COMPETENCIES REQUIRED OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF SCHOOL-BASED SPECIAL
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Melanie R. Yules

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Administration and Supervision of
Special Education

APPROVED:

P.R. Jones, Chairperson

J.A. McLaughlin   W.M. Worner

R.G. Salmon   J.A. Gallion

September, 1985

Blacksburg, Virginia

COMPETENCIES REQUIRED OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF SCHOOL-BASED SPECIAL

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Melanie R. Yules

Abstract

The infusion of special education students into general
education programs has added to the expanding role of the
high school principal. The purpose of this study was to
identify competencies needed by high school principals and
assistant principals to effectively develop, supervise,
monitor, and evaluate school-based special education
programs. Competency statements were generated from the
literature and validated by a panel of experts. The final
instrument containing thirty competency statements in eight
function areas was administered to Virginia high school
principals and assistant principals who were randomly
selected from the Virginia Educational Directory.
Respondents were asked to rate the individual competency
statement using a five point index of value scale and to
list the competency statements which should receive first,
second, and third priority.

Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics. The index
of value rating for the competency statements were
independent of the position of respondent. The selection of
first priority statement was dependent on the position of

the person generating the rating, while the second and third priority statements were independent of the person generating the rating. The findings of this study identified "rules for discipline", "select personnel", "implement due process", "enable improvement of instruction", and "implement programs according to regulations" as competency statements with the highest mean index of value. Principals identified the top priority statements as: "evaluation for referred students", "evaluate personnel", and "implement programs according to regulations". Assistant principals identified the top priority statements as "promote positive attitudes", "rules for discipline", and "implement programs according to regulations". Recommendations for further research included task analysis of competency statements to identify performance indicators that could be used in administrative training programs; cooperation between the local and state education agencies and universities in the provision of special education administration skills infused into general education administration pre- and in-service training programs; and the use of Public Law 94-142, Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B State flow through funds and Part D State personnel preparation funds as financial resources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated with love to my
grandmother,   By example she has shown me
the value of an education. It is through her gypsy heritage
that I have learned to accept the challenge, challenge the
accepted, and enjoy the adventure the challenge may bring.
Her support and encouragement has been unending.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

Educational Administration became a formal topic of
investigation in the 1940's. The first national
organization, The National Conference of Professors of
Educational Administration (NCPEA), was assembled to address
concerns in the areas of preparation programs at the
pre-service level, instructional technique improvements,
teaching methods, and the use of field experience. Although
the outcome of the National Conference did not have a great
impact on educational administration, it did provide impetus
for further studies. A dramatic change in the preparation of
school administrators occurred in the 1960's, an era of
national social and emotional unrest. The process of
training educational administrators took a turn from
concrete formal lectures and lectures in specific theory, to
the use of human relations laboratory exercises,
observation, and field experience (Wynn, 1972). This shift
to a "reality orientation" training of educational
administration included training techniques from other
fields of study such as business and management.

The model of field experience and the introduction of

1

competency-based programs were used as a bridge between theory and practice. Field experience took the form of visits, field studies, or internships. Many authors, including Greenfield (1968), felt the quality of these experiences should be the core of the preparatory program. Yet, despite the emphasis on field components, doctoral students in educational administration preparatory programs in the United States spent less than ten percent of their time in the field (Miklos, 1983).

Competency-based programs involve the identification of skills that contribute to effective performances as an administrator. Graff and Street (1956) defined educational administrative competencies as factors that can be shown to contribute to or be an integral part of effective administrative behavior. Once identified, these competencies are used in situations that contribute to the practice of these skills. Performance indicators provide criteria by which the competencies can be measured. This type of evaluation can be useful in the certification of potential educational administrators. Competency-based programs are one way of relating the preparatory program to preferred objectives in educational administration.

The area of competencies has been examined by many educators. Kirk (1957) identified four areas of competence for the educational administrator:

1. skill in supervision of elementary/secondary schools;

2. understand theory and practice of American education;

3. understand legal basis of school administration;

4. understand school finance and business management.

Studies on compentencies of educational administrators have examined the acquisition of competencies acquired during pre-service or through on-the-job training (Walters, 1979), the priority rating of competencies (McCleary, 1980), and the identification of competencies and performance indicators (Betz, 1977). Packages of in-service training such as Project R.O.M.E.(Results Oriented Management Evaluation), and Maxi II (Seal, 1977) have been developed to examine competencies in relation to curriculum and program development.

As society has changed, so too have the competencies of general education administrators. Current demands on the principal in areas of instructional leadership and

motivation have added responsibilities to their already
taxing work load.

A national study of high school principals investigated
the increase in complexity with regard to the expanding
activities required of the principal (Nickerson, 1980).
Nickerson specifically mentioned the complex activities of:
managing the school's internal operations; working with
teachers in curriculum development; and dealing with parents
and the community. In general, principals have less
autonomy, more paper work, and increased responsibility in
the team decision making process regarding handicapped or
special needs students.

One aspect of the extended role of the principal is the
provision of education to handicapped students. Beginning in
1958 with the passage of P.L. 85-926 the federal government
has provided funds for the education of handicapped
students. P.L. 85-926 provided funds for the training of
college instructors who would then instruct teachers of the
Mentally Retarded. P.L. 88-164, Mental Retardation
Facilities and Mentally Handicapped Construction Centers Act
(1963), amended P.L. 85-926 to include training in other
major handicapping areas. The Elementary and Secondary
Education Act, P.L. 89-10, (1965) provided broad-scale aid

to education. The primary focus of the Act was on
economically disadvantaged children, however, many programs
for handicapped children resulted from its passage. ESEA
provided the existing law which was amended by Education of
the Handicapped Act (1966), P.L. 89-750. Later, P.L. 93-380,
(1974) amended Part B of the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act by: increasing the state grant program;
enforcing submission of state education agency plans
designing projected activities; regulating the due process
procedures; and delineating the conditions of the least
restrictive environment. The more comprehensive revision of
ESEA, Part B, the Education for All Handicapped Children
Act, P.L. 94-142, (1975) included the previously established
provisions and expanded the age limitations from three
through eighteen to three through twenty-one; insured P.L.
94-142 as permanent legislation; and contained a funding
formula which provided federal flow-through funds for all
states and school districts which are in compliance with the
law. An additional component of the law which affects
provision of services to handicapped students guaranteed the
provision of a free appropriate public education that is
designed to meet the unique needs of handicapped children
(Jones, 1981).

The passage of these laws has affected the role of the educational administrator. The influx of handicapped students into the public school setting has necessitated the expansion of administrative competencies to include the administration of school-based special education programs (Hill, 1980).

Unfortunately, little has been written regarding the actual role of the principal in the process of educating handicapped students. Johnson and Gold (1980) attributed this paucity of information to: lack of experience in administering special education programs; principal's limited academic background in special education; and limited knowledge concerning needs of handicapped students due to the reliance upon specialists in the field. The authors indicated that the principal plays an important role in the integration of the handicapped student into the mainstream, but no recommendations were given for identifying actual needs or remediating the situation.

According to Drake and Miller (1982), competence in increased organizational demands from the parents and community have expanded the previously accepted traditional competencies of principals. Betz (1977) identified competencies required of elementary principals in the

administration of school-based special education programs in
Indiana. His study identified priority competencies through
the use of the McIntyre model (1974) of competencies and
performance indicators.

The literature generated from the area of special
education addresses the competencies of directors or
supervisors of special education, but rarely addresses the
competencies required of general education administrators.
Different perceptions of the principal's role in
administering programs for handicapped students may lead to
conflicting views on the responsibilities of school-based
administrators regarding special programs. The role of the
school-based principal varies greatly from the role of the
director of special education. Many global administrative
duties may be shared, but specific special education
responsibilities may not be perceived in the same manner.
Leitz and Towle (1978) conducted a study in Wisconsin in
which they analyzed job discriptions of 166 elementary
school principals. The authors looked at the role of the
elementary principal in special education programs. Using
The Special Education Administration Policies Manual (SEAP;
Torres, 1977), the authors contrasted the desired with
actual involvement levels of elementary school principals in

27 specific special education functions. Nine operational

and decision-making functions in which the principal should

have competencies in order to provide services necessary for

the education of handicapped students were identified by

elementary school principals and by directors of special

education (Leitz & Towle, 1978). The nine functions

included:

1. design special education programs and services;

2. evaluate special education programs,
   personnel, and referrals;

3. formulate long term policies and objectives;

4. recruit and select staff;

5. develop in-service training;

6. attend in-service training for professional
   development activities;

7. screen the administration and interpretation of
   psychological tests and write IEP's;

8. provide counseling services for students; and

9. participate in evaluation and placement committees.

In addition to operational and decision-making

functions, Leitz and Towle (1978), identified the perceived

primary responsibilities of building principals for the

development and implementation of services for the education

of handicapped students. The content of the educational functions delineated in their study provided areas under which corresponding competency statements were identified as necessary in the administration of special education programs at the building level.

