universities in in-service teacher education take place? Who, or what entity, should determine the content of educational experiences for practicing teachers? In brief, what should be the role of the university in the continuing education of teachers?[146]

Powell suggests that "institutions of higher education are in a good position to sponsor in-service teacher education"[147] because they have accumulated a specialized staff prepared to work with teachers and have buildings and other facilities which can be used in many types of programs.

The role of the university also is related to a variety of trends, both external to and within the university.[148] Carey and Marsh state that the question of the role which universities can play in the inservice education of public school personnel is especially urgent now because the changing educational context has focused attention on staff development in the schools while, at the same time,

> factors within schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) are propelling them toward expanded involvement in inservice education. SCDEs are revising their institutional mission in light of declines in preservice and doctoral student enrollments, tightened budgets, demands for new research,

---

[146]Powell, p. 3.

[147]Ibid.

[148]Marsh and Carey, p. 44.

and related factors.[149]

Revision of or reexamination of the mission is an important development which should help clarify the university's role in inservice education. It is an issue also recognized by other writers. Powell arques that an institution's mission is reflected in the nature and type of involvement in in-service education.

> Institutions of higher education that adhere to a service-oriented land grant philosophy perceive their involvement in in-service education differently than those institutions that tend to be theoretical in nature and contribute to the professional preparation of teachers through research and development activities.[150]

A comment by Ryan regarding the mission of the university bears directly on their role in inservice education. He points out that different universities have "entirely different sets of resources"[151]; even though similar missions (teaching, research, service) may be adopted, considerably different resources exist within the various institutions. Such resource differentiation should be recognized and used in ways which can most appropriately serve the field. He states:

> Many universities, founded as normal schools, abandoned rich and honorable traditions of teaching and service in attempts to compete in the research arena. Those attempts were destined to result in a dilution of the total efforts of higher education to serve the profession. It

---

[149]Carey and Marsh, p. 1.

[150]Powell, p. 50.

[151]T. Ryan, p. 5.

> also contributed to the current confusion in the higher education community over our role in inservice training. The fact is there is no single role. Rather there is a constellation of roles to be taken by different institutions and agencies.[152]

Kersh, reporting on an AACTE workshop on faculty development, provides a practical perspective on the issue of the mission of departments and colleges of education:

> There is a sense of urgency, sometimes bordering on dispair, in what some of our colleagues are saying about the need to fulfill our service mission in the schools. At another of the regional workshops, Bert Shark, then dean of education at the University of Florida, observed that 'the train may already have left the station.' And James Collins from Syracuse University warned metaphorically, 'You have to do more than move the chairs on the Titanic.[153]

Both Mathis[154] and Bergquist[155] (university faculty development experts) also argue that university preparation for delivering inservice education must be done in a context of redefining the university's mission to support outreach efforts.

This emphasis on the mission of the university as a necessary adjunct to the question of the university's role

---

[152]Ibid.

[153]Bert Y. Kersh, "Needed: New Ways of Thinking and Acting in Staff Development," Journal of Staff Development (Jan/Feb 1979), p. 44.

[154]Claude B. Mathis, "The Teaching Scholar--An Old Model in a New Context," Journal of Teacher Education (May/June 1978), pp. 9-13.

[155]William Bergquist, "Relationship of Collegiate Professional Development and Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education (May/June 1978), pp. 18-27.

in inservice education is a recognition of the changing context for inservice education and the need of universities also to change.

Criticisms of University Involvement in Professional Staff Development

Implicit in the changing inservice context and the related role of departments and colleges of education, however, is an underlying dilemma. While universities have had the major role in the past--and have been asked and expected to build inservice programs--"their contributions have not always been wanted"[156] and often highly criticized. An extensive list of criticisms of university inservice endeavors could be compiled but they generally revolve around the university sponsored program or activity not meeting the needs of the classroom teacher.[157]

Powell cites several sources which support the position that colleges and universities have not adequately met the needs of teachers in service. Powell's conclusions further confirm that universities generally do not offer the programs that deal with everyday problems teachers face. He additionally points out that universities have done a poor job of relating graduate study to in-service

---

[156]Carey and Marsh, p. 1.

[157]See Allen, p. 109; Neale, Bailey, and Ross, p. 32; Arthur Sneed, "Continuing Education in the Professions," Journal of Higher Education (Summer 1972), p. 224; Agne and Ducharne; Edelfelt and Lawrence, p 14.

needs; they usually offer a smorgasbord of unrelated courses that collectively lead to a degree and course content is not professionally relevant to practicing teachers.[158] The most critical problem Powell addresses is the question of a "pattern of responsibility and programming"[159] for in-service education. He feels the professional school, and the profession in general, have not yet faced this challenge. There is no smooth transition from the undergraduate degree to the job and very little follow-up provided.

Sneed also indicates that the university's role in continuing education lacks adequate follow-through:

> Most discussions about the contributions which higher education can make to continuing education end with the university people promising to study the matter further, nonuniversity people promising to do more to inform the profession about the advantages of continuing education, and both asserting their loyalty to the goal of improving professional services.[160]

It does not seem necessary to document these criticisms of the university's involvement in inservice education further. It is starkly evident to anyone who has worked in the field that many teachers are critical of university sponsored professional development activities.

---

[158]Powell, p. 3.

[159]Ibid.

[160]Sneed, p. 224.

Questions About the Need for a University Role in Professional Staff Development

That universities should have a continuing and important role in the continuing professional development of teachers and school staffs is acknowledged by many writers and researchers concerned with the nature of staff development. Many of the same authors who are critical of the university's traditional role also have supported the necessity of university involvement in inservice education through collaborative relationships.

As would be expected, the teacher education profession itself, in an official publication of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, acknowledges the university's role.[161] However, these authors still see the traditional role of the university as the predominant role in the future.

> While the chief responsibility for continuing professional development must rest with the individual teacher and the organized profession, the major vehicle for carrying out professional development objectives still doubtless remains the graduate programs of the colleges and universities, enriched by the collaboration of school systems.[162]

While Dillon notes that "the university influence continues to be strong,"[163] and Kirby states that

---

[161]Howsam et al.

[162]Ibid., p.103.

[163]Dillon, Staff Development, p. 163.

"the unique role that colleges can play in staff development is truly great,"[164] most writers concede the changed role of the university but hold that collaborative relationships involving the university and local schools are necessary for optimal program effectiveness. Edelfelt, for example, makes this case very directly: "I don't think progress in inservice education can proceed without collaboration between members of the higher education community and their colleagues in the public schools."[165] Eubie and Gray also believe it is important for universities "to work on an intimate basis with public schools."[166] Dole notes that "the schools and teacher education are inextricably bound together"[167] and goes on to say that teacher education must take the lead in helping schools solve the problems facing public education. Boyer and Maertens posit that cooperation between universities and schools can lead to "a more productive effort than what has been

---

[164]Paul W. Kirby, "In-Service Education: The University's Role," Educational Leadership (February 1973), p. 433.

[165]Roy A. Edelfelt, "The School of Education and Inservice Education," Journal of Teacher Education (Mar/Apr 1977), p. 10.

[166]Joseph Eubie and Frank Gray, "University-School Cooperation," Educational Leadership (February 1973), p. 416.

[167]Dole, p. 20.

traditionally the case."[168] Dillon emphasizes "the potential contributions of professors of teacher education [in] collaborative arrangements between school districts and college institutions."[169]

Other writers have discussed the importance of the university in partnership with public schools and in parity relationships. Hough argues that in a situation where parity exists university involvement can enhance "effective programming and impact."[170] Cochran states that inservice education must be a partnership venture and that teacher educators have "vitally significant roles"[171] in this context; roles of coordination, leadership, and interaction. They "perform their 'catalytic role' in research, development, and delivery functions."[172] Smith[173] also stresses the

---

[168]James Boyer and Norbert Maertens, "School-University Coalitions for Reality-Based Instruction," Educational Leadership (February 1975), p. 313.

[169]Elizabeth A. Dillon, "Innovation and Collaboration--A Public School Educator Speaks," Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1974), p. 256.

[170]Wendell M. Hough, "School University Partnership for Teacher Growth," Educational Leadership (February 1975), p. 308.

[171]Leslie Cochran, "Inservice Education: Passive-Complacent-Reality," Theory Into Practice (February 1975), p. 9.

[172]Ibid.

[173]E. Brooks Smith, "Partnership in Teacher Education Revisited," Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1974), p. 253.

need for university-school system partnerships as the way to assure more effective inservice. A staff development model for effective change described by Delano[174] prescribes a necessary role in research and dissemination for the university.

Carey and Marsh have done a "working analysis" of the potential role for university involvement in inservice education. They conclude that "It appears from this research that universities must be a part of a long-term developmental process."[175] In a study of the university's role in inservice from the perspective of the university, Powell questioned professors of education in Big 10 and Big 8 schools about approaches to in-service programs. Most people (80.5%) in Powell's study preferred a cooperative approach to planning in-service programs.[176] Edelfelt and Johnson add: "A collaborative effort, including teacher organizations, colleges and universities, state departments of education, and school administrators, is essential to reconceptualize in-service teacher education."[177]

The broader general literature on school improvement

---

[174]June S. Delano, "In-Service for Change," Educational Leadership (May 1975), p. 523.

[175]Carey and Marsh, p. 4.

[176]Powell, p. 52.

[177]Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, eds., Rethinking In-Service Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), p. 6.

also is supportive of collaboration as a key element in successful programs. Neale, Bailey, and Ross, for example, discuss staff development in four different planned change models. These models have one ingredient in common--collaboration among all the participants in the change effort.[178]

The authors cited above make it clear that the university should have a role in inservice education as long as it is in a collaborative posture. Ryan feels it would "have unhealthy effects on the entire education enterprise in this country"[179] if universities were excluded from the inservice scene.

The key question appears to be, what are the specific dimensions of the university's role in relation to the other stakeholders in the inservice enterprise? Edelfelt acknowledges the importance of the university's role and addresses the question of its functions:

> The teaching profession is not competent enough, powerful enough, and large enough to control its own destiny. It needs the higher education component, but this segment must be a vital, responsive, cooperative part of the profession ready to deal with pragmatic as well as theoretical problems and ready to align itself with the school people in the mamouth task of

---

[178] Neale, Bailey, and Ross, p. ii.

[179] Kevin Ryan, "Can Professors Help the Teacher?," Inservice (January 1979), p. 4.

improving public education in America.[180]

Issues and Constraints Inhibiting the University's Role in Professional Staff Development

The dimensions of the university's present (and changing) role in professional staff development are influenced by a number of issues indigenous to higher education as well as some external to the institution. These issues and constraints are related to, and often the result of, the changing context for inservice education discussed previously. Many are issues never before faced by universities. By way of background and overview, Orrange and VanRyn enumerate many of the problems and issues facing higher education in 1975:

> If in-service training were to remain as it is now--a generalized catchall not necessarily job related--the dominance of higher education might also continue. However, the need is rapidly becoming obvious for higher education institutions to modify and, in some cases, to totally redesign the service they provide. Although they should continue to offer programs for the limited population wishing to undertake formal doctoral studies, universities should give emphasis in teacher training to the practicing professional with job-related needs. No longer is the college campus the only acceptable location for continued learning....Emphasis is being place (sic) on convenience, space, and accessibility rather than past practice. No longer are college professors considered the singular well of truth and knowledge. Peer instruction and sharing are gaining

---

[180]Edelfelt, p. 9.

> respectability as highly effective vehicles for improving classroom teacher performance. No longer can individuals who are far removed from day-to-day contact with elementary and secondary schools dictate what is relevant and necessary for survival. Sophisticated needs-assessment instruments are pinpointing priorities and identifying actual problem areas from which program developers take direction.
>
> The burden for change and flexibility, then, is on the traditional leaders, the higher education institutions. Their individual and collective capacity for openness and their willingness to change will determine the amount of control that they will maintain. The traditional finance structure of higher education institutions will need to be reexamined with an eye toward on-site (school-based) activities, and college faculty participation with school district personnel in training programs will need to be given high priority and accompanying status.[181]

The challenges to higher education illustrated by Orrange and VanRyn, for the most part, still remain. University structure and staff resistance have been the predominant internal factors inhibiting change. Drummond says that the university's organizational structure, social norms, and traditions all oppose change. He further notes that "college faculties, like other groups, face change reluctantly, often trying to avoid confrontation with reality."[182] A multi-stage investigation by Carey

---

[181]Patricia Orrange and Mike VanRyn, "Agency Roles and Responsibilities in In-Service Education," in Rethinking In-Service Education, eds. Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), pp. 48-49.

[182]William Drummond, "Emerging Roles of the College-Based Teacher Educator," in Emerging Professional Roles for Teacher Educators, eds. Karl Massanari, William Drummond, and Robert Houston (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1978), p. 15

and Marsh identified organizational constraints and the problems associated with institutional change as the major factors hindering university involvement in inservice education.[183] They determined that the principal organizational constraints were of four types: those constraints associated with the purpose of the university, economic, political, and sociological constraints. They further pointed out that these constraints "are intertwined in such a way that both individual faculty members and the SCDE (schools, colleges, and departments of education) are discouraged from greater involvement in inservice education."[184]

A. Constraints Associated With the Purpose of the University

Constraints associated with the purpose of the university have to do with the traditional mission of the university: teaching, research, and service. The centrality of the nature of the mission to all other issues affecting institutional involvement in inservice was discussed previously in this section. Carey and Marsh, however, discuss the constraints stemming from the fact that "the service function carries the least prestige within universities."[185] Little time is allocated

---

[183]Carey and Marsh.

[184]Ibid., p. 212.

[185]Ibid., p. 42.

for service functions, a service orientation results in loss of status across the university, and the reward system does not recognize service as a high priority.[186] Carey and Marsh argue that inservice education should not be viewed as a service function. Rather, it implies teaching new students through new learning designs in new settings and must be viewed as a legitimate teaching function.[187]

The service focus and the accompanying lack of institutional support has allowed weak and inadequate program quality and inadequate research and knowledge utilization to occur in many university inservice efforts. But inservice education, divorced from the service function and supported by action research and ethnographic studies, can enhance the university's role in line with their traditional teaching and research mission.[188]

B. Political Constraints

Political factors also inhibit the university from fuller and more effective participation in the inservice enterprise. University governance structures, for example, impede program development and delivery in the field. Cumbersome and time-consuming approval processes through committee arrangements often make it difficult to respond

---

[186]Ibid., p. 43.

[187]Ibid.

[188]Ibid., p. 44.

to requests for non-traditional programs. The added difficulty of cross departmental arrangements also makes collaborative planning next to impossible.[189] But even more perplexing and important is the question of the control of teacher education in the university structure. Edelfelt[190] has called for the development of a professional school as an answer to internal jurisdictional disputes and responsiveness to the field.

Another problem confronting departments and colleges of education that have tried to establish new pathways for involvement with public schools is that federal legislation mandating programs with inservice components often does not include a formal role for the university in the effort. For example, the federal Teacher Center legislation made only a small proportion of projects collaborative with higher education and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL94-142) did not require university involvement.

Another political issue is the reward system. Incentives and the reward system work against excellence in teaching and especially inservice efforts; promotion and tenure policies are university wide, tend to recognize on-campus work, and give most weight to research and writing.[191] Faculty members, therefore, may shy

---

[189]Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[190]Edelfelt, "The School of Education."

[191]Drummond, p. 115.

away from inservice work since it is tangential to the career norm academe and clearly a low priority in the reward system.

C. Sociological Constraints

Carey and Marsh[192] also postulate that sociological constraints hinder involvement in inservice education. Understanding these factors goes to the heart of the traditional role and socialization of the faculty member in the traditional university framework. Carey and Marsh point out that:

> Faculty members generally possess specialized knowledge, whereas inservice education requires broader expertise and a problem-solving orientation. A faculty propensity toward critical analysis (criticism) can hinder inservice education where support and program building are needed.
>
> Many faculty members have grown accustomed to a dominant power relationship with their students, making it difficult for the faculty to accept inservice programs where teachers have significant power in the negotiations about content and method of teaching....
>
> Faculty members have a continuing problem of protecting their own turf within the SCDE, and they have serious time constraints and a myriad of other responsibilities which keep them at an intense level of activity....
>
> Finally, inservice education is affected by the complex problem of faculty motivation, which is influenced by positive and negative reactions toward field efforts.[193]

---

[192]Carey and Marsh.