Raske (1977) investigated functions performed by general education administrators and addressed issues concerning the kind of tasks performed and the time required to accomplish each task. He reported that general education administrators spent 14.6% of their time on special education tasks, while directors of special education spent 100% of their time accomplishing the same duties. Raske concluded that the type of duties performed in the administration of special education programs do not vary dramatically by administrative position, but only vary by the time allocated to the tasks.

Nevin (1977) examined the index of importance of competencies for the administration of special education programs. Public Law 94-142 was used as a guide to generate the 47 special education competency statements in 9 function areas that were used to formulate recommendations for the training of general education administrators in the area of special education administration. Nevin also investigated

specific demographic variables as predictors of
competencies. She found no relationship between the
predictor variables and the selection of competency
statements. Although Nevin's data were collected only in
Vermont (1976), and the generalizability to other samples is
somewhat limited, her results have been incorporated into an
interdisciplinary training model which is now being field
tested in Vermont.

Newman (1970) examined the functional tasks of special
education administrators using Urwick's POSDCORB analysis.
She investigated tasks actually performed, tasks which
ideally should be performed, and the ranking of those tasks.
Like Nevin, Newman investigated the use of demographic
variables in predicting competencies. Newman found a direct
relationship between the training in the area of exceptional
children and experience in teaching of special education
classes and the performance of administrative tasks. Few
differences were found between the tasks actually performed
and the tasks which should ideally be performed.

Statement of the Problem

Special education researchers have examined the
provision of educational services to handicapped children in

relation to competencies of state directors of special

education (Schipper, 1974, Waters, 1977); the role of the

elementary principal (Betz, 1977, Leitz and Towle, 1978,

Leitz, 1980); and the role of the director of special

education (Mazor, 1977, Newman, 1970). A few authors have

addressed competencies required of general educators in the

administration of general secondary programs (Drake and

Miller, 1982, LoPresti, 1980). Educational theories and

techniques, as well as the learning environment and needs of

general secondary students have been used as content areas

for competency statements. No reseacher has identified the

function areas or corresponding competencies required of

high school principals or assistant principals in the

administration of school-based special education programs.

This gap in the literature may be attributed to a void in

information concerning special education administration

competencies required of general education administrators or

to a lack of training in the specific requirements needed to

administer school-based special education programs. Unlike

elementary school settings where most classes are

self-contained, the high school settings are

departmentalized to allow for specialization and greater

flexibility in course content. Elementary and secondary

schools differ in size, priorities, and complexity of structural arrangements. In response to these characteristics, the secondary school principal must expand his administrative role to include adolescent development and student relations, student activities and governance, and power and authority (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1978). Therefore, the problem is to fill this void in secondary educational administration literature and contribute to this specific interest area of special education. This study will examine the perceptions of field incumbents on the function areas and corresponding competencies required for the administration of Virginia high school-based special education programs.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to identify competencies needed by secondary general education administrators to effectively develop, supervise, monitor, and evaluate school-based special education programs. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

1) draw together and synthesize the extant literature;

2) identify a list of potential competencies

required in the administration of school-

based special education programs;

3) prioritize competencies according to the

perceptions of field incumbents (high school

principals, assistant principals);

4) assess the index of value of competency

statements according to the perceptions of

field incumbents;

5) identify similarities and differences of perceived

competencies among the various

groups;

6) create a demographic profile of field

incumbents and determine their relation to

prioritized competency statements; and

7) make recommendations for content and processes

to be included in the training of educational

administrators.

Research Questions

The following questions served to guide the development

and implementation of this study:

1) According to the perceptions of field incumbents

(high school principals, assistant principals),

what competencies are needed to administer
secondary special education programs at the
school-based level as determined by the mean index
of value and priority ratings?

2) What is the index of value assigned to each
competency statement as perceived by the field
incumbents?

3) What priority rating index is assigned to each
competency statement as determined by the field
incumbents?

4) a) Is the index of value rating independent of the
position of field incumbents?

   b) Is the priority rating independent of the
position of the field incumbents?

5) Are there relationships between priority
rating index of competency statements and the
selected variables of:

   a) field position (principal, assistant
        principal);

   b) certification;

   c) academic background (level of training);

   d) clock hours of special education or related
        courses;

e) years of experience in current position;

f) school enrollment;

g) percent of high school students enrolled in
    special education programs.

Need for Study

The current literature on the role of the principal in
the administration and supervision of special education
programs is limited to studies of elementary education
administrators. There is a gap in the literature in the
practical prescriptive approach to the general education
administrator's competencies in the administration of
secondary special education programs. A review of the
literature, including Dissertation Abstracts International,
yielded few studies on the competencies of secondary
principals and the administration of special education
services at the building level. If principals are to
increase their effectiveness in the administration of
special education programs, initially, competencies which
are perceived to be important and performance deficits in
these competency areas should be identified.

The empirical value of this study was to determine the
priority competencies necessary in the administration of

special education programs as perceived by practicing high
school administrators. The similarity of the perceptions of
practicing high school administrators strongly suggest areas
of competence that administrators should possess. Previous
studies have found significant relationships between the
demographic variables of principal's education, experience,
or attitudes and the quality of the programs of handicapped
students (Leitz, 1980; Olsen, 1976; Schipper, 1977). Further
research was needed to determine the relationship between
the selection of priority competency statements concerning
the administration of special education programs and
selected demographic variables. Information concerning
priorities of competency statements and the principal's
proficiency of these competencies would contribute to the
growing body of knowledge in the provision of services to
handicapped students.

The results of this study should prove valuable to the
Department of Education and institutions of higher education
involved in the preparation of in-service training for
secondary school administrators. Results from this study may
prove valuable for those involved in the evaluation of
secondary school principals and their support personnel.
This study was endorsed by the Virginia Association of

Secondary School Principals, Dr. Randy Barrack, President.
(see Appendix A). The competency statements identified in
this study now may be addressed in the pre-service and
in-service training of general administrators. Moreover,
institutions offering courses toward the certification of
general education administrators will be able to examine the
current requirements as perceived by those in the field and,
according to need, establish a working relationship with
schools in the provision of information pertaining to the
administration of school-based special education programs.

Assumptions

This study was predicated on the following assumptions:

1) The role of secondary school principals across the
   sample is virtually the same. Virginia State
   Statutes and regulations designate requirements in
   the certification of Virginia educational
   administrators (Board of Education Commonwealth of
   Virginia, 1982).

2) Educational decisions made by principals are
   influenced by the tasks to be performed, the
   relationship the principal has with the students
   and personnel, and the attitudes the principal has

toward the provision of general education and
toward the education of the handicapped students
(Olsen, 1978).

3) The sample has varying degrees of knowledge about Public
Law 94-142, handicapping conditions, and
educational requirements that may be necessary in
the education of handicapped students.

4) The sample is representative of urban, suburban, and
rural high school principals and assistant
principals in Virginia.

Limitations of the Study

This study was designed to assess the perceived special
education competency requirements for high school
principals. Similarities and differences of the perceptions
of high school principals and assistant principals were
examined. The researcher did not attempt to scientifically
examine the cause and effects of the perceptions of the two
groups. Therefore, the background information, including the
review of literature, considered aspects of administration
that were considered germane to both general and special
education administration. Even though the sample included
administrators of grade levels 8-12, 9-12, 10-12, and 11-12,

no distinction was made to separate the four groupings for analysis of data and development of general findings. In addition, the sample was drawn only from Virginia. There were many factors influencing the selection of this sample. Although Public Law 94-142 is federally mandated, state statutes and regulations can augment the delivery of services. Certification for administrators vary from state to state with course requirements differing dependent upon location. Due to these limitations caution should be exercised in generalizing conclusions or implications to other states.

Definition of Terms

Building Principal. The chief administrator and
    instructional leader of a local school building.

Assistant Principal. The auxiliary administrator,
    second in the administrative chain within a local
    school building.

Director of Special Education. A central office
    administrator who is responsible for the
    administration of special education programs in
    the school division.

Competency. A hypothetical construct considered to be

an ability or fitness within a job incumbent which

enables the performance of a job task

(cf. Lilly, 1976).

Competency Statement. A statement which outlines the

responsibilities vested in principals so that

thet can effectively administer the educational

program in the building.

Organization of the Study

Subsequent chapters are organized in the following

manner. Chapter Two contains a review of the literature

including: the use of competency-based training, the

changing role of the principal; the assistant principal;

information on the training of general education

administrators and training of special education

administrators. Chapter Three contains the research design

and methodology which includes information on the sample,

instrument, data collection, and data analysis. The findings

of the study, including the results and analysis of the data

are given in Chapter Four, while Chapter Five includes the

findings, conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for

further research.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Competency-Based Instruction

Chapter II presents a review of current literature
pertinent to the competencies required for administrators of
school-based special education programs. Specific areas of
review include the various models used in the development of
competency-based instruction; the use of competency-based
training; the principal's role within the total educational
process; and the principal's responsibility in the education
of handicapped children. A section on training of both
general and special education administrators concludes the
review.

Competency-based instruction is characterized by a
criterion referenced approach resulting in emphasis placed
upon learners and their exit requirements. The precise
learning objectives are stated in behavioral and assessable
terms. The instruction is personalized, thus making the
learner accountable for meeting the criteria. The various
criterion levels assigned to the competency allow for a
variety of modes of instruction through which learning
activities may be directed toward the objective. The various
levels of criteria also allow for a means of assessment and

provide for alternate activities (Houston & Howsam, 1972).

Evaluation of competency-based instruction is centered on

the outcome or object, where as the evaluation of the

specific competency is usually based on the performance of

the function (procedure used), the impact of the situation

on the object desired, and the results of the procedure

(Wochner & Lynch, 1973).

Functions can be stated in broad general terms that

will subsume the more specific competencies and objectives.

In contrast, competencies can be delineators of the function

statements usually stated in higher order behavioral terms.

These behaviors are critical to successful performance.

Competency-based instruction can be used as a method

for organizing and delivering instruction which can be

adapted to most learning theories, teaching approaches, and

content materials. Although the form of competency

statements and level of generality can be dependent upon the

bias of the developer, competencies should lead to the

development of a manageable program (Blackhurst, (1977).

Blackhurst expressed a clear bias against educators who do

not capitalize on the works of others in the identification

of competencies, and those not using competency-based

instruction in their field of educational preparation

programs.

It is wise to adopt a model that can be
used to guide program development efforts.
In this way, developers can be on the same
wavelength with respect to the tasks that
need to be performed, the sequence of these,
and their interrelationships (p. 162-164).

Various techniques for the identification of
competencies have been used in competency-based research.
Competencies can be generated by task analysis; cluster
analysis; assessment of needs of students in a current
training program; analysis of needs of the school learner;
and employing empirical methodologies.

The use of competency-based instruction was introduced
into the field of educational administration in the 1950's
by Katz (1955). He defined competency as containing
technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills (Katz,
1955). Other professionals involved in the initial
development of the core of administrative behaviors were
Griffiths (1959) and Culbertson (1963). Griffiths believed
an administrator should possess competencies in monitoring
and decision making in order to perform at an optimum level.
Culbertson's core of behaviors included communication with
individuals and small groups; decision making; building and
maintaining morale; and initiating change.

Downey (1961) modified Katz's original definition when he addressed the competencies of an effective principal which included:

1) technical-managerial skills;

2) human-managerial skills;

3) technical-educational skills; and

4) speculative-creative skills.

These four classifications outlined the programmatic and humanistic skills required in the administration of educational programs.

Using Katz's classification as a base, McCleary (1973) expanded the elements of competency to include:

1) specification of the task or role;

2) indication of the knowledge, ability or other identifiable characteristics needed to perform the task or role.

At the Southern States Cooperative Programs in Education Administration Conference (1972), McCleary outlined a matrix upon which competency-based training was built. The three part definition provided by Katz acted as input on one axis (x) while McCleary's expanded definition provided input for the other axis (y). McCleary's expanded definition for competency-based training included:

1) precision in program specification;

2) individualization, non-time bound instructional
   approach;

3) new methodologies that provided alternative routes
   to competencies including formative rather than
   summative measures of competencies;

4) qualitative evaluation;

5) specific clear competencies for administration; and

6) improved linkage with the field.

This molar form has been used to identify competency
statements and generate performance indicators which best
represent the technical, conceptual, and human knowledge
skills needed to achieve competencies. Performance
indicators are expressed in language containing "needs to be
able to" or "will" which point to performance expectations.
In a study by McCleary (1972), the level of competency and
the generated performance indicators were assessed using the
criteria of familiarity, understanding, and application.
Familiarity indicates an awareness of the skills involved
but little or no capacity in carrying out that particular
skill. Understanding reflects a partial capability in that
specific skill area. The person may be expected to practice
the skill in the future, but at the present time has
knowledge in the area so he can supervise those who practice
the skill. Application is the level at which the

practitioner demonstrates the skill with a degree of
success. McCleary used the three criteria statements as an
evaluation to insure quality control of the competencies
pursued.

Studies which have used the McCleary model of
competency-based performance statements and performance
indicators include: Gale and McCleary's (1972) investigation
of competencies of secondary school principals where
competencies were generated from job analysis; Betz's (1977)
study of competencies of elementary school principals in the
administration of special education programs; Project SEST,
Special Education Supervisor Training, (1972); competencies
of graduate preparation for special education services
resulting in learning resource training materials; and
UCEA-Atlanta Project, (Culbertson, et al., 1974); and
Caldwell's study (1979), which identified performance
objectives and evaluation for school principals. Caldwell
used a modified version of the UCEA model to identify the
professional development needs of principals in the
Northwest Territories. Zechman (1977), replicated the
UCEA-Atlanta study using the established list of
competencies on a Pennsylvania population.

Project SEST, Special Education Supervisor Training
(1972), identified seven categories of competencies germane

to and required by all administrators. These "Critical
Competency Statements" include:

1) develop curriculum;

2) develop learning resources;

3) staffing instruction;

4) organizing for instruction;

5) utilizing support services;

6) provision of in-service training; and

7) relate to the public.

From 1972 through 1975, the University of Texas at
Austin was involved in the gathering of information for the
development of competencies for instructional leadership of
personnel in special education. By using the "Critical
Competency Statements" generated by Project SEST, the
educators involved in the programs were able to develop
competency guided programs for the preparation of
instructional supervisors in the area of special education
and generate a model for competency guided preparation of
educational leaders including principals and supervisors.

Using the same theory of competency-based instruction,
without the elements of the McCleary model, Walters (1979),
conducted a study using the ratings of principals on 35
literature generated competency statements. The principals
rated the competency statements on level of importance. In

addition, Walters investigated whether the competencies were acquired in pre-service training or on-the-job, and the percent to which the preparation programs helped with the acquisition of the identified competencies.

Another study which uses the competency-based instruction approach is Project RETOOL: Survival Strategy Training (1984). This project is being used in the training of leadership personnel in the collaborative consultant model of skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to communicate effectively among general education teachers, special education teachers, and administrators in the provision of services to mainstreamed handicapped children. Unfortunately, due to the newness of the training program, there are no conclusive data available on the effectiveness of this project.

The Principalship

Principals

The principal is instrumental in the school's organizational structure. The role of the principal can either enhance or hinder the organizational characteristics that make a school effective in serving its instructional function. For example, a principal who supports a positive school climate and provides strong instructional leadership

is more likely to enhance the effectiveness of the school. A study by Firestone and Herriott (1982) compared the characteristics of effective schools at different levels in the educational system. Results of the study showed some of the features which characterize effective schools at the elementary level are significantly less prevalent at the secondary level. Elementary schools show greater emphasis on basic instruction, with the elementary principal having more opportunity to be an instructional leader. On the other hand, secondary schools departmentalize which provides for more diversity in instructional techniques that are not necessarily influenced by the principal. Although basic skills are important, the departmentalization makes it difficult to create consensus on instructional goals. The principal should have skills which enable him to act in the capacity of an instructional leader when necessary. His qualifications should therefore be similar to those of a Master Teacher (Petrie & Burton, 1980). Unfortunately, few studies suggest behavioral objectives or competencies to meet these needs.

Although the qualification of principal as instructional leader is desirable, a study by Firestone & Herriott (1982) found the secondary school principal's influence on instruction can be limited due to the size of

the staff and the school's employment of specialists. The
structural looseness at the secondary level, accentuated by
departmentalization and increased size, can undermine
agreement on instructional goals and the block efforts of
secondary administrators on the influence of classroom
management.

Studies on Functions and Competencies of Principals

The school principalship has been studied by many
individuals and organizations. The following overview cites
historical and clinical research findings.

A (1982) study by Klopf, Scheldon, & Brennan
investigated functions and corresponding competencies of
elementary school principals. The taxonomy of
characteristics used as criteria specifically distinguishes
qualities, attributes, or features the principal has or
would need to develop. From these characteristics, Klopf et
al. established functions of the school principal and
competencies needed to achieve those functions. The
functions areas are learning environment, learning needs of
children, instructional program, staff development,
community resources, building management, and financial
management. Klopf cautions, however, that competencies may
vary within the settings.

An earlier study by Lipham and Hoeh, (1974), identified

five functions within the area of management of building staff which were considered to be prominent in the role of the principal. The five functions were: the identification of new staff (recruitment and selection), orientation of staff (to faculty, community, and students), assignment of staff, improvement of staff, and evaluation of staff.