[193]Ibid., p. 54.

The restrictive nature of these factors (faculty-student power relationships, the reward structure, turf protection, lack of time, and the specialist versus generalist role) are further complicated in situations where soft money staff are involved in inservice projects and programs. Carey and Marsh note that although the use of soft money staff often enhances the university's involvement in inservice programs their relationship to regular faculty and to the institution seldom results in long-term changes at the university.[194]

Williams also discusses these sociological constraints and compares traditional university outreach programs to recent research on effective inservice. He arques that the culture and norms of higher education will not fit well into the kind of staff development programs modelled on the characteristics identified through efforts at synthesizing effective programs such as the Rand Study and the I/D/E/A model.[195]

He suggests, for example, that the culture of schools and departments of education does not "encourage or sustain"[196] long-term cooperative relationships

---

[194]Ibid.

[195]Richard C. Williams, "A Political Perspective on Staff Development," in Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, eds. Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), p. 101.

[196]Ibid.

with schools that demand time and commitment. Institutional incentives do not support such arrangements. Further, the "principal working norm is individualistic,"[197] and therefore not supportive of long-term cooperative activities with schools. Finally, Williams feels that university faculty are not likely to accept the passive role necessary when schools play the major role in planning.[198] Schiffer,[199] however, notes that this is a necessity because the organized teaching profession is challenging the traditional view of authority relationships and will not accept a submissive role.

Drummond discusses this same problem as it is exacerbated by financial factors. Although the literature on change supports long-term programs and cooperative relationships, the arrangements for financing college-based inservice educators (participants paying for course credits or contracts for consultant work) does not lead to extended programs. Thus, notes Drummond, "it is apparent that colleges of education are inextricably bound to university organizational life, and this institutional force has been

---

[197]Ibid.

[198]Ibid.

[199]Judith Schiffer, "A Framework for Staff Development," in Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, eds. Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), p. 12.

organized over time to prevent change--to preserve a more cloistered, contemplative life style."[200]

D. Economic Constraints

In times of rapid growth and strong economic support, financial constraints appear to be among the least important difficulties hampering university involvement in inservice education. Characteristics of the current context, such as institutional entrenchment and financial recession, however, amplify the importance of economic factors until they become the most important constraints affecting the university's involvement in inservice education. Carey and Marsh point out that funding instability is the key aspect of the problem.[201]

Inservice courses and other activities are often taught as overload and are not part of the regular time accounting procedures. Funds allocated are usually not part of the general fund and the inservice program barely pays for itself. These factors make it difficult for inservice education to contribute to the on-going operation of departments and colleges of education.[202]

Further, credentialling procedures guarantee a clientele only as long as the work force is young enough to need the continuing or permanent credential. In the

---

[200]Drummond, p. 18.

[201]Carey and Marsh, p. 45.

[202]Ibid.

present context of an aging and stable staff this also leads to financial instability. Howey adds that advanced degree programs lose much of their appeal as a means of continuing education when jobs are scarce.[203]

Also contributing to the financial instability is the budgeting procedure. Money generated, if any, usually is not credited to colleges or departments of education so they receive little benefit in the way of program development funds from their endeavors. When soft money projects are involved, Carey and Marsh point out that departments and colleges of education may even have a difficult time recovering overhead expenses for inservice projects.[204] Similarly, at the state level, off-campus work traditionally is budgeted as part of the regular general fund request and if state money is channelled directly to local schools (as in Michigan), departments and colleges of education may be left out of any source of funds for inservice efforts.[205]

A final aspect of the factors contributing to the economic contraints inhibiting institutional support for inservice education endeavors revolves around the issue of faculty consulting. Many university faculty have private consulting arrangements to provide inservice with local schools. This is often the most prestigious way for

---

[203]Howey, "A Framework for Planning," p. 23.

[204]Carey and Marsh, p. 47.

[205]Drummond, p. 18.

faculty to get involved with inservice education since consulting "is institutionalized as an arrangement within the university."[206] Consulting is an accepted part of nearly all university faculty functions, often having scheduled time and other support arrangements. And, consulting generally is attractive to faculty since it provides "money beyond their regular salaries without the bureaucratic strains of processing financial paperwork through the university."[207]

Consulting may provide some benefits to the university, such as improved relationships with the field and increased credibility. However, the drain of faculty resources from institutional outreach projects into private consulting and the accompanying lack of long-term, planned cooperative relationships creates another serious challenge to departments and colleges of education. The problem is that the consultant role is not an organizational role. As Agne and Ducharne note: "The paid consultant is clearly from the university; quite clearly he or she does not represent it."[208]

Powell found that: "A sizeable portion of teacher educator involvement in continuing teacher education is done without the official endorsement of the teacher

---

[206]Carey and Marsh, p. 45.

[207]Ibid., p. 46.

[208]Agne and Ducharne, p. 17.

education institution."[209] Powell interviewed the Deans of Education and education professors in the twenty-one institutions involved in this study. Many deans indicated "that a considerable number of professors on their faculties engage in consulting work that is independent of formal university programs."[210] Some professors reported that they devoted as much as one day each week in consulting work, the form of which varied from one-time in-service programs to long-range, on-going programs. Powell notes that it is difficult to determine statistically any typical amount of time university professors spend in consulting work that is not part of their assigned duties.

> The degree of involvement seems to vary with the status and expertise of the professor, the extent of his contacts in the field, and, as one professor put it, 'whatever innovation is hot in the schools'."[211]

This private enterpreneurship will have few long-range benefits for the organization. As Edelfelt surmises:

> Individual professors will be pushed off as private consultants, other agencies will contract for specific services to use higher education resources, but in none of these approaches will higher education be a partner.[212]

---

[209]Powell, p. 15.

[210]Ibid.

[211]Ibid., p. 16.

[212]Edelfelt, "The School of Education," p. 14.

Powell concludes his discussion by quoting Rubin who stated that: "institutions will have to resolve the consulting-professorial role conflict before creative institutional involvement in continuing education may take place."[213]

An analysis of these constraints and their implications for continued university involvement in inservice education makes it clear that removal of institutional roadblocks is a crucial challenge for departments and colleges in the near future. Mechanisms need to be developed to deal with faculty attitudes and their current role perceptions, and, as Carey and Marsh note: "organization issues must be addressed and resolved if universities are to be successfully involved in field-based inservice education for school personnel."[214]

Considerations for the Potential Role of the University in Professional Staff Development

Recommendations regarding the nature of the role that universities can and should play in professional staff development emerge from three different aspects of the literature: (1) examination and review of the many unresolved problems and constraints confronting departments and colleges of education in their quest for a role in

---

[213]Powell, p. 71.

[214]Carey and Marsh, p. 55.

staff development, (2) description of the changing context for inservice education, and (3) analysis of effective program efforts. Suggestions for the development of new or refined university roles have been offered by a number of writers and researchers who have discussed these three aspects either separately or as interacting factors. The final section of this chapter will review the considerations for potential university roles in inservice education suggested by these writers.

Discussions of university involvement in inservice education often focus on potential roles and necessary steps that must be taken to insure continued involvement. Carey and Marsh note that:

> "The exact definition of roles which the university can play should be negotiated by university and school district personnel by determining: (a) what the university currently has to offer; (b) what capabilities the university can build, and (c) what the school district needs to maintain efficient performance of all school personnel.[215]

The essence of this suggestion is the overriding issue in nearly all discussions of potential roles; the university can succeed in the inservice enterprise only if they act in a context of collaboration with local schools.[216]

Davies and Aquino, discussing teacher education's role, state that: "One of the most promising strategies being discussed in considerations of continuing

---

[215]Ibid., p. 79.

[216]See Edelfelt and Johnson, Rethinking; Gallegos; and Dillon, Innovation and Collaboration.

professional development is 'collaboration'."[217] Speculation by Pancratz is that higher education will no longer be in control of inservice education and that cooperative relationships with schools are therefore an imperative if teacher education is to continue to have a role in the inservice enterprise. He recommends that universities "determine appropriate relationships and build strong linkages"[218] with other educational agencies. He adds to the notion of collaboration by recommending other steps the university must take if it is to become proactive in inservice education: "Teacher education institutions, in collaboration with their local constituencies must develop a conceptual framework for the preservice/inservice program continuum and other graduate programs in professional education."[219] Such an interrelated framework would systematize inservice education and would help clarify the university's role in inservice education. Schwartz argues that the universities should take the initiative for establishing collaborative relationships with schools. She summarizes her position with a paraphrased cliche, "If you don't call us, we'll call you again and again and again."[220] Davies and

---

[217]Davies and Aquino, p. 224.

[218]Roger S. Pancratz, "Surviving the Inservice Revolution: A Proactive Stance," Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1979), p. 21.

[219]Ibid., p. 20.

[220]Henrietta Schwartz, "When University and Schools Relate," Educational Leadership (February 1973), p. 400.

Aquino add that "Institutions of higher education must take leadership in developing...cooperative arrangements."[221]

Some authors feel that for the university to maintain a role in inservice education the mission of departments and colleges of education must be broadened to recognize learning and education needs in areas beyond the public schools.[222] Preparing personnel for educational roles in business, industry, government, and health would be one strategy. Appagnani notes that the reason to expand the mission and serve new clientele is "not to abandon responsibility to the public schools but to balance the tendency to focus on that limited sphere of educational activities as the whole of education."[223]

Another important issue discussed in the literature is the distinction made between institutional roles and individual faculty roles. Carey and Marsh, for example, base their analysis of potential university roles on the premise that increased involvement can best be understood as a problem of institutional change in higher education and can best be organized around planned organizational change procedures.[224] They also argue that

---

[221]Davies and Aquino, p. 22.

[222]See Johnson; Georgianina Appignani, ed., Policy for the Education of Educators: Issues and Implications (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1981).

[223]Ibid., p. 59.

[224]Carey and Marsh, p. 2.

university involvement "in inservice education ought to be based on views about realistic and effective inservice education for public school personnel and about roles which SCDEs can play in these programs."[225] The literature reveals an increasing consistency in the identified characteristics and elements of effective staff development programs.[226] One implication of this was noted in the discussion of political constraints in the previous section. Analyzing the present context along these lines, however, provides a framework which Carey and Marsh believe can guide universities to more productive roles in the inservice enterprise. Points identified as important to successful university involvement include the following:

a) university staff members must become "part of an ongoing problem-solving and planning process in the school setting,"[227]

b) universities must "work within the collaborative governance structures to develop programs which both enhance the ecology of staff development and provide specific skills for teachers."[228]

---

[225]Ibid.

[226]Milbrey McLaughlin and David Marsh, "Staff Development and School Change," Teachers College Record (September 1978), pp. 69-94.

[227]Carey and Marsh, p. 4.

[228]Ibid., p. 6.

c) University involvement must also "be based upon research findings about effective staff development."[229]

Carey and Marsh make it clear that the development of new roles or the amplification of current roles for university involvement in inservice education "must include the removal of institutional roadblocks as well as the development of program directions, faculty skills, and faculty motivation."[230]

In a study of university roles in inservice education in the Big Eight and Big Ten University Deans' Network, Powell asked practicing teacher educators how their institutions could better serve the needs of teachers. Based on the suggestions made by the fifty teacher educators interviewed, Powell developed five suggested roles for universities related to in-service education:

1) Universities ought to provide educational experiences that are cooperatively developed by the participating in-service teacher and the teacher educator;

2) universities should cultivate among teachers a value for continuing professional education;

3) universities should contribute to in-service teacher education based in the organizational (school) setting;

4) universities ought to pursue research activities that contribute knowledge to the area of continuing professional education of teachers;

---

[229]Ibid., p. 8.

[230]Ibid., p. 55.

5) universities should provide and facilitate a variety of learning environments to meet the varied continuing education needs of individual teachers.[231]

Carey and Marsh state that specific organizational support services and structures are necessary to assure the success of new inservice endeavors.[232] Powell observes that universities do have several mechanisms for supporting and enhancing the development of in-service education programs. Nearly 50% of the institutions in his study have advisory councils which involve teachers, parents, administrators, and members of other groups. These councils provide information and perspectives about professional needs and are "of valuable assistance in the development of in-service programs."[233]

Special organizational structures and mechanisms have been established in some departments and colleges of education to develop and facilitate in-service education. Special programs also have been developed to deal specifically with the continuing professional development of teachers in the field.[234]

Becherman suggests a systematic approach to overcoming the constraints facing the university's role in planning for inservice. He calls for the creation of a new

---

[231]Powell, p. 79.

[232]Carey and Marsh, p. 12.

[233]Powell, p. 44.

[234]Powell, p. 46.

personnel role which he dubs an "extension educational specialist," a person who, from his university base, would act as an educational change agent.[235] This person would be a process helper, dealing directly with schools and teacher needs and problems. Meade has also suggested a new personnel role--the "training specialist"[236] who would work directly with teachers to assist them in finding their strengths and weaknesses and who "actively seeks ways to unfetter in-service training from the traditions of the past."[237] Havelock suggests that one of the key functions of the educational change agents is to "help schools to acquire and utilize relevant university academic resources."[238]

Implications from the Powell study provide difficult challenges for departments and colleges of education. Powell succinctly argues that the "degree to which universities successfully become involved in continuing teacher education is directly related to the institution's ability to deal with and resolve"[239] many of the

---

[235]Becherman, p. 530.

[236]Edward J. Meade, Jr., "No Health in Us," in Improving In-Service Education, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 221.

[237]Ibid.

[238]Ronald G. Havelock, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1973), p. 9.

[239]Powell, p. 68.

complex problems and issues discussed in this chapter. These problems and issues have been categorized into three general areas by Powell and include both personal and institutional change:

"1. Universities must examine and perhaps redefine the role of a professor."[240] The normal mode of operation in a university is individual and allows the professor to remain unattached to problems in schools and therefore avoid responsibility for what happens. Collaboration requires cooperative action and different power relationships. Further, the current reward structure discourages involvement and risk-taking. Powell suggests that deans must create a supportive environment in terms of support services and "psychological assurance."[241] They must also forcefully promote institutional rewards which will encourage faculty involvement in inservice activities. Braun[242] adds that the education professor as an inservice leader must change his function. The role of interpreter and translator of research appear to these writers to be the key roles.

"2. Universities must examine and perhaps redefine criteria for a valid educational experience."[243]

---

[240]Ibid.

[241]Ibid., p. 70.

[242]Frederick Braun, "The Education Professor as an In-Service Leader," Educational Perspectives (December 1975), p. 19.

[243]Powell, p. 71.

Resolution of the theory-practice gap requires compromise between "graduate programs that adhere to a strong theoretical base"[244] and practical applications for teachers; a complex, difficult issue in itself. One aspect of this issue that needs resolution is the question of the type of experiences approved for graduate credit. Orrange and VanRyn feel it is important for universities to focus their graduate programs on job-related needs of teachers.[245]

"3. Colleges of education must examine and perhaps alter their internal and external relationships."[246] In the context of decline and retrenchment most universities find themselves in today, this suggestion may be the most difficult to meet. Departments and colleges on the one hand may struggle to become true professional schools[247] while on the other hand need to reestablish their relationship with other departments in order to assure institutional survival.[248]

Winsand offers a very incessive analysis of the university's potential role based on her analysis of exemplary programs. She posits that universities can only

---

[244]Ibid., p. 72.

[245]Orrange and VanRyn, p. 50.

[246]Powell, p. 74.

[247]Edelfelt and Lawrence, p. 20.