Martin and Leitz (1980), used elementary school principals and directors of special education in their study of job descriptions for staff working in special education. Using the Special Education Administration Policy Manual (SEAP; CEC, 1977), Martin and Leitz looked at the involvement levels of elementary school principals in operational and decision making functions. The results of the study showed that special education directors did not view principals as having a major responsibility for any of the 27 functions listed in the SEAP Manual. However, the directors did say the principals had some responsibility for nine of the function areas. The principals surveyed did not concur with the directors' finding. The difference in perceptions of appropriate educational roles for the principal in regard to special education exemplifies the need for role clarification. Martin and Leitz agreed with Culbertson (1972), in his statement that "...many special education functions of principals had related counter parts

in regular education programs (p. 32)".

There have been recent empirical studies on the
functions and competencies of principals, each using a
different strategy for investigation or different samples to
generate functions and corresponding competency statements.
In 1972, McCleary and Gale investigated the competencies of
secondary school principals. The competency statements were
generated from job descriptions and an analysis of the
actual job. The intent of the study was to develop
procedures that would identify and validate competency
statements which could be used in satisfying the need for
data based planning of pre- and in-service educational
programs.

Betz (1977), examined the role of the elementary school
principal in regard to special education services at the
school building level. Using surveys which were sent to both
elementary principals and local directors of special
education, Betz addressed the topic of authority within the
role of the principal. Betz's findings showed the day to day
operations of special education within the school were part
of the principal's administrative role, while systemwide
special education matters were subsumed under the role of
director of special education. The most clearly defined
function of the principal vis-a-vis the administration of

special education programs was in relation to the
instructional staff. The most ambiguous or unclear role of
the principal occurred in the area of due process hearings.

From these findings, Betz concluded that if a
principals are to play a greater role in the administration
of special education programs at the building level, they
should have the appropriate special education training. This
training should include selection and evaluation of special
education staff; methods of observing special education
programs and the handicapped children being served; training
in skills to determine the quality of programs provided; and
training to determine if the least restrictive environment
is being provided.

The Secondary School Principal

Although the approaches used in educational
administration have general applicability to most
administrative positions in the educational system, the role
and responsibilities of secondary school principals are
different from other administrative positions. On a systemic
level, secondary school principals are confronted with the
dynamics of a formal organization, the behavior of
individuals and the forces exerted by informal groups (Lau
and Rudman, 1963). Operationally, secondary principals are
primarily involved in program development and instructional

leadership which is a reflection of the uniqueness of the secondary school among educational institutions. This uniqueness is manifested in three ways:

1) Task of Goal Definition.

The controversy over the purpose of secondary school education has implications for leadership in a secondary school. The secondary school principal should act as mediator in the conflicting proposals regarding the purpose of secondary education and hold a defensible point of view regarding the appropriateness of the purposes that guide the practices in his school. In order for a principal to achieve this comprehensive concept of secondary education, the training of the secondary school principal should include educational philosophy and value orientation.

2) Task of Process Coordination.

Secondary education incorporates strategies of inquiry in all basic disciplines. A crucial task of a secondary school administrator is the merging of many aspects of inquiry into a coordinated unit. The principal must be a generalist who appreciates all aspects of education. This does not imply that principals need to know more than their specialized staff, however, they should be aware of the staff's function and purpose.

3) Task of Selecting Procedures.

Secondary schools are constantly improving in the areas of curriculum, physical plant, technology, and in regard to the organization of staff. The principal must guide the evaluation and selection of educational procedures. The secondary principal must anticipate the consequences of change for all aspects of the educational process. All modifications within the educational system need to be tested and evaluated for selection and adoption in educational procedures (Downey, 1963).

Cook and Van Otten (1972) conducted a study of the prime competencies required to perform tasks of the secondary school principal. They looked at attitudes of secondary school principals, superintendents, and secondary teachers in Utah public schools. The sample was asked to respond to the importance of the competencies for secondary school principals: as the principal was presently functioning, and as the principal ought to be functioning. Cook and Van Otten found specific competencies required for the principal to successfully perform his administrative tasks vary according to the particular principalship. Their recommendation included the development of competency-based curriculum for secondary school principals. This curriculum could be used at pre- and in-service training.

Changing Role of the Principal

The National Association for Secondary School
Principals conducted extensive studies on the senior high
school principalship (NASSP, 1978). In 1977, NASSP, through
the use of surveys and structured interviews, ascertained
personal characteristics, professional qualities, and
competencies associated with exemplary senior high school
principals. Their sample group consisted of senior high
school principals from across the United States and their
corresponding significant others, i.e. parents; students;
teachers; and Central Office Personnel. The report describes
the principals as hardworking, concerned about students, and
involved in improving opportunities for learning,
specifically mentioning involvement in curriculum,
programming, and in-service training.

Nickerson, (1980), concurred with the NASSP report in
his observations of role of the principal, but added changes
that were occuring due to the increasing demands in content
and quantity of reports and paperwork. LoPresti (1982) cited
the increased complexity of the job as being a factor in the
changing role of the principal. The principal acts as the
link between the local school, the district, the region, and
the state. This expanded role includes manager,
instructional leader, and coordinator of people and

resources. Like Culbertson (1972), both Nickerson and LoPresti identified the need for additional training in communication skills, decision making procedures, and staff development (LoPresti, 1982; Nickerson, 1980).

The introduction of federally funded programs (ESEA,1965, Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975) has affected the role of education, specifically influencing the changing role of the principal. A 1980 report by the Rand Corporation for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed increased responsibility and therefore an increase in the amount of time the principals spent on paperwork. The report cited the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I which requires separate financial records and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) which requires an individualized educational program for every handicapped student. Also mentioned was the increase in the amount of time the principals spent with parent activist groups, and time spent in coordination of the work of specialist teachers provided by district or state funded programs. Two additional responsibilities were the principal's response to students' non-instructional needs and administering the school's collective bargaining agreements. Although the last two are not directly required by federal programs, the needs

which surface as a result of these areas are the same ones
that have stimulated the growth of federal education
programs.

Many of the changes in the principal's role have
resulted in a positive change in response to student and
community needs. However change is imposed by federal
programs, the change itself could adversely effect the
principal's role:

> ...by diverting the principal's energies to
> tasks that are not productive for either
> the objectives of the federal program or
> other goals of the school; and second, by
> piling more new tasks on to the principals
> until they cannot manage the workload
> (Hill, 1980, p. 14).

In summary, the Rand report stated that federal programs
have changed the principal's job by adding new requirements
for instructional mangement, public consultation, and
paperwork.

Hill (1980), one of the authors of the Rand report,
published his own article detailing the facts disclosed in
the Rand report. He concluded that the more severe the
student and community needs, the more aggregate the burden
of federal requirements. The difference in the expanding

role of the principal is proportional to the increase in federally funded programs in the school. In light of traditional recruitment practices which require only standard administrative courses, Hill recommends further study on existing resources for training principals. These suggestions included in-service training and varied graduate courses.

Competencies for Implementing Public Law 94-142

Haisley and Gilberts (1978) addressed individual competencies needed to implement P.L. 94-142. They cited the artificial gap between general and special educators that have developed over the years and have been reflected in placement practices. They proposed a checklist of competencies for teachers to assist educators in focusing on major areas of concern. The needs of the teacher should be addressed in pre- and in-service training centering on due process procedures, the individualized educational plan, and placement justifications. No mention was made of the role or the training of the principal in this process.

Johnson and Gold (1980) addressed the new responsibility of the building principal as a result of P.L. 94-142, and identified the major issues of the law as they relate to the principal as:

1) provide a free and appropriate public education;

2) identify, locate, and evaluate special

education students;

3) coordinate individualized educational plans (the

principal can help coordinate planning

sessions, and develop new channels of

communication);

4) implement due process;

5) allocate space for special services;

6) coordinate mainstreaming efforts (assure general

teachers of support services); and

7) facilitate teacher attitude change through

in-service training for staff, provided by the

principal.

Although the responsibilities of the principal have

increased, the knowledge base or expertise of the principal

has not developed in conjunction with the increased

responsibility (Cone & Hyatt, 1982; Meisgeier & Sloat,

1969).

Another viewpoint on educational administration

functions within the schools was expressed by Crossland et

al. (1982). Contrary to the beliefs of Haisley and Gilberts,

and Johnson and Gold, Crossland feels the introduction of

P.L. 94-142 has called for only minor alterations in

instructional functions. He feels the confusion that occured

after P.L. 94-142, was instigated by the teachers'
misperceptions about the principal's role and the
principal's unclear job functions. Crossland feels the
confusion could be eliminated by informing the teachers of
the administrative functions for which a principal is
responsible within general and special education.

The National Institute of Education (1983) sponsored an
exploratory study on the impact of federal laws and programs
on the principal. The responses from principals nationwide
included comments on the burden of "increased paperwork" and
reported perceptions on the fields of behavior, cognitions,
incentives, and the larger environment. Individual
principals and the school context they create strongly
influence how the laws and programs are interpreted and put
into practice (Mulhauser, 1983).