[248]Powell, p. 75.

fulfill certain roles effectively and what is needed is a careful assessment of the role functions necessary to carry out special inservice activities. Based on these carefully identified functions, universities would be able to respond more effectively. She also points out that universities alone cannot provide successful programs; local education agencies and individuals have certain role responsibilities which must be fulfilled if any inservice effort is to be effective.[249]

Pancratz also recommends that teacher education institutions assess the areas of expertise and services they can provide and determine those that "can be provided better and more efficiently by other organizations."[250] It is critical in Pancratz's view, however, that these areas of strength be communicated clearly to the educational community.

The issues and problems related to the university's role are difficult in the extreme. Resolution in the form of new institutional and faculty roles in the staff development enterprise is perplexing but imperative. Powell concluded that continuing education probably would "emerge as a major activity of institutions of higher

---

[249]Jean Winsand, "The Role of Higher Education in Inservice Development," in Staff Development and Educational Change, eds. Robert Houston and Roger Pancratz (Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980).

[250]Pancratz, p. 21.

education."[251] At the time of the study he identified eleven areas of activities in which he thought universities would continue to be involved:

> conferences, institutes, seminars and workshops; consultation and school services; faculty exchange programs; master's degree programs and graduate courses (campus-based); master's degree programs (field-oriented); multi-university cooperation; off-campus courses; professional associations; publications; school-based programs; and teacher centers.[252]

To overcome the role sterotypes that teachers hold of university staff and inservice, Kirby suggests that school systems develop continuing relationships with universities, that universities offer needs-based programs delivered at the school site, that districts structure workshops in series with follow-up, and that consultants act as facilitators or observers rather than as a "solution bank."[253]

Drummond has listed sixteen new roles for faculty:

> Instructor, instructional manager, diagnoser/prescriber
>
> Advisor, preservice student advocate, group facilitator
>
> Committee member, project team member, policy maker
>
> Clinical supervisor, performance feedback provider
>
> Linker, referrer, resources retriever

---

[251]Powell, p. 77.

[252]Ibid., p. 78.

[253]Kirby, p. 432.

Writer, editor, correspondent

Instructional designer, materials developer

Curriculum designer, program developer

Demonstrator, modeler

Data collector, situation describer, documenter, needs assessor, data analyzer, program evaluator

Researcher, model builder

Professional counselor

Organizational consultant, communications consultant

Stranger, outside observer, applied anthropologist

Teacher advocate, principal advocate, friend at court

Team leader, project manager, contract administrator[254]

Kersh[255] has categorized Drummond's sixteen role descriptions into five component areas of inservice education. These areas encompass roles and tasks associated with governance, funding, management, delivery of services, and assessment, evaluation, and dissemination. By doing this, Kersh was able to show how a faculty member could be assigned and function effectively in each of these component areas. It should be noted that Kersh suggested that a full-time faculty position might encompass two or more of these areas.[256]

---

[254]Drummond, p. 23.

[255]Kersh, Faculty Development.

[256]Ibid., p. 20.

Bottoms delineated the responsibilities of higher education institutions (and three other agencies) for in-service education. His conceptualization of these responsibilities rests on legal, professional, and ethical bases. These responsibilities are not exclusive domains and therefore he argues that cooperation among schools, state departments, professional associations, and universities is necessary "if a meaningful in-service program is to emerge."[257] In summary, Bottoms sees higher education's responsibilities are to participate collaboratively with local schools and individual teachers...; to participate in the formulation of inservice objectives to meet assessed needs...; to relate new knowledge to the individual needs of educators...; to assure the acquisition of skills and competencies which will result in improved student performance; to formalize a process where all agencies have imput regarding programs.[258]

By consensus, the participants of an AACTE leadership training institute identified eight specific tasks that universities can and should do to

> improve inservice education opportunities for school personnel:

---

[257]Gene Bottoms, "Responsibilities of Local School Systems, State Departments of Education, Institutions of Higher Education, and Professional Organizations for In-Service Education," in Rethinking In-Service Education, eds. Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), p. 39.

[258]Ibid.

1. Reexamine their missions relative to inservice education and establish a master plan for delivering it.

2. Develop departments of school services to serve school districts on a regular, sustained, and systematic basis. Include the field agent concept.

3. Provide for the retooling of university personnel in terms of the nature and characteristics of clients.

4. Create a united front with teacher organizations and L.E.A.'s to improve funding opportunities for inservice.

5. Establish effective communication system with teacher organizations, L.E.A.'s and state departments of education.

6. Provide for greater continuity between preparatory and graduate programs through more cooperation within IHE departments.

7. Relate research efforts to inservice education.

8. Change IHE faculty reward system to make staff development a major factor in promotion and teaching load.[259]

In 1977 Edelfelt made nine suggestions for teacher education related to inservice education. These are as current today as they were then. The first four are very straightforward:

> Schools of education should become professional schools in the control and service of the profession....
>
> Schools of education need to give attention to adult learning....
>
> Schools of education also need to explore more effective ways of capitalizing the contribution

---

[259]Karl Massanari, Higher Education's Role in Inservice Education (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977).

> subject discipline professors can make to inservice education....
>
> Research (should be) made more of a feature in inservice education (but to give it a more desirable connotation it should be called) a more systematic approach to teaching.[260]

Edelfelt's last five suggestions are somewhat more circuitous but no less important. Number five has to do with developing a first year internship program to bridge the gap between university preparation and work. The sixth involves embedding the organization and schedule of inservice into the teacher's regular day. The inservice education of university faculty is the necessary seventh suggestion. The eighth suggestion is for new types of personnel with new functions to staff various inservice activities. Edelfelt's last suggestion is similar to the first and calls for the building of professional schools of education.[261] Each of these nine suggestions presupposes a "total preservice and inservice teacher education scheme."[262] In this context these suggestions still have currency and would be very beneficial to the university's inservice education effort.

The potential inherent in the suggestions of these writers must be considered as departments and colleges of education struggle with the "new reality" of the eighties.

---

[260]Edelfelt, "The School of Education," p. 9.

[261]Ibid.

[262]Ibid., p. 8.

Commenting on progress in inservice education in 1981, Edelfelt observes that:

> alternatives to college-based inservice education have not turned out to be substitutes for graduate teacher education. Site-based and teacher-centered inservice education appear to offer a practical, short term, immediate kind of assistance. Graduate study is more theoretical, long-term, in-depth. Whether these two purposes and the roles they define will become more distinct or whether new purposes and roles will evolve may be among the most interesting developments to observe as the last four years of the 1974-84 decade pass.[263]

Summary

The final section of this review of the literature focuses specifically on the role of higher education in professional staff development. The central role traditionally played by departments and colleges of education in inservice education is contrasted with the changes that have occurred in the past two decades. The views of several writers regarding general implications of the changed role are offered. Perspectives on the nature of these changes in relation to the mission of the university also were examined.

Following this introductory discussion, several issues which impact the current role that universities play were presented. Included was a brief review of the criticisms leveled at the university regarding their role in the past, an exposition of the views of a number of writers on whether the university should still have a role, and the

---

[263]Edelfelt, "Six Years of Progress," p. 117.

internal and external constraints restricting the university's role in staff development. The constraints examined are those associated with the purpose of the university--political constraints, sociological constraints, and economic constraints. Incorporated in the discussion on economic factors was the issue of private faculty consulting and institutional affiliation, an issue of particular importance to this study.

This section concludes with a review of the comments and recommendations of a number of writers and researchers pertaining to the potential roles that the university may play in the future. The suggestions made are considered from the perspective of both institutional and individual roles and functions. Finally, specific lists of functions, descriptions of potential roles, and necessary tools offered by seven respected educators are presented as visions of the future.

The conditions giving rise to the discussion of the current and potential roles of the university in the inservice arena stem from the changed context of education and the specific situation in Michigan considered in the first two sections. Together, these topics provide the background for this study and will influence any implications to be drawn from the analysis of the data presented.

Johnson offers a succinct appraisal of the present situation and an appropriate final note for this review of literature. She notes that higher education's

> major role in organizing and conducting inservice is being taken over by collaboratives and teachers. A profession isolates its research and training arm from its practicing arm at great peril. The mistakes of the past must not be repeated. The 1980s must be a decade of role explanation for higher education.[264]

---

[264]Johnson, p. 45.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the design and procedures of this descriptive study. Included in the chapter are a restatement of the research questions, a summary of the Section 97 program for 1980-1981 which serves as the framework for this study, the instrumentation, data collection procedures, and the plan for the analysis of the data.

The principal purpose of the study is to examine the involvement of university faculty in the planning and delivery of staff development programs offered through Section 97 of the Michigan State School Aid Act. In order to accomplish this, information regarding the planning and delivery of programs was collected from policy boards established in accordance with the Section 97 program. To further investigate the role departments and colleges of education play in supporting staff development activities in Michigan, appropriate individuals in eleven state colleges and universities were questioned regarding staff participation in and organizational support for these activities. The information obtained is intended to answer the following research questions:

1. How many staff development programs and activities were delivered by staff from colleges and universities under the aegis of the Section 97 program?

2. How many of these programs and activities were delivered cooperatively with resource people from other institutions and organizations?

3. Do university staff who deliver staff development programs represent the institution they work for or do they function as private consultants?

4. What sources of funds, other than those provided through Section 97, are used to pay university staff who deliver staff development programs and activities?

5. What is the form and function of university staff involvement with local policy boards?

6. How are university personnel identified as resource people to deliver programs?

7. Do university staff tend to serve as resources for any specific category or categories of staff development activities?

8. How many department or college of education personnel are assigned part- or full-time to work specifically in professional staff development programs and activities?

9. What mechanisms exist in departments or colleges of education to facilitate the delivery of services to the field?

10. Do any fiscal arrangements exist in departments or colleges of education to support involvement in professional staff development activities?

11. What informal linkages or formal relationships have been developed between department or college of education and other people or groups involved in the state plan for professional development?

12. Does department or college of education policy and organization support service to local and intermediate school district staff development efforts?

This study was designed to collect descriptive data systematically on a statewide basis about the nature of university involvement in staff development programs and activities offered to public school staffs. The Section 97 program was used as the context to facilitate the study since it is a state-supported program operating in 542 of the State's 574 school districts and serving 104,364 professional personnel, or 95% of all public school personnel in Michigan. The answers to the research questions may provide information useful to decision-makers in both the Michigan Department of Education and in departments and colleges of education in Michigan universities.

To gather the information necessary to answer the research questions and to draw conclusions regarding the principal purposes of the study, two survey instruments were developed.

INSTRUMENTATION

The survey instruments used in this study were designed specifically to answer the research questions.

1. The first instrument, PD 4674 A--1980-1981 Follow-Up to Professional Staff Development Activities (Appendix A, Instruments), was designed to collect information from each policy board about staff development providers and their official affiliation. This instrument was authorized as an official form of the Office of

Professional Development of the Michigan Department of Education. Following initial development, the questionnaire was modified by the Michigan Department of Education Forms Office to conform to department policy and accepted format. Department policy prohibits asking for specific names on evaluation forms. Since this instrument was authorized as a supplement to PD 4764--1980-1981 Evaluation of Professional Staff Development Activities, it was modified to collect the necessary data regarding staff development providers without requesting specific names.

2. A second instrument, Higher Education Survey (Appendix A, Instruments), was developed to address the questions related to the extent that departments and colleges of education provide support for the Section 97 program and other local staff development efforts.

DATA COLLECTION

1. Form PD 4674 A--1980-1981 Follow-Up to Professional Staff Development Activities, was mailed, with a cover letter, instructions, and return envelope, to the staff development coordinator in 114 policy board areas (Appendix B). Each form was designed to collect information on one specific staff development program. The major intent of the questionnaire was to collect information about who delivered programs and other information about the program resource person.

Six hundred eighty-nine (689) forms were mailed. The number of forms to be mailed, and the specific activities for which information was requested, was arrived at in a two-step procedure as follows:

a. There were 2,664 staff development activities reported to the Office of Professional Development by the 114 policy boards that returned the 1980-1981 evaluation report forms. These activities were then categorized by the nature or type of activity. There were forty-one different categories of staff development activities developed by this process. Examination of these various activities shows that for some categories resource people would not be used (for example, teacher exchanges).

Secondly, the reports of some activities listed on the PD 4674 forms were so vague and/or unclear that they were categorized as "miscellaneous." It was concluded that it would be difficult to request supplemental information about these activities.

Finally, the decision was made to exclude from this study those activities reported with less than five participants. Although university staff may have served as resource

people in these activities, it was felt that the limitation on the number of questionnaires which could be mailed (see "b" below) outweighed the potential information to be gained from these activities. Therefore, the following categories were excluded from the total number of staff development activities upon which this study is based. The number of individual activities in each category is noted in the column on the right.

Category of Activity	Number of Activities Per Category
Teacher Exchanges and Attendance at Conferences	636
Administrative and Program Maintenance Activities	50
Specific Curriculum Development Activities: Coordination and Planning	53
Films	10
Miscellaneous Category	144
Activities With Less Than Five Participants	458

This process, therefore, identified a total of 1,351 activities which were excluded from this study.

b. The remaining 1,313 activities, therefore, were the total number of staff development activities sponsored through Section 97 to be included in this study. The Office of

Professional Development, however, restricted the number of questionnaires that could be sent to any policy board coordinator to ten. Twenty-two policy boards had reported more than ten activities in the "included" categories. In these cases the ten activities to be investigated through the supplemental questionnaire were selected randomly.

Through this process, 689 activities were identified and questionnaires prepared and mailed. It was decided to obtain information about the involvement of university staff in the remaining potential activities through a follow-up telephone call after the questionnaires were returned.

2. In order to provide information necessary to extend the analysis to departments and colleges of teacher education, a "Higher Education Survey" (Appendix A, Instruments) was mailed to the departments or colleges of education in eleven state universities. A cover letter accompanied the questionnaire which explained the purpose of the study and indicated that the addressee would be contacted by telephone to answer the survey questions. It was felt this procedure would assure 100% response and would provide the

opportunity for probing questions and for more in-depth, meaningful responses.

The respondents on this survey were the persons identified at each college or department of education as having the primary responsibility for staff development service functions. Their names and positions are listed in Appendix C.

ANALYSIS

The information collected in this study was treated by descriptive analysis designed to answer the research questions posed. Borg and Gall[265] note that educational research usually consists of one or more of three types of studies: descriptive studies, studies measuring differences between two or more samples, and studies describing relationships between two or more variables. This study is a descriptive study designed to collect information which can describe the role of departments and colleges of education in staff development activities. Borg and Gall[266] state that the proper statistical tools used to report descriptive research data are quantitative descriptions. Data from the supplemental questionnaires were aggregated and reported by totals according to the questions asked. Results of the

---

[265]Walter Borg and Meredith Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, Third Edition (New York, Longmans Inc., 1979), pp. 38-39.

[266]Ibid.

survey of departments and colleges of education were reported individually and similarities and differences in support mechanisms and levels of support for staff development activities were identified. Conclusions were drawn based on the answers to the research questions and implications discussed in line with the issues raised in Chapters I and II.

Summary of Section 97--1980-1981

Section 97 of the State School Aid Act provides funds on an entitlement basis to participating local school districts or consortia of districts. To participate, a local district or consortium must establish a policy board with a majority of teachers which is responsible for planning and implementing the program. The 1980-1981 year was the second full year of operation for this state-supported program.