In addition to the research from the field of special
education programs, the changing role of general education
professionals has been a particular topic of research for
the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA).
As an organization, UCEA has sponsored consortiums on the
issues and concerns of general education professionals since
1972. A recent UCEA Collaboration Leadership Conference
(1979), focused on the interfacing of general and special
education. Sage (1979), reported on the role of the

principal as a catalyst in the delivery of services to handicapped students. Sage expressed concern because many principals have narrow views of need for services and/or types of in-service training necessary for the dissemination of information in the education of handicapped students. Sage stated that principals, through in-service training, could increase their knowledge in regard to handicapped students and subsequently have a greater chance of being in compliance with state and federal regulations.

In 1979, the Federal Division for Exceptional Children provided training for local directors and principals that was designed to meet the needs of school leaders who were responsible for providing educational programs for exceptional children. Funding for this training was provided by SAGE (Special and General Education), a special subgroup from UCEA. Unfortunately, there was little dissemination of information past the original training group.

Currently, principals recognized they need assistance in judging not only the provision of services to handicapped students, but the quality and quantity of education received by children in special education classes. Hilton et al. (1984), identified criteria by which self contained special education classrooms could be evaluated. Hilton acknowledged that the principals were rarely trained in these areas and

made recommendations for in-service training to increase the
supervisors' and administrators' knowledge in classroom
scheduling, small group instruction, integrated therapy(s),
functional curriculum, individual programs, data collection,
charting specific objectives, periodic reviews, least
restrictive environment, age appropriate curriculum and
materials, instruction (for students) outside class, and
family involvement.

The Role of the Principal

As early as 1960, educators were analyzing the role of
educational administrators and the types of training they
received in order to be effective in their position.
McIntyre (1960), believed no college or university
preparation program could adequately and completely educate
a prospective school administrator. McIntyre supported on-
the-job training and believed training should be adapted to
the individual trainee within the school situation. At that
time, he perceived the role of the principal to include
instructional programming, coordination of activities of
agencies in the community, management duties, supervision,
selection of teachers, staff development, and community
involvement.

Twenty-eight years later, the NASSP study of senior
high school principals identified a majority of the same

components when researching the effective principal

(Hill, 1978). In addition, Hill included program evaluation,

in-service training, and time management in the role of the

principal. The NASSP study supported McIntyre in the

adaption of the training program and included an internship,

as an important component of pre-service preparation.

The American Association of School Administrators

(AASA) published the Guidelines for the Preparation of

School Administrators to assist in the training of

educational administrators. Like Culbertson (1972), the

Guidelines recommended training which included a blend of

management functions, i.e. collaboration, human relations,

participative management; in addition to functions

indigenous to schools, like staff development, instructional

management, curriculum, school community relations, and

legal concepts. LoPresti (1982), expanded this concept into

an integrated system of preparation for school

administrators at the university where theory would be

taught and in the field where practical field experience

could be assessed. LoPresti recommended competency-based

entry into the administrative system with a re-evaluation

every three years. These competencies established by the

state education agency would serve as criteria. Full

credentials in educational administration would be awarded

only at the end of the third year evaluation.

The Role of the Assistant Principal

The role of the assistant principal has emerged from the traditional operations or maintenance director to an administrative position with supervisory responsibilities (Burgess, 1976). The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), stipulated that their supervisory duties include discipline, curriculum, and external relations. Long (1957) reported the duties of the secondary school assistant principal as one who: acts as principal in abstentia; listens to teachers' complaints; handles discipline; school control (schedules); and mechanical procedures for operating the school. The actual activities performed by the secondary school principal, however, depend largely on the organization of the school and the assistant principal's relationship to the principal.

The change in the traditional role of the high school assistant principal was addressed at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association in Pennsylvania (1978). The assistant principal was perceived as having decision making authority invested by the school board. Their responsibilities may include accounting (attendance); curriculum; scheduling; school control (discipline); public

relations (meeting with parents); and improved instruction (visiting with new and problem teachers) (Brottman, 1981).

A study by Burgess (1976) attributed the perception of the assistant principals' changing in role in the educational system to their views of the position as a stepping stone and not a career choice. Childress (1973) also saw the assistant principal's perception as an important issue. Childress recommended specific job preparation for the role of assistant principal. He felt the state should consider specific certification requirements for assistant principals, including appropriate course work and internship or a period of apprenticeship. By studying a specific area of expertise, this specialized knowledge could increase the assistant principal's usefulness, responsibilities, and authority. Childress also felt it would add to the clarification of the role of the assistant principal.

> It is suggested that the overburdened principal
> be allowed to cope with extant problems while
> the assistant principal is given the legal
> responsibility to administer the new functions
> (Childress 1973; p.9).

The perceptions of the role of secondary school assistant principals were examined by questionnaire and

follow-up interviews (Black, 1980). Six areas containing a

total of thirty-four duties were generated from the

literature. Perceptions were reported according to the

assistant principal's degree of involvement. The author

attributed discrepancies in the perceptions to the varying

amount of time the assistant principals alloted to the

duties listed on the survey. Those tasks receiving low

degree of involvement scores were duties completed only

after their assigned duties were accomplished. Black also

attributed the discrepancies to the variety of duties

assigned by administrators. This research lead to the

development of a position guide in an attempt to clarify the

role of the secondary school principal. Black recommended a

school district policy that delineates the functions of the

secondary school assistant principal, including high

priority duties and tasks which are designed to meet unique

local needs.

Kriekard and Norton (1980) used the competency approach

to define the position of assistant principal. Competencies

were generated from the NASSP publications and then

validated by a jury consisting of professors of educational

administration, superintendents, principals, assistant

principals, and teachers. The six task areas identified

were: a) school management, b) staff personnel, c) community

relations, d) student activities, e) curriculum and
instruction, and f) pupil personnel. The final list of
competencies for assistant principals had implications for
administrative training programs.

Training

The literature refers to competency-based programs and
the development of competencies in conjunction with training
programs. Although competency-based programs make up part of
the professional preparation of educational administrators,
these programs are only a small part of the emerging field
of educational administration preparation. The following
section will present an overview of the trends in
educational administration preparation, with specific
attention given toward the change in programs and the
subsequent development of educational administration
training models.

The first national body to address the preparation
programs in educational administration was the National
Conference of Professors of Educational Administration,
(NCPEA, 1940). This organization dedicated its work toward
the improvement of instructional techniques by utilizing a
wide variety of teaching methods, specifically, field
experience. The NCPEA also made special efforts to
incorporate humanities courses into the training programs of

educational administrators. Content in humanities included philosophy, ethics, values, and religion. While the NCPEA proposals were well founded, the emphasis on this type of preparation program has been limited.

After World War II, the Cooperative Programs in Educational Administration (CPEA, 1950) was established with funds from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. This group was concerned with the study and improvement of school administration with little attention given to the method of instruction. Their efforts were directed toward the development of substance or content of the educational administration preparation programs. The CPEA is given credit for the establishment of the University Council for Educational Administration, UCEA (1955).

The majority of the progress in the field of educational administration preparation programs occured from 1960 through the 1980's. The trend of "training in common" became popular during the 1960's. Training in common is defined as bringing together prospective administrators or researchers from two or more institutional areas for some form of common learning experience during at least part of their training program. In theory, training in common can increase communication, allow for better perspective of values and biases, and, due to the identification of

similarities between programs, reduce the magnitude of
differences between administrations (Miklos, 1972). The
training in common programs in business, government, and
education focused on conceptual not technical content.

> ...In terms of preparatory programs this
> means that a large block of content and
> experience should be designed to change
> behaviors of potential administrators so
> that they will decide more wisely,
> communicate more effectively, cope with
> change more constructively, and handle
> morale problems more skillfully. This
> block of content and experience would be
> applicable to preparatory programs for
> all types of administrators (Culbertson
> 1963; page 37).

Training programs of the 1960's included the use of the
social sciences. The literature reflects the different views
toward social science input. Goldhammer (1967) viewed the
social science content as discipline-based, theory-based,
problem-based, and career-based. Miklos' historical research
stated the social sciences were used in preparatory programs
to broaden perspectives, strengthen theory, and increase
research in the field of study (Miklos, 1982). This increase

in research and development and the number of dissemination

agencies is due, in part, to the increase in legislation and

federal resources. The outcome of the federal influence was

the establishment of a national network of ten research and

development centers, and eleven educational laboratories

(Owens & Steinhoff, 1976).

Culbertson (1963) was involved in the UCEA studies on

common and specialized content in the preparation of

administrators. He viewed the dimension of administration in

three parts; process, purpose, and technologies. The process

dimension included decision making, communication, morale

building, and coping with change. These social science

content areas offered a "real world" approach to

administration (Culbertson, 1963). The purpose dimension

stems from the humanities content area and included moral

dilemmas or values which confront administrators. Culbertson

viewed this dimension as what "should be", as opposed to the

process dimension of "what is". Culbertson felt the first

two content areas would help administrators adapt

organizational purposes to a society whose needs are

changing. The final dimension, technologies, included the

technical aspects of administration such as finance and

curriculum. Culbertson (1963) added that:

    Scientific and value content should

compliment one another. Preparatory

programs must provide practicing and

potential administrators with opportunities

to grasp these two kinds of content and

to see their interrelationships. Such

opportunities should contribute to the

rigor, the utility, and the quality of

preparatory programs (page 47).