At the conclusion of the year, information was collected to assess the extent that the program was being implemented throughout the State. The Section 97 program serves as the framework and primary source of background data for this study. The information from the Section 97 evaluation indicating the extent and form of program implementation provides the data upon which many of the analyses in this study are based. The following data are extracted from the evaluation and serve as the primary

information necessary to this study:

Number of policy boards receiving Section 97 funds	120
Total number of school staff receiving funds	104,364
Number of separate staff development events provided	2,664
Hours of activities provided	23,298
Average number of hours per activity	9.184
Total number of teachers and other staff participating in staff development activities	75,903
Average number of staff participating per activity	28.338
Total number of staff (estimated unduplicated count) participating in activities	34,209
Total number of participant hours supported by Section 97 funds	670,441
Average cost per activity	$ 622.67
Average cost per participant	$ 22.00

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was reviewed in this chapter. The twelve basic research questions which guide the data analysis were presented. Data collection procedures, instrumentation, and the plan for the analysis of the data also were presented. Finally, information from the 1980-1981 Section 97 evaluation, which serves as the basis for interpreting the data from this study, was presented.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This is a descriptive study designed primarily to portray the role of department and college of education faculty in the staff development enterprise in Michigan. The primary objective is to examine the extent to which universities and university faculty have been involved in the design, development, and delivery of programs and activities funded through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act. A second objective is to assess the extent to which departments and colleges of education in state-supported institutions of higher education in Michigan, through their staff and through institutional support provided, have been involved in local staff development efforts. The analysis of the data collected is presented in this chapter. As background for the analysis in this chapter, the data collection procedures, the parameters and limitations of these procedures, and the sources of data are reviewed and discussed.

PROCEDURES

Primary data for this study were collected by means of a questionnaire sent to local staff development policy

boards organized under Section 97 and a questionnaire/interview directed to the departments and colleges of education in Michigan. The analysis of the data collected through these questionnaires provides answers to each of 12 research questions which guided the study. Each research question is restated and the analysis of the data bearing on the question is presented and interpretation offered. Following discussion of the separate research questions, the data are reviewed and further discussion and interpretation pertaining to the two principal objectives is presented. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the findings.

Two primary procedures were used to gather information for the study: (1) A questionnaire designed to collect information from each policy board participating in the Section 97 program and (2) A "Higher Education Questionnaire" sent to the department or college of education in each of the eleven state colleges and universities to collect specific information about the extent of their involvement in the staff development enterprise.

The questionnaire sent to policy boards was an official Michigan Department of Education form, PD 4674 A, Follow-Up to Professional Staff Development Activities. Data from the returned MDE forms were organized into categories and coded numerically. Codes were entered into the computer and totals and cross tabulations of the coded

data were generated. The computer was used simply to aggregate the data and to calculate the necessary information for the descriptive analysis used to answer the study's research questions.

Limiting Factors

The MDE form was sent to 114 policy boards which participated in Section 97 activities (see Appendix B). Although funds were provided to 129 policy boards* in the 1980-1981 year, fewer policy boards were included in the study due to two factors. Policy boards which did not return the primary evaluation report to the Office of Professional Development and policy boards which reported no activities of the type included in this study (described below) were excluded.

The 114 policy boards listed 2,664 staff development activities sponsored under the auspices of Section 97 on the 1980-1981 evaluation report. These activities were classified according to nature and type. Forty-one categories were developed by this process.

Examination of these forty-one categories and the activities involved led to the exclusion of some reported categories from this study. Some activities reported (for example, teacher exchanges and visitations) clearly are of

---

*Funds originally were provided to 120 policy boards. However, one fiscal agent (Northwest Staff Development Center) was discontinued and the member school districts which continued operating as separate entities filed separate evaluation reports.

such a nature that a resource person, or anyone functioning in a similar position, would not be used. Although these are legitimate and possibly important staff development activities, it was felt it would unnecessarily distort the interpretation of data regarding university involvement, since no resource person would be used, if these were counted in the total activities considered.

Secondly, the reports of some activities listed on the the Section 97 evaluation report were so vague and/or unclear that they were categorized as "miscellaneous." It was concluded that it would be difficult to request supplemental information about these activities and, therefore, these also were excluded from the totals.

Finally, it was decided to exclude from this study those activities reported with less than five participants. Although resource people, including university staff, may have served as leaders, facilitators, observers, etc., for some of these activities, it was felt that the limitation on the number of follow-up forms which could be mailed (discussed on page 123) justified the exclusion of these activities, i.e., the data collection procedures that would have had to be used outweighed the potential information to be gained since these activities impacted only a small total number of people.

The following categories and activities, therefore, were excluded from the staff development activities upon which this study is based:

Category of Activity	Number of Activities
Teacher Exchanges and Attendance at Conferences	636
Administrative and Program Maintenance Activities	50
Specific Curriculum Development Activities: Coordination and Planning	53
Films	10
Miscellaneous Category	144
Activities With Less Than Five Participants	458
TOTAL ACTIVITIES EXCLUDED FROM STUDY DUE TO ABOVE LIMITATIONS	1351

In addition to these factors, additional limitations were caused by the distribution procedure used for the questionnaire sent to policy boards, the return rate, and the follow-up. One of the additional limitations was introduced into the study by the Michigan Department of Education's Office of Professional Development. Each MDE form was designed to gather information about one specific activity. The number of forms that could be sent to any one policy board was restricted to ten by the Office of Professional Development. Twenty-five policy boards (of 114) reported more than ten activities in the categories of activities included in the study. In these cases, the ten activities to be investigated through the questionnaire were selected randomly. Telephone follow-up was planned

for each of the twenty-five policy boards to collect data on the remaining activities.

Through this winnowing process, 689 staff development activities were identified and questionnaires prepared and mailed to the 114 policy boards included in this study. Questionnaires were returned by a total of 102 policy boards following one telephone follow-up, a return rate of 89 percent. The unreturned questionnaires accounted for a total of 71 activities.

A final limitation is attributable to the follow-up of the twenty-five policy boards which offered in excess of the ten activities investigated by the questionnaires. Telephone and personal follow-up with the program coordinators of these policy boards was hindered by several problems including new coordinators, incomplete or nonexistent records, and lack of response. Follow-up was completed and comprehensive data were returned from six of these policy boards and partial data returned from another ten. As a result, 258 activities from the boards not responding are not accounted for in the study and were excluded from the baseline data.

The study, therefore, is based on the following baseline information:

Number of staff development activities reported by policy boards completing the primary evaluation report:		2,664
Activities excluded from study according to criteria discussed:	1,351	
Activities included on unreturned MDE Form PD 4674 A (12 policy boards):	71	
Activities not accounted for in follow-up inquiry:	258	1,680
Baseline data for this study--activities reported on PD 4674 A and follow-up:		984

The exclusion from this analysis of 1,680 reported activities, due to these constraints and limitations, should not impair the meaningfulness or usefulness of the findings. The rationale for excluding 1,351 of the activities (80% of the total excluded) rests on two assumptions: (1) the belief that no resource person was likely to be involved in certain categories of activities such as attending a conference or a grade-level curriculum meeting and (2) that activities with very small numbers of participants (less than five) would use no university person as a resource in the large majority of cases. It was felt that the extent of the university's role in staff development should be analyzed in respect to an assessment of activities and programs in which university staff and other provider groups are likely to be involved. The inclusion of these activities in the baseline data would paint a distorted picture of the university's potential role in staff development. Stated conversely, it was

assumed the pool of activities used as a baseline would be so inflated that the extent of university involvement would be incorrectly analyzed and any inplications drawn would be misleading.

On the other hand, the lack of complete information collected through the follow-up procedure is a limiting factor in this study. Activities not accounted for in the follow-up inquiry total 258 or 20.7% of the potential number of activities included as a basis for the analysis. The extent to which the mix of activities and providers is significantly different in these data from the collected data would distort the accuracy of the findings and limit the usefulness of the study. All of these activities, however, were included in the pool of activities which could not be included in the mailing due to the limitation on the number of questionnaires which could be sent to each policy board. These activities were chosen through a random-selection procedure and, therefore, the type of activities offered and the mix of providers utilized would not be expected to vary significantly from the data collected.

Although these constraints and limitations decrease the number of activities investigated, it was felt, on-balanace, that little potential usefulness of the findings would be sacrificed and a more realistic interpretation of the data would result.

RESULTS

The findings of the study relating to the twelve research questions which guided the investigation are reported below. Information collected by means of the questionnaire (MDE Form PD 4674 A) sent to policy boards provides the data for answers to the first seven questions.

Research Questions Number 1 Through 7

1. How many staff development programs and activities were delivered by staff from colleges and universities under the aegis of the Section 97 program?

Table 1
Staff Development Activities
Provided by College/University Staff

Total Staff Development Activities Investigated	Activities Delivered by College/ University Staff	Percent of Total
984	223	23

The categories of programs and activities included in the total pool of staff development programs and activities in this study all involve the use of resource people in some provider capacity. Twenty three percent (223) of these activities involved university staff as resource people.

The professional development programs in Detroit, Kent County, and Kalamazoo County are the oldest and among the most well established in the State. The programs offered through these centers appear to be well defined and procedures, including resource selection, well established. A review of the data revealed that university resource people are not heavily utilized in these centers. It was felt that some additional insight might be derived by inspecting the data with these three centers excluded. University staff might find it useful to examine any differences in the extent of involvement in these older centers for insights into their potential role.

If the three original professional development centers* are excluded, the percentage of activities delivered by university staff increases to 28% (see Table 2).

Table 2
Staff Development Activities
Provided by University/College Staff
Excluding Detroit, Kent ISD, and Kalamazoo Valley ISD

Total Staff Development Activities Delivered	Activities Delivered by College/ University Staff	Percent of Total
708	200	28

*Kent and Detroit offered the largest number of programs in 1980-1981.

Table 3 presents a rank order listing of staff development activities delivered by all provider groups. The percentage of university staff used as resource people ranks first of all provider groups in the total pool of resource people.

Table 3
Number of Staff Development Activities
Delivered by all Provider Groups*

Provider	Number	Percent
College/University	200	26.4
Teacher	159	20.9
Private Consultants	156	20.6
Intermediate School District	103	13.6
Administrator	67	8.8
Community Group	35	4.6
Michigan Department of Education	16	2.1
Community College	11	1.4
Aides	5	.7
Regional Educational Media Center	4	.5
Parent Group	3	.4

*Information identifying all provider groups was not gathered in the follow-up procedure. Therefore, the information on activities provided by university staff obtained in the follow-up was excluded; the total pool of activities used in selected analyses was decreased accordingly.

The staff who provided the 223 total activities are dispersed among many colleges and universities in the state. Table 4 lists the colleges and universities for which the resource persons work and the number of activities provided.

Table 4
Place of Employment of
University Staff Providing
Staff Development Activities

Institution	Number of Activities Provided
Michigan State University	42
Central Michigan University	31
Eastern Michigan University	24
Oakland University	23
University of Michigan	15
Western Michigan University	14
Wayne State University	12
Grand Valley State Colleges	4
Albion College	3
Northern Michigan University	3
Hope College	2
Saginaw Valley State College	2
Ferris State College	2
Nazareth College	2
Hillsdale College	1
Marygrove College	1
Kalamazoo College	1
Aquinas College	1
Adrian College	1
Alma College	1
Spring Arbor College	1
Out-of-State Colleges and Universities	37

2. How many of these programs and activities involved university staff working collaboratively with individuals from other institutions and organizations?

Table 5
Institutional or Organizational Affiliation of Individuals Providing Programs Collaboratively With University Staff

COLLABORATING INDIVIDUALS	NUMBER
Local District Teachers	19
Other College Faculty	9
Local District Administrators	3
Intermediate District Staff	3
Michigan Department of Education Staff	3
Private Consultant	3
Community Persons	1

Twenty-four programs involving university staff working collaboratively with individuals from other institutions or agencies were delivered during the period of this study. Sixteen of these activities involve more than two providers. Therefore, the total number of providers accounted for on this table is greater than the twenty-four programs delivered collaboratively. This equals eleven percent of the total number of programs and activities delivered by university staff. Table 5 lists

the institutional affiliation, if any, of staff development providers working collaboratively with university personnel.

3. Do university staff who deliver staff development programs represent the institution they work for or do they function as private consultants?

Table 6
Affiliation of Staff Development Providers

Affiliation	Number	Percentage
University Staff Representing College/ University	58	32
University Staff Serving as Private Consultants	126	68

Over two-thirds of the university staff serving as providers do so as private entrepreneurs/consultants. Policy board coordinators, to whom the questionnaire was directed, were asked to indicate whether resource people were hired as representatives of an organization or as independent consultants, apart from any organizational affiliation or connection. On all verbal follow-up contacts, the respondent was asked to expand on this question. This was done as a check on the clarity of the meaning and intent of the question. All people queried understood the nature and intent of the question. There essentially was no misunderstanding and no new or

changed information was elicited through these verbal follow-ups.

4. What sources of funds, other than those provided through Section 97, are used to pay university staff who deliver staff development programs and activities?

Table 7
Percent of Funds for
Staff Development Activities

Number of Staff Development Activities	Percent of Expenses Provided by Section 97 Funds	
	Section 97	Other Sources
121	100	
11	90	10
8	80	20
4	75	25
16	70	30
10	50	50
2	40	60
2	30	70
1	20	80
2	10	90
1	No Cost	
1	0	100

The majority (68%) of the programs and activities provided by university staff were completely paid for by

Section 97 monies. However, it is also apparent that multiple sources of funds were used to pay for these services. The responses on the questionnaire were, in many cases, not clear regarding the source of the other funds. Those responses that were interpretable included local school districts; intermediate school districts; Title I, vocational education and other categorical funds; in-kind services; and participant fees as sources of revenue used to partially pay for staff development activities. In one case, the university provided a percentage of the funds for the programs and in one case the university resource person provided the service free of charge.

5. What is the form and function of university staff involvement with local policy boards?

Table 8
Involvement of University Staff
in Policy Board Operations

Functions/Role Served	Number of University Staff Involved
Voting Member	14
Non-voting Member	17
Involved in Formation of Policy Board Only	24
Consultant to Board/Occasional	33
Planning/Implementing Needs Assessment	34
Program Planning/Occasional	39
Other Roles	5
No Role	21
No Response to Item	7

This table reveals, in terms of numerical assessment, that university staff continue to play significant roles in some activities of policy boards. Twenty-one boards (21%) show no university staff involvement beyond that of resource provider. Roles which reflect on-going and permanent involvement with policy board operations, however, number 31 (30%); 14 voting members and 17 non-voting members. Roles such as consultant are probably occasional functions. Consistent involvement in policy board operations in roles such as

program planning is problemmatic and impossible to determine from these data.

6. How are university personnel identified as resource people to deliver programs?

Table 9
Source of Identification of
University Person as Resource
for Staff Development Activity

Source of Identification	Number	Percent
Personal Contact by Policy Board Staff	78	42
Referred/Suggested by Person Not on Policy Board	71	38
Brochure	26	14
Other	11	6

This table indicates that most university-connected resources are identified through the personal knowledge of some member of the policy board. However, a significant percent are referred by other people in the district, or service area, or other contacts. Only 14 percent are primarily identified through brochures.

7. Do university staff tend to serve as resources for any specific category or categories of staff development activities?

Table 10 illustrates the variety of categories and number of activities provided by university staff.

Table 10
Categories of Staff Development
Activities Provided by University Staff

Category of Activity	Number Provided
1. Reading and Related Language Arts Instruction and Programs	30
2. Teacher Personal Development	29
3. Student Motivation	11
4. Classroom Management/Classroom Organization	10
5. Subject Area Skills--Other Than Math and Reading	10
6. General Professional Development (A Category of Activities Difficult to Categorize)	9
7. Law/Liability/Teacher Rights	9
8. Discipline	8
9. Learning Disabilities and Mainstreaming	8
10. Math Instruction	6
11. Gifted and Talented	5
12. School Climate	5
13. Student Learning	5
14. Improving Classroom Communication	4
15. Evaluation and Testing	4
16. The Computer as a Teaching Tool	4
17. The Creative Arts (Specific Topics, Such as Music, Dance)	4
18. Student Self-Concept	3
19. Humanistic/Affective Education	3
20. Alternative Careers/Options	2
21. Curriculum Development	2
22. Grade-Level General Programs	2
23. Administrative Inservice	2
24. Emergency First Aid	1
25. Teaching Student Responsibility	1
26. Community and Parent Relations	1
27. Career Education	1
28. Counseling	1
29. Problem-Solving Skills	1

These data illustrate the types of programs delivered by university staff and casts some light on the question of potential roles. Two specific categories of

programs were predominant: (1) teacher personal development and (2) reading and related language arts instruction and programs. Teacher personal development involved a few programs in the quality of work life, personal growth, and teacher morale. Stress management was the primary activity delivered by university staff in this category. The reading category consisted of a mix of specific reading workshops and writing, listening, and general language arts activities.