Culbertson's work on training in common lead him to

develop a fractional division of the types of courses which

he felt should be offered in educational administration

training programs. Approximately two-thirds of the training

program should be in common for all school leaders i.e.,

superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals.

Of these two-thirds, one-third should consist of a common

two year preparatory program consisting of coursework in

decision making, communication, dynamics of change, and

staff morale. Another third should be designed to develop

competency in purpose setting, policy making, philosophical

concepts, economical trends, political trends, and social

trends (special populations). The final third should afford

the student the opportunity to specialize depending on the

type of position to which the student aspires. For example,

in the content area of finance, the technical skills of a

superintendent would relate to business finance. The same

content area, finance, would pertain to school finance for

> to grasp these two kinds of content and
>
> to see their interrelationships. Such
>
> opportunities should contribute to the
>
> rigor, the utility, and the quality of
>
> preparatory programs (page 47).

Culbertson's work on training in common lead him to
develop a fractional division of the types of courses which
he felt should be offered in educational administration
training programs. Approximately two-thirds of the training
program should be in common for all school leaders i.e.,
superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals.
Of these two-thirds, one-third should consist of a common
two year preparatory program consisting of coursework in
decision making, communication, dynamics of change, and
staff morale. Another third should be designed to develop
competency in purpose setting, policy making, philosophical
concepts, economical trends, political trends, and social
trends (special populations). The final third should afford
the student the opportunity to specialize depending on the
type of position to which the student aspires. For example,
in the content area of finance, the technical skills of a
superintendent would relate to business finance. The same

content area, finance, would pertain to school finance for

someone studying to be a principal. Culbertson was

futuristic in his opinions on preparation programs. He

believed preparation should include content that enabled the

learner to continually update the meaning of "equality in

learning opportunities" and "excellence in education".

A UCEA publication by Miller (1964) addressed the

common background of training which should be

available to all leadership personnel. The background

included:

1) a sense of educational purpose and program;

    the structure and controls of education and

    of society; and

2) an understanding of leadership and social process

    that goes beyond the common core of learning

    (page 6).

Miller supported the provision of areas of specialization

which coincide with functional or service areas, rather than

specialization which is tailored to fit existing positions.

Areas of specialized training should be defined to match the

varying interests and competencies of a range of prospective

administrators.

Not all educators are in agreement with the model of

training in common. Millett (1962), for example, believes

the administrative process is not the same for all fields
due to differences in the institutional environment. Millett
supports the model that states the administrative process
should reflect the differences. In 1972, the National
Association of State Directors of Special Education
(NASDSE), reported the same belief, i.e., that the tasks of
an educational administrator are unique to the position.

The content of the training programs, as well as the
varied methods of delivery of training programs changed
during the 1970's. Alternate strategies to improve the
perceived problem between theory and practice were employed
in training programs in addition to traditional lectures.
Alternatives included the improvement of instructional
methods and materials which resulted in an increasing
emphasis on simulation. Training programs in educational
administration progressed through the use of "in-basket"
items, laboratory training, and role playing, to the case
study method. The progression from conventional toward
reality-oriented alternatives was, in part, influenced by
other fields of study, specifically, the studies conducted
at the Harvard School of Business (Wynn, 1972).

Although already present in some educational
administration preparatory programs, field experience became
more significant in the training of administrators. Field

experiences enabled the potential administrator to specialize through field visits, informal attachment to a specific organization, and through an internship. The final alternative to the traditional lectures was the focusing of preparation programs on identified specific skills that contribute to effective performance as an administrator, and in turn, help design a set of experiences that will contribute to proficiency in those skills (Miklos, 1983). Since the late 1960's, the preparation of administrators has been stated in specific, more operational terms. Preparation programs have included administrator competencies, performance criteria, and behavioral objectives (UCEA, 1973). In a report on educational administration preparation programs in the 1970's, Lipham (1983) stated that about one-third of the preparatory programs in the United States were orienting some aspect of their program to the development of competencies.

Both professors working at institutions of higher education and individuals in the field of education have developed competency-based training programs for educational administration. Project R.O.M.E. (Results Oriented Management in Education, 1974) was developed in Georgia. It identified competency statements based on a review of literature, objective-based workshops with principals, and

from on the job observations of principals. From this review, eighty competency statements were identified.

The UCEA - Atlanta Project (Culbertson et al., 1974) used a panel of prominent educators to identify and validate thirty-two competency statements in eight operational areas. The project dealt with role, pre- and in-service training, performance objectives, and evaluations for school principals.

Other competency-based programs in specific educational administration areas have been developed for the training of special education administrators. The S.E.S.T. Project (Special Education Supervisor Training, 1972) was established to design, develop, and test competency-based programs of graduate preparation of special education supervisors. The identification of 24 critical competencies resulted in many pre- and in-service learning resources and assessment materials.

The S.E.N.A.P. Model (Special Education Needs Assessment Priorities) (Gable et al., 1981) was based on the work of Kaufman (1972) and Hoepfner, Bradley, and Doherty, (1973). The model was designed in four stages:

1) Identify competencies through a review of the
   literature and a panel of experts;

2) Determine discrepancies between competencies the

administrator presently possesses and competencies the administrator desires to possess using a five point scale. These ratings are then compared with the ratings of the expert panel members on desired competencies;

3) Set training priorities based on discrepancy data from stage II; and

4) Allocate resources through state and local educational agencies and the universities collaborating in joint funding and program planning for the training of special education administrators.

The interest in preparation of educational administrators was shared by the professionals attending the National Consortium of Universities Preparing Administrators of Special Education (1969). This consortium met to address the topic of common and specialized learning competencies for the specialized population of special education administrators. The milestones of the conference as reported by Meisgeier and Sloat (1969), addressed the need for concrete steps toward recognizing handicapped students as part of the responsibilities of the total educational system and the need for better training programs at the university level for special education administrators. The consortium

concluded there were common components performed in all
administrative capacities in education. Further
specialization should occur in graduate level training
programs for administrative positions in special education.
It was the opinion of the conference participants that
general education school administrators have neither the
personal experience with the handicapped, nor the academic
contact with these areas. The final recommendation was for
collaborative efforts between university professors and UCEA
to inject special education into general education
administration program activities.

In 1970, UCEA approved a proposal to be the
administrative agent for the General-Special Education
Administration Consortium (GSEAC). The mission of GSEAC was
to advance innovative preparatory programs for general and
special education administration, and through
inter-institutional approaches, promote the integration of
the two fields (UCEA, 1972). Investigation by the consortium
disclosed that the preparatory programs for special
education administrators were too isolated from general
education training programs. In response to this identified
need, GSEAC delineated four goals and corresponding specific
activities to achieve their aim. These goals are:

1) to improve communications and cooperation for those

involved in the preparation of general education

administration, special education administration,

and other special education preparation programs.

To achieve this goal, institutions should broaden the

base of preparation programs for both general and

special education administrators;

To promote greater integration between administration

preparation programs; and

To increase the awareness of special education on the

part of those in general education administration.

2) to improve communication and cooperation both

regionally and nationally among faculty and

student personnel involved in the preparation of

general and special education administrators.

To achieve this goal, institutions will need to combine

and coordinate resources of different universities in

upgrading selected components of preparation programs.

3) to improve the continuing education of professors of

special and general education administration.

To achieve this goal, institutions will need to provide

short-term opportunities and longer-term post doctoral

research and development opportunities for professors.

4) to evaluate on a continuous and systematic basis,

the degree to which the prototype model is meeting

its objectives.

To achieve this goal, educators need to note the changes in objectives and functions which can be demonstrated as resulting from the work of the prototype model (Yates, 1976).

Vance (1973) reported an increase in the integration of general and special education administration preparatory programs. Vance's conclusions are based on an investigation of USOE-BEH training grants to universities providing educational administration preparation programs. The programs investigated by Vance varied in population and research practices. After looking at the qualifications and preparation of teachers of exceptional children (Mackie & Engle, 1955); functions of special education directors (Howe, 1960); functions and corresponding skills of special education administrators (Sage, 1968; Newman, 1970); a normative study of administrative positions in special education (Kohl & Marro, 1971); and GSEAC proposals (UCEA, 1972), Vance concluded that special education administration is too isolated from general education administration both as practiced in the schools and as taught in the universities. Although the two fields of administration are not totally similiar, the requirements unique to special education administration are, for the most part, included in

a few specific content competencies.