Summary

The information presented in answering these first seven research questions has indicated the extent to which state college and university staff are involved in the design, development, and delivery of Section 97 sponsored staff development programs and activities. This is the primary objective of the study.

Twenty-three percent of the programs offered through Section 97 are provided by university staff. Also, seventy-eight percent of the policy boards responding utilize university staff in some role; thirty-one boards have a university person as a member. However, most university resource providers do not function as official representatives of their institutions; sixty-eight percent served as private consultants in their role as staff development providers. They also provide a wide variety of activities, although personal development activities and

reading and related language arts activities (33%) predominate.

Research Questions
Number 8 through 12

The final five research questions were answered based on the information gathered from the "Higher Education Questionnaire." This questionnaire was sent to an identified person in the department or college of education education in each of the eleven state universities in Michigan (see Appendix C) whose job entailed assigning, scheduling, or developing policy for staff members' field assignments. It was assumed that this person would be knowledgeable of conditions in local school districts, of the Section 97 program, and of the work done in the field by staff members in his or her department or college. The information from the questionnaire was collected by means of a telephone or personal interview which facilitated the in-depth discussion of university policy, capabilities, and constraints. A factor limiting the usefulness of the "Higher Education Survey" information was the lack of policy, procedures, accountability, and record keeping which characterizes department and college of education involvement in the staff development enterprise.

Michigan State University was the only institution with any type of official, comprehensive record-keeping system in operation during the 1980-1981 school year. This system required faculty to keep a detailed account of their

time for "professional contributions" on a form specifically designed for this purpose. At the end of each term, data were aggregated and reported by department and total college. For this study, the Winter, 1981, report was used and was assumed to reflect the average contribution for the year. Eastern Michigan University also records the number of faculty who provided services to the field.

8. How many department or college of education personnel are assigned part- or full-time to work specifically in professional staff development programs and activities?

Table 11
Part-Time/Full-Time Assignments to
Work with Staff Development:
Department or College of Education Staff

Institution	Individuals	Estimated Full-Time quivalent ssignments
Michigan State University	31	8.00
Oakland University	7	2.33
Eastern Michigan University	2	1.25
Grand Valley State Colleges	2	.50
Western Michigan University	1	.67
Wayne State University	1	1.00
University of Michigan	1	.60
Central Michigan University	0	0.00
Northern Michigan University	0	0.00
Saginaw Valley State College	0	0.00
Ferris State College	0	0.00
TOTAL	45	14.35

This table vividly illustrates that in 1980-1981, in colleges and departments of education in Michigan, only Michigan State University and Oakland University had demonstrable institutional commitments through time assigned for staff development efforts in the field. Michigan State University had one assistant dean assigned responsibility in the area of outreach and the departmental records indicate there were staff in the departments of Administration and Higher Education, Counseling and Educational Psychology, and Secondary Education and Curriculum who had some assigned time for work in the field.

Oakland University had one associate dean assigned responsibility to develop linkages and programs in the field. In addition, six faculty were assigned one-third time each to develop and work in field-based activities focused specifically on combining staff development activities and action research.

The College of Education at Eastern Michigan University houses the National Center for Teaching and Learning, which has as one objective the development of school-centered staff development. The College of Education supports one full-time person and one quarter-time person in that Center. No other staff from the College of Education are provided assigned time for staff development activities. Wayne State University and the University of Michigan both have administrators at the

dean's level fulfilling assigned responsibilities in this area. The Department of Education at Grand Valley State Colleges has assigned two individuals half-time to develop linkages with the field. One faculty member at Western Michigan University is also provided assigned time to develop linkages and programs in the field. Of note is the comparison between the number of full-time equivalent faculty positions in the eleven departments and colleges of education and the estimated full-time equated positions asigned to work with staff development efforts. During the 1980-1981 academic year, the eleven institutions in this study reported approximately 1,035 full-time equated staff positions in departments and colleges of education. Only 14.35 FTE or 1.4 percent were assigned to functions directed toward staff development.

In addition to the assigned time issue, the question was posed whether there were department or college of education faculty who provided services to the field as part of their regular institutional responsibilities in addition to carrying a full load of regular teaching or administrative responsibilities. Seven departments and colleges of education noted that they had some faculty that provided services to the field beyond any assigned-time functions as part of their regular responsibilities. Some of these services entail serving on policy boards and are discussed under research question 12. Eastern, Western, Central, and Northern Michigan Universities and Grand

Valley State Colleges reported from two to four staff in this category while Oakland University reported seven. Again, Michigan State reported a significantly different situation. It was reported that all directed teaching faculty were expected to provide services when requested although this was not included as a "load" function. Including these staff members, MSU reported 48 faculty in this category. The record-keeping system at MSU reflected 219 incidences of service to the field over and above assigned time field responsibilities.

9. Do any fiscal arrangements exist in departments or colleges of education to support involvement in professional staff development activities?

Table 12
Fiscal Arrangements Which Support Staff Involvement in Staff Development Efforts

SOURCE OF SUPPORT	INSTITUTION PROVIDING SUPPORT
Released or Reassigned Time	Michigan State; University of Michigan; Oakland; Wayne; Eastern and Western Michigan, Grand Valley
Travel, Per Diem	Michigan State; Western Michigan
Contract Services	Michigan State; University of Michigan; Oakland; Wayne; Western and Northern Michigan; Grand Valley
In-Kind Services	Michigan State
Supplemental Pay	Michigan State; University of Michigan; Eastern and Northern Michigan; Grand Valley
Externally Funded Projects	Michigan State; Eastern and Western Michigan
No Special Arrangements	Central Michigan; Saginaw Valley; Ferris

Michigan State University, in addition to providing the greatest amount of assigned time to staff development and having the most people involved in these efforts, also has more possible arrangements to provide financial support and time to staff working in the field.

Seven schools provide some reassigned time, while three schools have no special arrangement. Those respondents that indicated supplemental pay as a method of support (MSU, U of M, EMU, NMU, and GVSC), noted that this was for overload work and paid for through another division--usually a continuing education area--of the university.

Wayne State University is inhibited from providing other supportive arrangements which include pay by a university policy which holds that no faculty members can receive any additional money from the unit where they receive their base salary. Wayne does, however, "loan" people to the field for short periods of time, but these faculty members must make up this time to the college at a later date.

Central Michigan University has no special arrangement to support staff through the College of Education. They do, however, have a unique arrangement with another organizational unit, the Bureau of School Services. The Bureau of School Services is attached to the Continuing Education Unit and has the responsibility to broker services and programs to the field. The data reported on research question number one point out that CMU provided a large number of activities. If not arranged by the individual staff member, these activities are contracted through the Bureau of School Services.

Externally funded projects which provide financial and time support for staff development activities include Teacher Corps projects at MSU and WMU. Ferris has a National Institute of Health grant which supports a summer workshop. Eastern Michigan University also has a project funded by the Mott Foundation, the National Center for Teaching and Learning, which has a staff development responsibility.

In addition to those arrangements listed in Table 12, the University of Michigan has a new category of graduate credit dubbed "P" (for professional) credit. Students receive credit on their graduate program but there is a five "P" credit limitation on any student's program. The purpose is to support and acknowledge staff development type activities delivered by faculty as part of regular load but which do not meet the regular University of Michigan criteria for a graduate course.

10. What mechanisms exist in departments or colleges of education to facilitate the delivery of services to the field?

Seven of the eleven departments or colleges of education have developed some arrangement or mechanism to facilitate the delivery of services to local school districts.

The brokering of services is the mechanism used by most schools to facilitate arrangements between staff members and local schools. Western Michigan University has

a part-time coordinator for professional development (a faculty member with assigned time) whose function is to broker services to local and intermediate school districts. WMU also has two "centers" or offices which provide services for which clerical help is provided but no assigned professional time. The Research Experimentation Demonstration and Evaluation (REDE) Center serves as a brokerage office and the Educator Feedback Center provides a personnel evaluation service to local schools through a computer-scored instrument.

The University of Michigan's Bureau of School Services, although primarily concerned with school accreditation, also brokers services. Michigan State University had an Office of Professional Development Services serving this function as did Oakland University. Oakland University has developed a university talent bank and the Associate Dean's office brokers services identified in this listing (resulting primarily in "one-shot" services). The focus of Oakland's activity currently is being redirected to field-based action research combined with staff development as a procedure for providing sustained work for staff members and on-going relationships with the field. Although at Central Michigan University the Bureau of School Services is not housed in the College of Education, its function also is to broker services.

These brokerage services are supported by assigned administrative positions in four colleges of education:

Oakland, a half-time associate dean; U of M, a full-time associate dean for professional relations and development; MSU, a part-time assistant dean; and Wayne, a full-time associate dean.

Of particular interest is the unique arrangement available to both Eastern Michigan University and Wayne State University through the higher education appropriation of the State budget. Both universities are provided a special budget allocation of $200,000 per year specifically designated for staff development efforts with local schools. At Wayne State University this money is managed by the Associate Dean of Education and is used in a field-based, building-focused program involving 19 schools. Five staff members are partially supported by this money to work as facilitators in these schools; four at one-half time and one at ten percent of her time. The money at Eastern Michigan University is channelled through the National Center for Teaching and Learning, an organizational unit housed in the College of Education. The National Center for Teaching and Learning has several functions, one of which is school improvement through staff development. The program supported by this money is also focused on school building-based staff development programs and coincidentally also involves 19 schools. The money partially supports eight teacher educators (1/4 time each) who function as program facilitators in two or more school sites. The faculty members involved in these two programs

are not included in assigned staff listed in Table 11 since these are special arrangements beyond the range of regular budget allocations.

The department or college of education representative also was asked if his/her organization had any systematic mechanism for identifying a staff member to respond to requests from the field. Only the University of Michigan indicated a specific formal procedure was utilized.

At the University of Michigan an incoming request comes to the Associate Dean for Professional Relations and Development who discusses it with the appropriate program chair. They make a decision whether to honor the request and then identify a faculty member to deliver the service. Several other schools (WMU, MSU, CMU, and NMU) follow some more or less formalized organizational protocol to identify staff. At Northern Michigan, for example, requests come to a Bureau of School and Community Services, which contracts the faculty member directly without informing college administrators. All department or college of education personnel commenting on this issue, however, rely primarily on the personal sense of the person receiving the request to identify an appropriate faculty member.

11. What informal linkages or formal relationships have been developed between department or college of education and other people or groups involved in the state plan for professional development?

One of the most apparent formal linkages between departments and colleges of education and the staff

development effort organized under Section 97 is through membership on policy boards. Table 13 points out the number of faculty from the various schools serving as either voting or non-voting members on policy boards.

Table 13
Department and College of Education
Membership on Policy Boards, 1980-1981

School	Number of Staff Serving on Policy Boards
Michigan State University	7
Central Michigan University	4
Oakland University	4
University of Michigan	4
Northern Michigan University	3
Wayne State University	3
Eastern Michigan University	2
Grand Valley State Colleges	2
Western Michigan University	2
Ferris State College	0
Saginaw Valley State College	0

In terms of numbers of staff involved, the policy board role is the principal formal link that most schools (with the exception of Wayne State University and Eastern Michigan University) have with the Section 97 program. Policy board membership provides direct, on-going linkages

to the deliberations of the group which plays the pivotal role in planning and funding staff development programs.

The four college administrators who are assigned time and responsibilities in staff development roles all indicate part of their function is to establish linkages and contacts in the field. Although these contacts are not formalized, they may be long-lasting due to the personal nature of the interaction.

Eastern Michigan and Wayne State are special cases, and provide a unique perspective on this discussion, having developed formal programmatic relationships resulting from the special budget allocation from the State. In addition to funding staff to serve as resource people to local school-based programs, this allocation allows the university to give each local school a set amount of dollars as an incentive to participate. This local school/college connection is contractual and therefore provides for on-going institutional as well as personal linkages to the 38 participating schools.

The information collected for this question provides only a partial answer and limited perspective regarding relationships and linkages between department and colleges of education and their staff and local schools. Few formal connections exist; department and college individuals responsible for staff development indicated they would like to develop long-term collaborative relationships but are inhibited by various internal and external reasons. Many

informal, personal linkages do exist but the extent and importance of these is hard to ascertain.

Respondents to the "Higher Education Survey" also were asked to describe how they publicize their services to potential clientele. All eleven respondents noted that word of mouth was the main way that staff services were publicized. Brochures developed by the education units are distributed by MSU, Oakland, Wayne, Western, and the University of Michigan. The continuing education services also develop and distribute brochures in those schools with such services. Oakland and Wayne State have a joint brochure planned for the future. Table 9 in this chapter indicates that brochures are not a particularly important means used by policy boards to identify potential resources; 14 percent of the resources were identified through brochures.

The Dean at Eastern Michigan University noted that the university president has taken a major role in publicizing services and has invited area superintendents to meet with the dean periodically. The Associate Dean at the University of Michigan offered a perception that the use of Cable T.V. has been a "big plus" in their outreach effort. The publication of services clearly, however, is primarily an informal, word-of-mouth procedure.

12. Does department or college of education policy and organization support service to local and intermediate school district staff development efforts?

The final question answered by the information from the "Higher Education Survey" relates to the recognition the institution gives to staff development. Service to the field is an acknowledged commitment of seven departments and colleges of education through an officially adopted mission statement. The education units at Eastern, Northern, Saginaw Valley, and Ferris do not have a mission statement encompassing service to the field. The organizational structure, through assigned roles or organizational functions, reflects this commitment in seven of the departments and colleges of education. Only the four smallest schools (Grand Valley, Saginaw Valley, Ferris, and Northern Michigan) do not provide for some role or organizational mechanism to attend to a service/staff development function.

Summary

These five research questions specifically address the second objective of this study--the extent to which departments and colleges of education, through their staff and institutional support provided, have been involved in local staff development efforts. Seven of the eleven state colleges and universities assign one or more staff to work specifically in staff development programs and activities. The estimated full-time equivalent staff for these assigned responsibilities totals only 14.35 and over half of this small amount was provided at Michigan State University. A

variety of financial and time arrangements exist to support staff work in the field and seven schools have developed mechanisms to facilitate the delivery of services. The primary method for this is the brokering of services by a staff member assigned responsibility to develop and administer staff development efforts. Beyond these activities and organizational thrusts, the primary vehicle enabling on-going linkages with the field is staff membership on local staff development policy boards. Thirty-one faculty from the eleven schools studied served as either voting or non-voting policy board members. Considering the various mechanisms developed and support provided, word-of-mouth still appears to be the predominant way universities develop linkages with the field.

Two unique programs at Eastern Michigan University and Wayne State University, established by means of a special financial allocation from the State, provide a somewhat different perspective on the involvement of departments and colleges of education. New mechanisms, increased faculty involvement, changing role patterns, and distinctive program models have emerged from the opportunities implicit in these programs.

SUMMARY

The data gathered through two questionnaire instruments were examined in this chapter. Twelve

research questions were used to guide the development of these instruments and the data collected provided answers to the questions. The analysis of these questions encompassed the two primary objectives which served as the framework for the study. Both objectives relate to the nature and extent of university involvement in the staff development enterprise in Michigan.

The primary objective led to the examination of this issue from the perspective of the staff development efforts organized through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act. The second objective focused the investigation specifically on efforts of departments and colleges of education in Michigan to provide services to the field. These two guiding objectives are interrelated; the information collected for both leads to a more complete portrayal of the university's involvement with the staff development enterprise.

The data disclose that university staff still provide a sizeable numer (223) of staff development activities although the total is only 23 percent of those delivered under the aegis of the Section 97 program. The large majority of university staff (68%) serve in a private consulting capacity, however. University staff also provide activities covering a wide variety of topics. One-third, however, were in two categories--reading and teacher personal development.