In response to the exploration of common and specialized training, the Council for Exceptional Children, (CEC), as part of a project on professional guidelines, conducted a Delphi Study to survey information on the preparation of special education personnel (CEC, 1974). The results of the study were included in the 1975 revision of the original 1966 CEC Guidelines for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children. The guideline statements do not address either the general education component of personnel preparation for the field of special education, or the personnel's general orientation to professional education. Instead, emphasis is given to the specialized preparation that is needed in addition to a strong general education background, as well as attention given to professional preparation as it might be common for general educators. The guidelines are oriented to process as opposed to content area. Specifically, guidelines 2.1.2 and 2.1.4. address this concept of preparation.

> Preparation centers in special education
> should participate in the education of
> other educators, such as regular teachers,
> pupil personnel workers, and general
> school administrators, to develop

> effective joint responses to the needs
>
> of exceptional persons (2.1.2; CEC, 1975; p.16).

> Preparation programs should reflect and
>
> promote the kind of interprofessional
>
> cooperation that should occur in school
>
> programs (2.1.4; CEC, 1975; p.18).

The CEC Delegate Assembly in Los Angeles, California

approved the revised guidelines on April 24, 1975.

The status of general education programs in relation to

special education programs in the 1960's were summarized in

a UCEA document by Farquhar (1969). The investigation

identified two major problems. First, professionals in the

field of educational administration preparation found

special education administration too isolated from general

education administration. Educators in special education

show a tendency to deal with problems by themselves rather

than as part of a larger system. In addition, professors of

special education administration often lack experience in

and contact with educational administration. It was also

noted that professors within the field of educational

administration usually lack the experiential contact or

interest necessary to generate study of special education.

The second issue identified was that preparation

programs in special education administration lack a

sufficiently clear sense of common objectives. Farquhar's

investigation showed the program area of special education

administration to have limited resources, contain objectives

which cover a broad expanse of loosely defined purposes, and

show a resistance to program standarization and uniformity.

If general aims could be recognized, individual institutions

could systematically diversify and specialize in means to

achieve these goals.

As a result of this investigation, Yates (1976)

identified the need:

> to provide general administration
>
> preparation programs, input of both
>
> content and process designed to bring
>
> into perspective the role of general
>
> administrator in programming for
>
> exceptional children,...to provide
>
> inservice training programs for
>
> professors of both short-term and longer
>
> post-doctoral types, ...to determine
>
> the array of specific competencies which
>
> are basic to the performance of a variety
>
> of special education administration roles
>
> (page 27-29).

An article by Jones and Wilkerson (1975) confirmed the need for cross categorization in course work required of administrators in special education programs. Jones and Wilkerson made a strong case for the sharing of expertise between the departments of general and special education administration. The article's review of literature cited authors who believed in this thesis but found preparatory programs limited to special education centered course work which often did not include a sequence of courses in general education administration. In the article, Jones and Wilkerson explained the preparatory programs for administrators of special education at Indiana University. The comprehensive courses and course related practica in a variety of settings enable graduate students to meet licensing requirements for general education administration positions. The reverse was also true in that the students enrolled in the program of general education administration participated in courses in special education administration. Jones and Wilkerson attribute the two-way interaction to the program's location within the Department of General Education Administration and to the supportive faculty.

UCEA also sponsored a three year project entitled Special and General Education, SAGE (UCEA, 1979). The focus of the SAGE project centered on in-service training for

administrators and other personnel involved in the implementation of Public Law 94-142 (EHA, 1975). The in-service was desiged to enhance integration of personnel and help them coordinate their efforts. The training involved the integration of general and special education administrators, as well as school psychologists, teachers, counselors, and parents.

The Collaboration Leadership Conference held by UCEA-SAGE (1979) addressed several important issues concerning the integration of special and general education. In his report on administrative training, Baars cited the need for a collaborative effort between the school and the community to implement P.L. 94-142 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973).

During the UCEA Collaboration Leadership Conference, Baars (1979) addressed the training of general education administrators. Baars stated that all school administrators would profit from some level of awareness regarding the issues of providing specialized services. The existing leadership training programs have been characterized by a distinction between the course of studies undertaken by special education administrators as opposed to general education administrators.

While the identity of general

> administration students has been clear,
> they had no association with special
> education curricula . . . the identity
> of the special education administration
> students has been much more ambiguous
> (Baars, 1979, p.335).

Baars suggested training programs provide a continuum of curriculum emphasis between general and special education. It would then be possible for general education administration students to secure courses which included exposure to either side of the general-special education dichotomy. In addition to competencies usually required of administrators, Baars saw the need for skills in mediation, conflict resolution, consultation, and procuring available resources.

During the Collaboration Leadership Conference, Sage (1979) presented results from his survey on special and general administration training programs. Sage's findings reflected a modest amount of infusion of special education administration students partaking in general education administration training programs to acquire conceptual resources from general education. Sage suggested future demands on general education administration will require the adminstrator to gain competencies normally associated with

specialist roles. General education training programs should
be designed to prepare school principals, central office
personnel, supervisors and district superintendents in
special education competencies. Sage felt all school
administrators would profit from some level of awareness
regarding the issues of providing services of a specialized
nature.

> An administrative training program which
> would better fulfill such a need must be
> structured so as to likewise provide a
> continuum of curricular emphasis between
> general and special education. That is,
> it ought to be possible for a student of
> educational administration to secure a
> program of preparation which included a
> little or a lot of exposure to either
> side of the regular-special dichotomy
> (Sage, 1972, p. 335).

Summary

The literature on competency-based instruction presents
a rationale for the use of performance exit criteria in
training programs. Strong recommendations from Culbertson
suggest using the works of others in the development of

competency-based systems of instruction. This
competency-based model has been successful in the fields of
business, management, and education.

In addition to the competency-based model of
instruction, the research strongly suggests the use of
training in common for educational administrators. Jones and
Wilkerson (1975), Sage (1979), and Vance (1973) support the
integration of general and special education preparatory
programs.

Chapter Three

Research Design and Methodology

Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions
of high school principals and assistant principals in order
to identify the competencies needed by secondary general
education personnel in the administration of school-based
special education programs. In essence, the researcher
a) generated a list of competencies needed by secondary
school administrators in the administration of school-based
special education programs; b) surveyed field incumbents to
identify the index of value for these competency statements;
and c) identified the first, second, and third priority
ratings for the competency statements.

The Instrument

A review of current literature failed to identify an
instrument designed specifically to assess the competencies
of secondary school personnel in the administration of
school-based special education programs. The literature
addressed competencies required by elementary school
principals (Betz, 1977); state directors of special
education (Schipper, 1974); and competencies of local

directors of special education (Leitz, 1980). Nevin (1977)
designed an instrument to assess the competencies of school
administrators including superintendents, assistant
superintendents, principals and directors of special
education. Waters (1974) investigated the perceptions of
special education doctoral students in addition to the
perceptions of employing officials regarding competencies
required to administer special education programs, while
White (1969) investigated similiar competencies required of
central office administrators. These studies all explored
competencies required either before or shortly after the
passage of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All
Handicapped Children Act (1975). In addition to the added
regulations of Public Law 98-199 (1983), Supreme Court cases
such as Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley
(1982) and Tatro v. Texas (1984) have expanded the role of
personnel involved in the administration of school-based
special education programs. No one survey has addressed the
specific functions or competencies related to the
administration of secondary school-based special education
programs. The instrument used in this study reflects the
functions and competencies identified in previous studies
and findings from the current literature pertinent to this
investigation.

A list of functions areas and corresponding
competencies identified in the Betz, Leitz, Nevin, White,
and Waters dissertations and a study by the National
Association of State Special Education Directors was
included in a competency matrix. (the Competency Matrix can
be found in Appendix B). Statements that were cited by
three or more authors were included in the initial
instrument. The instrument also included competency
statements generated from the literature which addressed due
process, funding, interpersonal skills in relation to team
functioning, and discipline. Disciplinary procedures
required for special education versus the procedures
required for general education students were compared by
Purcell in a 1983 study. Findings from her research
pertinent to this topic were included in the form of
competency statements. Baker (1985) addressed similar issues
for discipline and student control in his research on the
problem of student discipline. Klopf, project director of
the Center for Leadership Development at the Bank Street
College of Education, investigated the characteristics and
competencies needed by all principals in schools serving
special education students. Competencies were listed in
seven function areas and were stated in terms of knowledge,
values, and attitudes. These characteristics and

competencies were acquired by surveying representatives of
thirteen school districts in inner-city New York and the
surrounding boroughs. Findings from Klopf's review were
incorporated into the generated list of competencies.
Competency statements which were felt to be redundant, or
not specific in content or phraseology were not included in
the instrument. The initial instrument was then submitted to
an expert panel for review.

The Panel

The following persons were included on the expert
panel:

James Galloway, Executive Director of the National
Association of State Directors of Special Education,
(NASDSE) has conducted training sessions on the preparation
of Special Education Administrators and was also a
participant in the 1972 Consortium on General and Special
Education Administration.

Ann Nevin, a professor at the University of Vermont
and consultant to Project RETOOL, a post-doctoral leadership
training model on collaborative consultation is the author
of one of the surveys referenced in this study.