Thirty-one university staff members served on policy boards, thereby establishing an on-going presence with the staff development planning and administrative process in those areas. In most cases, these board positions also serve as the only formal linkages between universities and policy boards. Departments and colleges of education have developed other mechanisms to increase linkages with the field and to support staff involvement with local schools. These attempts are limited, however, and constrained by lack of sufficient arrangements for providing financial and time support for staff endeavors in the field.

These findings are reexamined in the final chapter. Inferences are drawn leading to conclusions and recommendations about the university's potential role in the staff development enterprise.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is organized in four sections: Summary, Conclusions Derived from the Data Collected, Recommendations, and Reflections. The Recommendations section includes Recommendations for Policy and Action and Recommendations for Further Study.

SUMMARY

The role of university faculty in the professional staff development enterprise is an issue of deep concern and increasing challenge to departments and colleges of education. Once the leader in providing staff development programs, the university no longer enjoys that role.

During the past decade a number of events have occurred which have focused renewed interest on staff development. During this same period the university's role in this endeavor has changed significantly and appears to have diminished. The purpose of this descriptive study was to examine the nature and extent of the university's role in professional staff development, especially as this role currently is realized in Michigan.

In the past two years the staff development efforts of local and intermediate school districts in Michigan have been substantially enhanced by the implementation of a legislatively supported State Plan for Professional Staff Development, implemented through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act. The program provides money on a per-staff-member entitlement basis to school districts and consortia of districts which have initiated policy boards comprised of a majority of teachers. One hundred and twenty policy boards were established representing 104,364 Michigan teachers and administrators (95% of the work force) during the 1980-1981 school year--the program's second full year of operation.

The Section 97 program serves as the framework for this study and the staff development activities offered by the policy boards implemented under Section 97 provide the parameters and determine the limitations of the data analysis. Twelve research questions encompassing two basic objectives guided this investigation. The primary objective was to examine the extent to which state universities have been involved in the design, development, and delivery of Section 97 programs and activities. A second objective was to assess the extent to which colleges and departments of education in state-supported universities in Michigan, through their staff and through institutional support provided, have been involved in local staff development activities.

The procedures used to collect data included the development of two instruments designed to elicit information pertaining to the twelve research questions. One questionnaire (MDE Form 4674 A--Follow-Up Staff Development) was sent to 114 policy board coordinators in Michigan and the other (Higher Education Survey) was sent to an administrator in each of the departments or colleges of education in eleven state institutions of higher education in Michigan. Data were collected through these questionnaires which addressed both objectives and served as the basis for answering the research questions.

Analysis of the data consisted of straightforward compilation of the information from the questionnaires returned by policy boards and the tabular display of totals and percentages of the numerical data. Information from the Higher Education Survey was compiled and displayed in tables where appropriate. The responses to the Higher Education Survey were obtained by a telephone interview which provided the opportunity for in-depth questioning of the respondents regarding their answers. Therefore, these data were supplemented by additional descriptive information which also was used to answer several of the research questions.

Data collected generated answers to the research questions, portrayed the extent to which university personnel are involved in providing activities offered under the sponsorship of Section 97, and described their

role and function in the program. Additionally, the extent and form of department and college of education support for the staff development effort was explored.

The study was based on an examination of 984 staff development activities offered through the Section 97 program. Briefly, the results showed that 223 or 23 percent of the activities were delivered by university staff. Most of the university personnel delivering these staff development programs (68%) served as private consultants; only 32% (58 individuals) officially represented their college or university. Staff employed by Michigan State University provided the largest number of activities (forty-two) and the numbers ranged down to two activities delivered by Saginaw Valley State College and Ferris State College. Sixty-eight percent of the programs were fully paid for by Section 97 funds; the remaining thirty-two percent were partially supported by a variety of other funding mechanisms.

University personnel delivered a wide variety of programs. Programs and activities in twenty-nine different categories were offered. Thirty-two percent of all programs delivered, however, were in just two categories--reading and related language arts and teacher personal development (primarily stress workshops). In only three other categories were ten or more activities offered--motivation, classroom management, and a general category of subject area skills other than reading or math.

In terms of planning and decision-making roles, thirty-one of the 114 policy boards responding had a university person serving as a member of the board. However, twenty-one boards indicated that the university played no role in activities of the board. University staff served in a variety of consultant and planning roles on the remaining boards.

The data from the Higher Education Survey indicated that only forty-five personnel from departments and colleges of education had any time assigned to work specifically in the area of staff development. These assignments totaled only 14.35 full-time-equated (FTE) positions. Eight FTE positions were from Michigan State University. The organizational mechanisms provided by departments and colleges of education designed to support staff development efforts were neither extensive nor comprehensive. Organizational support generally consisted of a part-time administrative position whose principal function was brokering services. Long-term relationships and formal linkages between universities and local educational agencies seldom existed.

Although there were similarities between departments and colleges of education, the local context and specific local constraints made the differences much more vivid. Michigan State University had the most actively involved educational unit while the three smallest colleges provided the least support for staff development efforts.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the data collected in this study illustrated several aspects of the extent and form of university involvement in the Section 97 program and, in a somewhat less complete manner, described the extent to which departments and colleges of education are involved in staff development endeavors. The findings support the following four conclusions:

1. University personnel still play a substantive role in staff development, but not the dominant role of the past.

2. University staff are involved to some degree in all aspects of the Section 97 program--planning, administration, and delivery. Participation by university personnel, however, is limited to nondecision-making roles in most cases.

Support for these conclusions is provided by examining several aspects of the data, including the number of activities delivered and related characteristics of program delivery. University staff provided 223 or 23% of the staff development programs investigated in this study. University staff also make-up the largest provider group delivering staff development activities through the Section 97 program. Local school district teachers are the second largest provider group (20.9% of the activities) followed by the private consultants category which accounted for 20.6% of the services. Many of the providers categorized as private consultants, however, are from out-of-state universities.

University staff also provided a wide array of activities, offering programs in twenty-nine categories of activities delivered through the Section 97 program. All eleven state universities are involved in the Section 97 endeavor. State institutions provided seventy-seven percent of all activities delivered by higher education institutions, both in and out of state.

In addition to the provider role, university personnel were involved in all other aspects of the Section 97 program through the activities of the policy boards. Seventy-eight percent of the policy boards responding utilized university staff for some functions, from planning and needs assessment to follow-up and evaluation. Thirty-one boards (29% of those boards responding) have university staff as official members, although seventeen are non-voting members. These thirty-one university personnel represent seven of the eleven state colleges and universities. The university played no role on twenty-one boards.

These various factors provide evidence that the university plays a substantial role in the staff development effort and university personnel are, to some degree, involved in many aspects of the Section 97 program. The extent of the university's role must be viewed from the perspective of the past, however, if valid implications are to be drawn.

While university staff still deliver many programs and are the largest provider group, it is clear that the dimensions of the university's role are shrinking. The literature on staff development/inservice education points out that prior to the previous decade there were very few people other than university personnel delivering programs and activities. That is, universities were the primary providers of staff development activities despite the fact that the staff development enterprise was more limited and circumscribed than it is currently.

The percentages discussed above, representing the level of involvement of university personnel, clearly illustrate that the university no longer plays the dominant role in Michigan's staff development effort. Seventy-seven percent of the activities investigated were delivered by personnel other than university staff. Many other provider groups, notably practicing teachers, now offer programs and activities. Further, only fourteen university personnel, who serve as voting members of policy boards, have formal decision-making responsibilities in the Section 97 program. That is, in eighty-five percent of the responding policy boards, the university plays no direct part in the decision-making process.

The institutional support provided by departments and colleges of education is another factor which restricts fuller and more active university involvement in staff development. With the exception of Michigan State

University, the equivalent of only six (6.35) full-time staff were assigned roles and functions in the staff development effort.

Additional factors, such as increasing maturity of the local staff development effort, for example, may lead to a decreased use of university staff. Excluding the programs of the three oldest professional development centers in Michigan (Detroit, Kent County, and Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District) from the analysis of the data illustrates that, on the average, university personnel are utilized more extensively in the remaining programs--increasing from twenty-three percent to twenty-eight percent of the programs offered through all other policy boards. University staff provide only eight percent of the programs offered in the three programs which have been in existence the longest time.

Internally, departments and colleges of education provided little support for an increased presence in the staff development effort. Less than fifteen full-time-equated staff (6.35 FTE excluding Michigan State University) were assigned to roles involving staff development. This is only slightly over one percent of the approximate total number of education personnel in the eleven state colleges and universities in 1980-1981.

3. When delivering staff development activities, most university personnel function as private entrepreneurs as opposed to officially sanctioned representatives of their institutions.

Sixty-eight percent of university staff functioned as private consultants when delivering staff development activities through the Section 97 program. Conversely, only thirty-two percent served in an official capacity by representing their institution in the provider role. This conclusion is further supported by inferences drawn from other aspects of the findings. It is likely that the situation is exacerbated by the lack of formal programs and linkages between institutions of higher education and local education agencies. In many instances, institutional mechanisms within the university do not seem to aid the process of linking officially to schools and policy boards. Further, most contracts between universities and local agencies are made through personal knowledge and connections, not through on-going institutional arrangements. Such factors bear on this issue and may influence individuals to respond to requests from the field as private consultants rather than seeking institutional sanction.

4. University commitment to the staff development enterprise (as demonstrated by the organizational mechanisms and personnel arrangements that exist to develop, support, and expand its role in staff development) is limited. The existing mechanisms and arrangements provide little support or incentive for a vigorous and expanded role for departments and colleges of education.

Data gathered from departments and colleges of education supplied the information to support this conclusion. Few staff have assignments and

responsibilities directly related to supporting the university's role in the staff development effort. During the 1980-1981 academic year, only forty-five individuals in seven departments and colleges of education held positions with specific responsibility in the staff development area. These positions accounted for only slightly more than one percent of the estimated education positions in the eleven state colleges and universities included in this study. Such a small percentage of staff assigned to these functions clearly supports the conclusion that university commitment is limited.

The minimal extent of institutional support is even more striking if the Michigan State University data are excluded. Michigan State University, with a land-grant tradition of service to the field, provided assigned time for thirty-one individuals for an estimated eight full-time- equated positions. The remaining assignments in the other departments and colleges of education, therefore, totaled only eight individuals and 6.35 full-time-equated staff positions.

Only four of the departments and colleges of education reported having specific administrative positions with assigned responsibilities to support and develop out-reach activities. These were the three major universities in Michigan (Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University) and Oakland University, the one other university with a significant

number of individuals assigned time for staff development work.

In addition to personnel having assigned responsibilities in the staff development area, university commitment and support also can be inferred from the nature and extent of the organizational mechanisms and structures utilized to support staff development efforts. Four departments and colleges of education (Northern Michigan University, Central Michigan University, Ferris State College, and Saginaw Valley State College) reported no organizational structure or process specifically designed to promote staff development. Brokering of services was the primary mechanism used by all remaining universities to aid the staff development effort.

Formal procedures and processes designed to develop long-term, on-going relationships with local educational agencies were not part of the regular organizational functions of departments and colleges of education reported at the time of this study. Personal contact and informal networking remained the principal connecting links to the field. Membership on policy boards was the most apparent, on-going, formal relationship reported in the findings. Although seven departments and colleges of education had staff members serving on policy boards, the total number of boards with a member from higher education totaled only thirty-one, or only twenty-seven percent of the policy boards included in this study.

These findings provide the evidence to support this fourth conclusion. Although service to the field is an acknowledged commitment through an officially adopted mission statement in seven of the departments and colleges of education studied, the organizational support systems designed to enhance this role are minimal and usually do not lead to a vigorous institutional presence in the field. Lack of formal linkages between universities and local educational agencies clearly is an added factor in support of this conclusion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following two sets of recommendations are made. The first recommendations emerge from the specific conclusions of the study and, therefore, are restricted to the implications drawn from these narrow conclusions. They apply primarily to policy and procedural issues confronting departments and colleges of education. The second set of recommendations, also related to the findings of the study, are directed to more elusive issues pertaining to the university's role in the staff development arena. These recommendations consist of a set of concerns and unanswered questions which should be addressed through further study. The order of the recommendations reflects no particular priority, except for the first. The general nature of the first recommendation

encompasses the specific issues in the remaining recommendations.

Recommendations for Policy and Action

1. It is recommended that departments and colleges of education clarify their missions and take the steps necessary to make the mission operational.

In light of the findings of this study, it is evident that the traditional missions of departments and colleges of education, when they involve service and staff development functions, are not systematically addressed. Although seven departments and colleges of education had mission statements which acknolwedged an inservice function, the extent of involvement was problematic and often lacked organizational support. If the institution examines its mission and chooses to address staff development, the necessary steps should forcefully be taken to accomplish the task.

Actions to be taken include (a) developing an organizational structure and mechanism to support the staff development effort, (b) allocating more resources for this effort, including increasing the number of staff with assigned responsibilities in the out-reach area, (c) addressing the issue of credit-hour production, (d) redefining the role and function of some faculty, and (e) providing internal faculty development programs. These

issues are addressed more specifically in the following recommendations.

The overriding issue to be resolved for this recommendation to be realized, however, relates to the traditional three-part mission of the university--teaching, research, and service. Staff development is a teaching mission. Although staff development activities are typically delivered away from the university and the format is usually not a traditional course format, the nature of staff development remains a teaching and learning procedure. Staff development must be understood as such if institutional resources can be expected to be committed for its support. The service function of the university seldom is a high priority. Accepted measures of productivity, which serve as the basis for financial support, do not obtain in service tasks. Staff development activities are no different from other teaching activities except that they occur off campus, often in a different format, and may not produce credit hours. Administrative functions supporting staff development are no different in kind from normal administrative tasks and should be equally supported. The resolution of this major issue would noticeably enhance the prospect for the following recommendations to be accepted.

2. It is recommended that departments and colleges of education seek new staff development roles while at the same time reexamining and adapting their traditional functions to the changing staff development

context and changing needs of teachers and administrators.

The nature of the present staff development effort as it has developed through the Section 97 program has circumscribed the extent of the role that universities can play. There is no prescribed or mandated role for universities as part of the Section 97 program. Policy boards are merely encouraged to use the resources of the university. Any role played by the university is by invitation. The response of departments and colleges of education to this situation must be to seek new roles or to adapt and reassert traditional functions. In order to accomplish this, it is recommended that departments and colleges of education assess the capabilities and strengths of their staff and match these capabilities/ strengths with current and potential needs in the field.

An analysis of potential needs also will help define new roles for teacher educators. The findings of this study support the inference that university staff are competent in many areas and serve in many roles. Careful attention to staff and institutional strengths and needs in the field will amplify the university's ability to be proactive in the staff development enterprise.

Examining and adapting traditional functions also are important considerations for this recommendation. In the present context of "staff development for school improvement" discussed in Chapter II, the university's

traditional research function should be adopted as an important aspect of staff development practice. Action research tied to long-term relationships with teachers and schools can provide a vehicle for effective staff development practice and an obvious role for teacher educators.

3. It is recommended that colleges and universities support the development and improvement of internal institutional mechanisms designed to enable more effective support for the staff development function.

To support institutional and staff participation in the staff development enterprise, departments and colleges of education must actively seek and support the development or improvement of organizational mechanisms and arrangements designed to enable an effective staff development capability. Evidence from this study suggests that current organizational structures and personnel arrangements provide little support or incentive for the development of a vigorous role in the staff development enterprise. Although controlled by the contextual factors characteristic of their particular institution, departments and colleges of education should direct additional organizational resources to the improvement of existing mechanisms, such as an office of staff development, to enhance their capacity in the staff development arena.

Coupled with this support, department and college administrators should move to provide additional incentives

and rewards for staff involvement in institutionally supported endeavors. The findings of this study indicate that over two-thirds of the university staff delivering services to the field act as private entrepreneurs. Institutional connection or endorsement appears not to encourage individual participation in staff development.

While serving as a private consultant appears to be the principal university staff role in the Section 97 program, other evidence reviewed in Chapter II suggests that outside consultants often inhibit effective staff development. Their use in organized staff development programs is declining. Consequently, university staff need to become part of on-going, school-centered programs designed to solve school problems. Both the individual staff member and the department or college of education, therefore, have a stake in providing this type of staff development. Organizational structures designed to encourage institutional affiliation should facilitate this type of program.

4. It is recommended that departments and colleges of education take steps to increase the number of higher education staff serving on Section 97 policy boards.

Membership on policy boards gives departments and colleges of education their most direct and formal access to the deliberations of the Section 97 planning group. On-going relationships with policy board members, supported by a university commitment to provide services, offers the

chance for significant and positive impact on this important decision-making group. University human resources should be devoted on something like a "loss leader" basis to maximize the possibility of developing these formal relationships.

5. It is recommended that departments and colleges of education actively seek to form collaborative relationships with local educational entities. Collaborative relationships draw on the strengths of each institution and focus on educational improvement.

Evidence from this study indicates that relationships and linkages between departments and colleges of education and local educational agencies currently are primarily informal and dependent on personal contacts and relationships. Such arrangements may have satisfied past needs but the nature of the present staff development enterprise suggests that formal collaborative relationships between all parties involved is a key to effective school improvement. Departments and colleges of education should take the lead in promoting long-term, collaborative relationships with schools. The special programs at Eastern Michigan University and Wayne State University provide evidence of the institutional benefits of carefully articulated collaboration. Such programs fall outside of the normal funding channels. Cost factors may inhibit similar meaningful attempts at collaboration. If cost factors and the institutional reliance on the FTE procedure can be overcome, opening the way for more flexible delivery

procedures, collaboration will provide the opportunity for departments and colleges of education to reestablish a leadership role in staff development.

6. It is recommended that departments and colleges of education take steps to develop cooperative relationships with each other aimed at enhancing their overall staff development effort and increasing their impact.

The institutional context within which each department or college of education functions determines the type of organizational support mechanisms, and the nature of the personal resources, which are directed to the staff development effort. One result is that different universities speak to staff development issues from different agendas and respond to requests from the field through very different procedures. It can be inferred from the findings of this study that local educational agencies lack adequate knowledge of how to use university resources, or even what resources are available. Formalized, cooperative efforts could lead to the development of more coherent policies and more effective procedures to inform the field of university resources and services. Drawing on each other's strengths and resources potentially can increase each university's capability in the staff development endeavor.

Further, cooperative efforts could lead to more effective action in support of specialized funding for

staff development and for a modification of the FTE personnel accounting procedure.

7. It is recommended that departments and colleges of education implement a more formal individual record-keeping system related to activities and services provided to the field.

The need to document service to the field is imperative if institutional support is to be gained for many of the previous recommendations. Michigan State University's 1980-1981 record-keeping procedure, for example, may have uncovered and documented instances of individual service to the field which would go unreported or, at least, unrecognized at other colleges and universities. Although this recommendation may not receive enthusiastic support from university staff, it represents a potentially important function in the university's support system for the staff development effort.

There are many unresolved problems and critical issues confronting departments and colleges of education in their quest for a continued role in the staff development enterprise. These recommendations stem from the findings of this descriptive study of one aspect of the staff development venture--the university's role in the Michigan State Plan for Professional Staff Development. Several of the critical staff development related problems facing departments and colleges of education are addressed. The recommendations are of value only if they inform and

influence university policy and practice and are offered in that light.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study was limited to an examination of the university's role in the Section 97 program in Michigan. Additional information was collected from departments and colleges of education to investigate their role in staff development. Analysis and review of the data raised many questions which could not be answered and were beyond the scope of the study. Some of the more apparent but elusive issues are presented without comment in this section as recommendations for further study:

1. What motivates university staff to become involved in staff development activities? Are issues of professionalism or survival involved? Does the university reward system enhance or decrease staff motivation? Do personnel from the disciplines, as contrasted to teacher educators, have diffferent motives for involvement? What do faculty view as necessary rewards to become involved in staff development?

2. What is the effect of the Section 97 program on university/local school relationships and linkages? If local districts have had long-term relationships with universities in the past, are these still viable?

3. Do universities need to control faculty consulting procedures? On what basis do the local schools choose

private consultants? Is an informal network among staff development workers the most effective and efficient way to identify and utilize resources?

4. How do university budgeting procedures affect the staff development effort? Can income from continuing education programs be used for program development or staff benefits? How is cost effectiveness addressed?

5. How can the internal political problems confronting departments and colleges of education, such as turf problems and jurisdiction of staff development programs, be addressed?

REFLECTIONS

These reflections go beyond the data and findings of this study. They take into consideration many of the factors related to the present staff development context and the university's role, discussed in Chapter II, as well as the personal experience of the writer. When the implications of the findings are examined from the perspective of the present perceived crisis in education, and with an eye to possible solutions, several related issues emerge.

If creative and forceful steps are not taken, colleges and departments of education may, indeed, lose the staff development capability as an organizational function. On the other hand, the challenge created by the changing staff development scene and the thrust toward school improvement

can have a strong positive influence. Merely taking steps to say afloat is not the answer to the problems facing departments and colleges of education. A proactive institutional response to the present situation is called for. The current literature makes it clear that effective staff development programs have certain common characteristics. The focus on the school building staff, with school improvement as the goal, is widely acknowledged as a key thrust for staff development in the immediate future. Leaders in local and intermediate districts are aware of this and increasingly are looking to resources other than the university to provide services to meet their needs. Universities must respond by developing long-term relationships focused on developing school staff capacity for problem solving.

The changing context need not cause the university's already diminished role in staff development to shrink further. A creative reentry into the staff development arena also has implications for strengthening other programs and functions of departments and colleges of education. A successful staff development effort encompassing new roles should attract new clientele, should lead to a stronger on-campus program, can serve as on-going faculty development for university staff, and should encourage the development of the action-research function of the department or college. Collaboration is the key and universities have the opportunity to take the lead in these

efforts. But, without appropriate institutional steps of the type proposed in the recommendations, the institutional role of departments and colleges of education will continue to shrink.

Another potentially important factor in a time of diminishing resources is the pool of highly trained university faculty who may be underutilized in their regular roles. Colleges and universities over the years have developed a pool of staff resources who delivered the courses and programs used for certification purposes and who logically were available to school systems for other staff development activities. Until recently, a deficit model of inservice education was pervasive; schools, therefore, tended not to use practitioners for staff development endeavors. University faculty, in their professional role of teacher/researcher and with the implicit charge of translating theory into practice, were the visible and obvious experts who could be called on to provide inservice education activities. Further, most teacher educators came from the ranks of the classroom teacher and continued to maintain these ties, easily positioning themselves to be summoned back to the public school to deliver consultative services in staff development activities. Many individual faculty, due to their specific competencies and personal links with the field, continue to play significant, but private, roles in staff development.

However, in the present context of declining university enrollments and surplus teachers, a sizeable pool of teacher educators may become available to play other institutionally supported roles. Potentially, this group constitutes a sizeable pool of highly trained professionals who could serve many different functions in the staff development effort. Without increasing total expenditures, the state could relieve the constraints imposed by the faculty accounting system (the FTE) and provide a method, such as the service hour, to facilitate faculty service to the field. The known characteristics of effective staff development programs could be linked to university staff utilization in collaborative efforts through a new funding model which could be of benefit to all of the groups which have a stake in education.

Further, it becomes apparent upon reflecting on the initial reason for this study of the role of the university in staff development that a larger, more general issue is involved--the role of staff development in the professionalization of education. The question of whether teachers regard staff development as a continuing professional responsibility is troublesome and deserves further inquiry. Similarly, there is a sense that universities have not been sufficiently forceful in helping preservice teachers understand the nature of the education profession and develop their own sense of professionalism. Teacher educators should explore the mechanisms used by

other professional groups to deal with the staff development function necessary in any profession. Business, agriculture, and medicine, for example, have a great deal of experience in providing continuing professional development programs which could prove very useful in this period.

A profession, among other characteristics, consists of individuals bound together by a common conception of process and role and serving a variety of functions. As university faculty work more closely with practitioners in a collaborative effort in the interest of school improvement, the true professional potentially can emerge. This cooperative community could establish standards and a shared understanding of practice. For those who participate in this type of staff development program, the result can lead to continued professional and personal growth.

Universities, not unexpectedly, often fall into the trap of providing the wrong type of staff development at the wrong time to the wrong group. Perhaps universities, in cooperation with each other, should initiate action to redefine the nature of preservice education, to establish an induction period preceding practice, and strive to help teachers gain a sense of professionalism as well as redefining and reasserting their role in staff development.

The implications of this study relating to collaborative efforts and new roles for educators reach beyond the university to all areas of education--governing agencies such as the Michigan Department of Education as well as K-12 systems. Although the context may be troubled, the challenges are apparent and the opportunities exist for revitalizing the schools in a time of great need through coordinated and forceful action at all levels. In meeting these challenges through collaborative action, departments and colleges of education again can play a major institutional role in staff development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agne, Russell, and Ducharne, Edward. "Rearranging the Parts: A Modest Proposal for Continuing and Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education (March/April 1977):16-19.

Allen, Dwight W. "In-Service Teacher Training: A Modest Proposal." In Improving In-Service Education. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Appignani, Georgianina, Ed. Policy for the Education of Educators: Issues and Implications. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1981.

Bartlett, Lynn. The Old and the New Faces of the Michigan Curriculum Program. Lansing, Michigan: Department of Public Instruction (1960).

Becherman, Marvin M. "Educational Change Agents: An 'Inside-Outside' Team." Educational Leadership (March 1973):530-532.

Bell, T. H. "Challenges for Inservice Vocational Education." Theory Into Practice (February 1975):1-4.

Bergquist, William. "Relationship of Collegiate Professional Development and Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education (May/June 1978):18-27.

Bettinghouse, Erwin P., Ed. A State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan. Lansing, Michigan: Study Submitted to the Michigan Department of Education (1978).

Borg, Walter R., and Gall, Meredith M. Educational Research: An Introduction, 3rd Ed. New York: Longman Inc., 1979.

Bottoms, Gene. "Responsibilities of Local School Systems, State Departments of Education, Institutions of Higher Education, and Professional Organizations for In-Service Education." In Rethinking In-Service Education, pp. 38-46. Edited by Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Boyer, James, and Maertens, Norbert. "School-University Coalitions for Reality-Based Instruction." Educational Leadership (February 1975):313-316.

Braun, Frederick. "The Education Professor as an In-Service Leader." Educational Perspectives (December 1975):19-21.

Brody, H. S. "In-Service Teacher Education: Paradoxes and Potentials." In National Symposium: Critical Issues in Teacher In-Service Education. Edited by Louis Rubin. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1976.

Carey, Lou M., and Marsh, David D. University Roles in Inservice Education: Planning for Change. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1980.

Clark, David D. "The Real World of the Teacher Educator: A Look to the Near Future." Phi Delta Kappan (May 1977):683.

Cochran, Leslie. "Inservice Education: Passive-Complacent-Reality." Theory Into Practice (February 1975): 5-10.

Collins, James F. "Centers for the Education of Teachers: Some Perspectives on Operation and Management." Paper delivered at NCSIE Conference, New Orleans, 1976.

Corey, Stephen M. "Introduction." In In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education, 1957.

Cremin, Lawrence A. "The Heritage of American Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education (June 1953):18-21.

Davies, Hopkin M., and Aquino, John T. "Collaboration in Continuing Professional Development." Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1975):274-77.

Delano, June S. "In-Service for Change." Educational Leadership (May 1975):520-523.

Dillon, Elizabeth A. "Innovation and Collaboration--A Public School Educator Speaks." Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1974):256-257.

Dillon, Elizabeth A. "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise." Educational Leadership (December 1976):165-170.

Dole, Carl J. "Conservatism in America: What Does it Mean for Teacher Education?" Journal of Teacher Education (July/August 1981):15-24.

Drummond, William. "Emerging Roles of the College-Based Teacher Educator." In Emerging Professional Roles for Teacher Educators. Edited by Karl Massanari, William Drummond, and Robert Houston. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1978.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade." The Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974):25.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Inservice Education: Alive With Interest and Fraught With Problems," Inservice (September 1976):1.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "The School of Education and Inservice Education." In Higher Education's Role in Inservice Education. Edited by Karl Massanari. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "The School of Education and Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education (Mar/Apr 1977):16-23.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Six Years of Progress in Inservice Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education (Vol. 14, No. 2, 1981):112-118.

Edelfelt, Roy A., and Johnson, Margo, Eds. Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Edelfelt, Roy A., and Johnson, Margo. "A History of the Professional Development of Teachers." In The 1981 Report on Educational Personnel Development. Edited by Emily Feistritzer. Washington, D.C.: Feistritzer Publications, 1980.

Edelfelt, Roy A., and Lawrence, Gordon. "In-Service Education: The State of the Art." In Rethinking In-Service Education. Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Eubie, Joseph, and Gray, Frank. "University-School Cooperation." Educational Leadership (February 1973):416-419.

Feistritzer, Emily C. The 1980 Report on Educational Personnel Development. Washington, D.C.: Feistritzer Publications, 1979.

Ferver, Jack C. "Coordinating SCDE Programs." Journal of Research and Development in Education (Fall 1981):22-54.

Fisher, Floyd B. "Coordination: The Need in Continuing Education." Adult Leadership (March 1974):288-292.

Gallegos, Arnold M. "Politics and Realities of Staff Development." Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1980):21-24.

Grinder, Robert E., Boyle, Virginia, and Carey, Lou M. "Teacher Education's Professional Development in the Context of Emerging Field Experiences." In The Institutionalization of Change and Inservice. Edited by Paul R. Walker. Bellingham, WA: Far West Teacher Corps Network, 1978.

Harris, Ben M. "The Evaluation of Inservice Education: Taking A Closer Look." The Developer (June 1982):1-4

Harris, Ben M. Improving Staff Performance Through In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Hass, Glen C. "Inservice Education Today." In Inservice Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago: NSSE, 1957.

Havelock, Ronald G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Hendee, Raymond E. "Toward Effective Staff Development Plans and Programs." Educational Leadership (December 1976):163.

Hite, Herbert. "Inservice Education: Perceptions, Purposes and Practices." In Planning Inservice Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives. Edited by Herbert Hite and Kenneth Howey. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Hough, Wendell M. "School University Partnership for Teacher Growth." Educational Leadership (February 1975):308-312.

Houston, Robert W. "The Nature of Change in Schools and Universities." In Staff Development and Educational Change. Edited by W. Robert Houston and Roger Pancratz. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980.

Houston, Robert W. and Frieberg, Jerome J. "Perpetual Motion, Blindman's Bluff, and Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1979):7-9.

Howey, Kenneth R. "A Framework for Planning Alternative Approaches to Inservice Teacher Education." In Planning Inservice Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives. Edited by Herbert Hite and Kenneth Howey. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1975.

Howey, Kenneth R. "Putting Inservice Teacher Education Into Perspective." Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1976):101-104.

Howsam, Robert B., Corrigan, Dean C., Denemark, George W., and Nash, Robert J. Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Inservice Education: Infopac No. 7. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Fall, 1974.

Johnson, Margo. Inservice Education: Priority for the '80s. Syracuse, New York: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1980.

Joyce, Bruce R, Kenneth Howey, and Sam J. Yarger. Issues to Face. Palo Alto, California: ISTE Report I, June 1976.

Kennamer, Lorrin and Hall, Gene E. "Educational Staff Development and Its Implementation: Past, Present, and Future." In Dimensions of Inservice Education, pp. 16-32. Edited by Jerome Freiberg and Rubin Olivarey. San Antonio, Texas: The Texas Teacher Corps Network, 1978.

Kersh, Bert Y. Faculty Development for Inservice Education in the Schools. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1978.

Kersh, Bert Y. "Needed: New Ways of Thinking and Acting in Staff Development." Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1979):44-48.

Kirby, Paul W. "In-Service Education: The University's Role." Educational Leadership (February 1973):431-433.

Lawrence, Gordon. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education," Inservice (February 1977):1-4.

Le Baron, Walt. Teacher Corps Reports: Inservice Development Processes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Contract 300-76-0302, 1977.

Marsh, David D., and Carey, Lou M. "The Involvement of Universities in Inservice Education: An Organizational Analysis." In The Institutionalization of Change and Inservice in Schools and Colleges of Education. Edited by P. R. Walker. Bellingham, Washington: Far West Teacher Corps Network, 1978.

Massanari, Karl. Higher Education's Role in Inservice Education. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977.

Mathis, Claude B. "The Teaching Scholar--An Old Model in a New Context." Journal of Teacher Education (May/June 1978):9-13.

McLaughlin, Milbrey, and Marsh, David. "Staff Development and School Change," Teachers College Record (September 1978):69-94.

"MEA's Platform," Teacher's Voice (April 30, 1973).

Meade, Edward J., Jr. "No Health in Us." In Improving In-Service Education. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Michigan Department of Education. "Evaluation of Professional Staff Development." Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished memorandum, 1981.

Neale, Daniel C., Bailey, William J., Ross, Billy E. Strategies for School Improvement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Nicholson, Alexander M., Joyce, Bruce R., and Parker, Donald W. The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education. Palo Alto, California: ISTE Report III, June, 1976.

O'Keefe, William. "Some Teacher-Centered In-Service Programs." Today's Education (March/April, 1974):39-43.

Orrange, Patricia and VanRyn, Mike. "Agency Roles and Responsibilities in In-Service Education." In Rethinking In-Service Education. Edited by Roy Edelfelt and Margo Johnson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Pancratz, Roger S. "Surviving the Inservice Revolution: A Proactive Stance." Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1979):20-22.

Pearson, James B. and Fuller, Edgar, Eds. Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1969.

Powell, Douglas R. Continuing Teacher Education: The University's Role. Evanston, Illinois: Occasional Paper Number Six, Center for the Teaching Professions, Northwestern University, April, 1974.

Professional Development for School Staffs. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, October 1976.

Ream, Marsha A. Inservice Education of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Research Summary 1966-S1, 1966.

Richey, Herman G. "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-Service Education." In Inservice Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago, Ill: National Society for the Study of Education, 1957.

Rubin, Louis J. "Teacher Growth in Perspective," In Improving In-Service Education. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Rubin, Louis J. "The Case for Staff Development." In Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers. Edited by Thomas J. Sergrovanni. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1975.

Ryan, Kevin. "Can Professors Help the Teacher?" Inservice (January 1979):4.

Ryan, Thomas F. "Speculations on Higher Education's Role in Inservice." Inservice (January 1979):5-6.

Sandefur, J. T. "Perspectives on Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education (Jan/Feb 1979):13-14.

Sandefur, J. T. "We Can Change--We Must Change." Inservice (January 1979):1-2.

Schiffer, Judith. "A Framework for Staff Development." In Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.

Schwartz, Henrietta. "When University and Schools Relate." Educational Leadership (February 1973):397-400.

Smith, E. Brooks. "Partnership in Teacher Education Revisited." Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1974):253-257.

Sneed, Arthur. "Continuing Education in the Professions." Journal of Higher Education (Summer 1972):224-230.

Spink, Edward Taylor. "The Michigan Cooperative Curriculum Program: A Descriptive Study of State Leadership in Curriculum Development (1935-1968)." East Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

Staff Development of Educational Personnel. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1977.

State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan. Lansing, Michigan: Office of Professional Development, Michigan Department of Education, March 22, 1979.

Stinnett, T. M. "Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation." In Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook. Edited by Edgar Fuller and J. B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1969.

Stroud, Sarah Jane. "The Michigan August Working Conference as a Method of Curriculum Development." East Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966.

Teacher Supply and Demand Report. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1980.

Tyler, Ralph W. "In-Service Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future." In Improving In-Service Education. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Ward, Douglas. Local Associations Eye Instruction and Professional Development. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1974.

Williams, Richard C. "A Political Perspective on Staff Development." In Staff Development--New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.

Winsand, Jean. "The Role of Higher Education in Inservice Development." In Staff Development and Educational Change. Edited by Robert Houston and Roger Pancratz, Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

OS-2733
10/79

Michigan Department of Education

COMMUNICATIONS COVER SHEET

DATE September 1, 1981

FROM: Barbara Ort-Smith, Associate Superintendent,
Libraries and Adult Extended Learning

SUBJECT: Form PD-4674-A, "1980-81 Follow-Up to Professional Staff Development Activities"

ITEM(S) ATTACHED: Cover letter and Form PD-4674-A

NATURE OF ACTION REQUESTED:

- [X] Response Required
- [ ] Response Required to Continue Funding
- [ ] Response Invited to Participate in Funding
- [ ] Response Invited
- [ ] Local Action Required
- [ ] For Your Information

DUE OR ACTION DATE October 15, 1981

BRIEF SUMMARY: Cover letter explains follow-up. Form PD-4674-A is a follow-up to the 1980-81 Professional Staff Development Activities.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Lansing, Michigan 48909

PHILLIP E. RUNKEL
Superintendent
of Public Instruction

September 1, 1981

TO: Professional Staff Development Coordinators

FROM: Barbara Ort-Smith, Associate Superintendent,
Libraries and Adult Extended Learning

SUBJECT: Attached Form PD-4674A: 1980-81 Follow-up to Professional Staff Development Activities

We need some expanded information relative to the professional staff development activities of 1980-81 funded through Section 97 of the State Aid Act. On the attached Forms PD-4674-A we have identified activity/ies supported through the professional staff development program and have directed questions relative to those activities. The activities were identified from Form PD-4674 - 1980-81 Evaluation of Professional Staff Development Activities which you submitted to this office. Please refer to your copy of PD-4674 if you have questions about which activities are included.

This form is due to the Office of Professional Development by October 7, 15 1981. Any questions should be addressed to Paula Brictson, 517 373-3608.

cc: Paula Brictson

Enclosure

PD-4674-A
8/81

Michigan Department of Education
OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909

Direct questions regarding this form to (517) 373-3608.

1980-81 FOLLOW-UP TO PROFESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

EDUCATIONAL AGENCY	Legal Name of School District	District Code No.	Telephone – Area Code/Local No.
	Address	City	Zip Code

MAILING INSTRUCTIONS: Return ONE copy by OCTOBER 1, 1981 to the STATE address indicated above.

1. Title of Activity: _____

2. Who did the provider/s of the activity listed above represent? That is, for whom do they work?

ORGANIZATION	NAME (i.e., Pontiac Schools, Wayne State Univ., etc.)
Local School District (teacher)	
Local School District (administrator)	
College or University	
Community College	
Intermediate School District	
REMC	
State Department of Education	
Parent Group	
Community Group or Organization	
Aides/Paraprofessionals	
Other (Please specify)	

3. Did the provider/s of this activity deliver the activity as an official representative of their organization or as a private consultant?
   ☐ Private consultant ☐ Representative of an organization

4. How did you become aware of this activity or resource person? (e.g., referral, brochure, personal contact, etc.)

   _____

5. For whom was the activity primarily designed? That is, who was the intended audience?
   (Check one or more)
   ☐ Grade level group ☐ General audience ☐ Single school district
   ☐ Specific subject area ☐ Specific building staff ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

6. What was the source of funds and what was the estimated percentage contributed? (Should total 100%)
   Percent
   _____ % Section 97
   _____ % Participant fee
   _____ % Local/ISD school district
   _____ % Categorical aid (e.g., Title I)
   _____ % In-kind services (from whom?) _____
   _____ % Other (Please specify) _____
   100 %

7. Indicate the involvement of institutions of higher education in providing services to your professional development program.
   (Check ALL that apply)
   ☐ Involved in formation of policy board
   ☐ Policy board member (voting)
   ☐ Policy board member (not voting)
   ☐ Consultant to policy board
   ☐ Planning and/or implementing needs assessment
   ☐ Program Planning
   ☐ Other roles (Please specify) _____

CERTIFICATION: I certify that the information submitted on this report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date _____ *Superintendent or* Authorized Official _____ (Signature)

Program Coordinator _____ (Signature) Telephone of Coordinator _____
(Area Code/Local Number)

199

WMU

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Department of Education and Professional Development

May 25, 1981

Dear _____:

I'm working on a project designed to assess the extent to which university staff are involved with local staff development/inservice efforts. The enclosed questionnaire is one aspect of this project and focuses on departments and colleges of education. Would you please take a few minutes to look over the questions and note the type of information requested.

To save you time I will be calling you to ask for your responses to the survey by telephone. I will contact you in two or three days to arrange a time to do this at your convenience.

Information from this survey will be included in the larger project. Particular emphasis will be placed on activities funded through Section 97 of the State School Aid Act. Your responses, however, should not be limited to those activities. I am interested in all staff development activities in which department or college of education staff are involved. The project focuses on the 1980-1981 academic year.

Thanks for your time. I will share the results with you late in the summer.

Sincerely,

Ronald A. Crowell

Enclosure

INSERVICE EDUCATION--STAFF DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT or COLLEGE OF EDUCATION SURVEY

1980-1981

Please answer the following questions for the largest education unit at your institution (school, college, department). You will be contacted by telephone for your answers.

- -

1. Does your department or college of education have any special arrangements or mechanisms to broker or deliver services to local and intermediate school districts (e.g., outreach center, school service bureau)?

   _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, please specify: _____

   _____

   _____

2. What arrangement, if any, exists in your department or college of education to provide support for the involvement of your staff in non-credit staff development activities with local and intermediate school districts?

   _____ Released or reassigned time _____ In-kind services

   _____ Travel, per diem _____ Supplemental pay

   _____ Contract services _____ No special arrangements

   _____ Externally funded project, e.g., Teacher Corps, Dean's Grant.

   Please specify: _____

   _____

   _____ Other (please specify): _____

   _____

3. How many staff from your department or college of education are officially assigned full- or part-time to work specifically in professional inservice/staff development programs and activities with local or intermediate school districts?

   _____ Individuals _____ Estimated Full-Time Equivalents

4. Are there staff who do not have time officially assigned for this but who may be called upon to provide services as part of their regular institutional responsibilities (e.g., policy board member/consultant)? This may include additional compensation and/or reimbursement for expenses.

   _____ Individuals

5. Please list the kinds of services provided by staff members included in 3 and 4 above. For example: program development, liaison with local schools, resource broker, workshop leader, research consultant, etc.

6. Do any of your staff members serve on policy boards established under Section 97 of the State School Aid Act?

   _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, how many? ___ Are they voting ___, non-voting ___, or both ___?

7. When your department or college of education receives a request for services from the field, do you have a systematic procedure for identifying a staff member to respond to the request?

   _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, please describe: _____

   _____

8. How do you publicize your services to potential clientele?

9. Does professional staff development and/or service to the field appear as part of an "official" mission statement of your department or college of education?

_____ Yes _____ No

Is this commitment reflected in the organizational structure?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, please describe: _____

_____

Thanks for your time!

APPENDIX B

POLICY BOARD INFORMATION

APPENDIX B

POLICY BOARD INFORMATION

The following policy boards were included in this study:

Alpena Public Schools
Alpena-Montmorency-Alcoma Intermediate School District
Ann Arbor Public Schools
Avondale Public Schools
Bay-Arenac Intermediate School District
Bendle Public Schools
Beaverton Rural Schools
Berrien County Intermediate School District
Berkley City Schools
Big Rapids Public Schools
Bloomfield Hills Schools
Brown City Community Schools
Calhoun Intermediate School District
Cheboygan Area Schools
Chelsea School District
Clarenceville Public Schools
Clawson Schools
Clinton Schools
Coloma Community Schools
Copper Country Intermediate School District
Covert Public Schools
Croswell-Lexington Community Schools
Davison Community Schools
Delta-Schoolcraft Intermediate School District
Detroit Public Schools
Dewitt Public Schools
Dexter Community Schools
Dickinson-Irons Intermediate School District
East Lansing Schools
Eastern Upper Peninsula Intermediate School District
Eaton County Intermediate School District
Farmington Public Schools
Fennville Public Schools
Ferndale City Schools
Flint City Schools
Flushing Community Schools
Fremont Public Schools
Fruitport Community Schools
Gaylord Community Schools
Genesee Intermediate School District
Gogebic-Ontonagon Intermediate School District
Grand Blanc Community Schools
Gratiot-Isabella Intermediate School District
Hamtramck Public Schools
Hart Public Schools
Holland City Schools
Hopkins Public Schools
Huron Intermediate School District
Highland Park Schools
Huron Valley Schools
Ingham Intermediate School District

Jackson County Intermediate School District
Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District
Kearsley Community Schools
Kent Intermediate School District
Lakeville Community Schools
Lansing School District
Lapeer County Schools
Lenawee Intermediate School District
Lincoln Consolidated Schools
Livingston Intermediate School District
Macomb Intermediate School District
Madison Public Schools
Manchester Community Schools
Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District
Mecosta-Osceola Intermediate School District
Midland Intermediate School District
Milan Area Schools
Monroe County Intermediate School District
Montcalm Intermediate School District
Morley Stanwood Community Schools
Muskegon Intermediate School District
Newaygo County Intermediate School District
Niles Community Schools
Novi Community Schools
Oak Park School District
Oakland Schools
Oxford Area Community Schools
Ottawa Intermediate School District
Peck Community Schools
Pontiac City Schools
Port Huron Area Schools
Reese Public Schools
Reeths-Puffer Schools
Rieverview Community Schools
St. Clair County Intermediate School District
Saline Area Schools
Sandusky Community Schools
Sanilac Intermediate School District
Shiawassee Intermediate School District
South Haven Public Schools
South Lyon Community Schools
Southfield Public Schools
Taylor School District
Traverse Bay Area Intermediate School District
Troy School District
Tuscola Intermediate School District
Utica Community Schools
Walled Lake Consolidated Schools
Warren Consolidated Schools
Washtenaw Intermediate School District
Waterford School District
Wayland Union Schools
Wayne-Westland Community Schools
West Branch-Rose City Area Schools
Whitehall District Schools
Willow Run Community Schools
Ypsilanti Schools
Woodhaven School District
Garden City Schools
Northville Schools
South Redford Schools
Plymouth-Canton Schools
Cherry Hill Schools

Form PD 4674 A Not Returned

Alpena-Montmorency-Alcoma Intermediate School District
Berkley
Calhoun Intermediate School District
Dickinson-Irons
East Lansing
Grand Blanc
Huron Valley
Lincoln Consolidated
Newaygo
Port Huron
Riverview
Cherry Hill

Follow-up Data Incomplete

Alpena
Ann Arbor
Bay Arenac
Dearborn
Eaton Intermediate School District
Ferndale
Genesee Intermediate School District
Gratiot-Isabella Intermediate School District
Ingham County Intermediate School District
Kearsley
Lansing
Lenawee
Midland
Montcalm Intermediate School District
Monroe County Intermediate School District
Muskegon Intermediate School District
St. Clair Intermediate School District
Shiawasee Intermediate School District
Wayne-Westland Community Schools

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE OF EDUCATION INFORMATION

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE OF EDUCATION INFORMATION

The following people were sent the Higher Education Survey. Their responses were collected by a personal telephone interview.

Michigan State University	Henry Kennedy Past Assistant Dean College of Education
University of Michigan	Thomas Switzer Associate Dean College of Education
Wayne State University	Wendell Hough Associate Dean College of Education
Oakland University	Donald Miller Associate Dean College of Education
Eastern Michigan University	Scott Westerman, Dean College of Education
Western Michigan University	Thomas Ryan, Chairman Department of Education and Professional Development
Central Michigan University	Michael Wolfe, Chairman Department of Education
Northern Michigan University	Elmer Schact, Dean College of Education
Grand Valley State Colleges	Tyrus Wessell Department of Education
Saginaw Valley State College	Joseph Snider, Director Student Teaching and Certification
Ferris State College	Keith Bancroft Department of Education