Monte Betz, General Director of Exceptional Student
Programs, Hillsborough County Public Schools, Tampa, Florida

is one of the authors whose research on competencies was instrumental to this study.

Tom Dye, a Principal at Council High School, Council, Virginia, and Carrol Clonneger, a Principal at Henrico High School, Richmond, Virginia were asked to serve as members of the panel. The role of the panel members was to provide feedback on the content, clarity, and applicability of the thirty competency statements.

The panel was mailed a packet of information containing: a copy of the cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and the purpose of the expert panel; a copy of the initial instrument; and a return stamped envelope. All the panel members were asked to evaluate the instrument for face validity, readability, accuracy, utility. In addition, the panel members were requested to provide general comments that could be helpful in the final draft of the instrument. (A copy of the cover letter and instrument can be found in Appendixes C and D.)

Of the five selected expert panel members, four responded to the request for input. One principal did not respond. Instead, comments obtained in an interview with Dr. James Gallion were used as input to the instrument. Dr. Gallion is a practicing principal at Northside High School, Roanoke, Virginia, and a member of this dissertation

committee.

The expert panel felt the competency statements were comprehensive, well stated, and allowed respondents to make value ratings on each competency statement. The suggestions from the panel of experts were reviewed for inclusion into the instrument. The panel's suggestions were added to the existing statements listed on the competency matrix. The identification of a competency statement by three or more sources was used to generate the initial list of competencies. These same criteria were applied to the revised competency matrix which included input from the panel of experts. None of the suggestions from individual panel members appeared on the initial competency matrix, nor were the same suggestions identified by other panel members. It is assumed that contextual suggestions reflected the personal bias of the individual panel member. This input was considered valuable, but did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the instrument. Therefore, the revisions to the instrument were grammatical and not substantive.

Specific suggestions on areas in administration included competency statements which reflected:

1) initiating building support teams;

2) promoting harmony between the special and general
education programs within the building

(addressed in competency statements 9 and 11)

3) knowledge concerning special education

administration;

4) knowledge of policy development

(addressed in competency statement 12).

One panel member felt in addition to the requested demographic variable of the number of clock hours of special education instruction, overall competency in arranging for effective education for students with special education needs should be examined. The competency should be rated on a scale of 1-9; one representing not at all competent, and 9 representing highly competent.

A more general comment reflected one panel member's perception on who performs the competency. This member felt many of the tasks associated with the competency statements would be delegated to the assistant principal, supervisor of special education, or central office personnel. Although the task might be performed by other personnel, the panel member felt the respondents' ratings on the index of value would reflect the extent to which the task was delegated.

The Final Instrument

The final instrument included three components. A cover letter introducing the study was jointly written by Dr.

Philip R. Jones, Coordinator of the Special Education

Administration and Supervision Program at Virginia

Polytechnic Institute and State University and the

researcher. The letter explained the purpose and intent of

the study, and insured confidentiality (a copy of the letter

is set forth in Appendix E).

The second component consisted of thirty competency

statements which addressed the competencies required of

secondary school personnel in the administration of school-

based special education programs. Respondents were asked to

rate the competencies according to the statement's index of

value, and its' priority. The instructions for the rating of

competencies appeared on the first page of the instrument.

Respondents were asked to rate the competency statements on

a Leikert scale of one to five which reflected their

perception of the index of value. The following scale was

used:

1) UNNECESSARY   not needed in the normal conduct of

                     your administrative duties.

2) LIMITED VALUE   a knowledge of the basic nature of the

                     content is necessary, but knowledge to

                     demonstrate the skill is not needed.

3) VALUABLE   beneficial in the conduct of your

                     administrative duties, but a person

could function without it.

4) HIGHLY VALUABLE   a person in the role of principal would
be impaired in the conduct of duties if
the competency was absent.

5) ESSENTIAL   it is impossible to perform the central
functions of the job if you do not have
this competency.

Respondents were asked to check the appropriate column
on the instrument to indicate their rating for the thirty
competency statements. Respondents were then asked to list
the corresponding number of the three competency statements
they felt should receive the highest priority (priority
rating index). The numbers reflected the first, second, and
third priority competency statements.

The last component consisted of demographic variables
used in the analysis of relationships between the variables
and the respondent's priority ratings. The demographic
variables included:

    1) field incumbent (high school principal, assistant
       principal);

    2) certification;

    3) academic background (level of training);

    4) years experience in current position;

    5) number of clock hours in special education

instruction;

6) school enrollment; and

7) percent of school population enrolled in special education programs.

The Pilot Study

A pilot study of the instrument was conducted to establish the reliability of the instrument. Reliability in this context refers to stability, dependability, and predictability. The instrument was administered to twelve students enrolled at Virginia Tech in a class on Administration of Special Programs: Special Education. The pilot group was told the instrument was being used in a dissertation study on competencies needed by secondary personnel in the administration of school-based special education programs. The instrument was administered twice to the pilot group within a two week interval. The test, re-test use of the instrument allowed for a Pearson R correlational analysis of responses.

The reliability coefficients of the instrument items ranged from a low of -.31 to a high of .90. Four competency statements' coefficients approached zero, no relationship, with coefficients of .03 (statement 29); .05 (statement 4); -.08 (statement 24); and .09 (statement 26). Although the

range of coefficients varied, the concentration of
reliability coefficients were in the .30 to .60 range. The
Pearson R correlation indicated that the responses from the
subjects were somewhat stable over time. According to
Helmstadter (1964), the median value for reported
reliabilities for this type of instrument should be .69. The
low reliability coefficients could be attributed to
increased knowledge as a result of the materials presented
in the Special Programs course, a change in attitude as a
result of a professionally related experience, or the pilot
subjects not responding to the survey in a serious manner.
Items with low reliability coefficients were reexamined for
clarity and content. These items were included in the
instrument based upon the importance of the competency
statement as cited in the literature. The Pearson
Test-Retest coefficients can be found in Table 1.

The Sample

The Virginia-Educational Directory, 1984-1985,
published by the Virginia State Department of Education was
used as a source to generate a list of possible participants
for the study. All 139 operating school

Table 1.

<u>Pearson</u> <u>Test-Retest</u> <u>for</u> <u>Pilot</u> <u>Subjects</u>

Statement	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Levels
1.	.90	.000
2.	.82	.001
3.	.62	.020
4.	.05	.439
5.	.50	.060
6.	.38	.127
7.	.46	.078
8.	.76	.003
9.	.51	.054
10.	.34	.150
11.	.90	.000
12.	.18	.294
13.	.67	.012
14.	.70	.007
15.	.67	.012
16.	.80	.001
17.	-.18	.301
18.	.63	.018
19.	.34	.149
20.	.34	.151
21.	.55	.040
22.	.67	.012
23.	.88	.000
24.	-.08	.404
25.	-.31	.176
26.	.09	.394
27.	.51	.055
28.	.63	.018
29.	.03	.462
30.	.55	.039

n=12

divisions in Virginia were considered for inclusion in this study. Only school divisions containing operating high schools were included in the sample. The high schools were then stratified by grade level. Each secondary school containing grade combinations of 8-12, 9-12, 10-12, and 11-12 were eligible for the study. Combination schools of K-12 or 7-12 were eliminated from the sample because of the difference in administrative responsibilities found among elementary, middle, and high schools.

The stratified sample was used to generate a list of high schools for possible inclusion in the study. A table of random numbers was used to select one high school from each school division. This random selection allowed each high school to have an equal opportunity for sample selection within their respective school divisions. Such randomly selected high schools were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1) The high school must contain only one principal.

2) The high school must contain special education programs of either the self contained or resource model.

3) The high school must have at least one assistant principal.

4) The high school must contain any combination of

grades 8-12, 9-12, 10-12, or 11-12.

Of the 139 operating school divisions in Virginia, 126 qualified under this selection requirement. Once a high school met these requirements, the principal and corresponding assistant principal were selected for the sample. If a high school did not meet the criteria, another high school within the same school division was generated from the list and was used in the sample. If no other high school existed in that division, the school division was not represented in the study.

The sample of assistant principals was correlated with the sample selection of the high school principals. If more than one assistant principal was present in the selected sample high school, one assistant principal within the high school was randomly selected. If there was only one assistant principal he/she was selected for the sample. The high school principal and the assistant principal from the same school were chosen to allow for comparison between the respondents' perceived competency ratings.

The two groups were mailed packets of information requesting their input on statements concerning school-based special education administration competencies of high school administrative personnel. Each packet contained a cover

letter that explained the purpose of the study, and the
assurance that information from the respondent would be kept
confidential; a copy of the instrument; and a stamped return
envelope. The respondents were asked to complete the survey
and mail it back as quickly as possible. The survey was
coded for data collection purposes. Those respondents who
did not reply within four weeks received a follow-up
postcard. The postcard reminded them to complete the survey.
A phone number was provided so they could request another
survey if they had misplaced the original. Those respondents
who did reply received a thank you letter.

Methods of Analysis

Responses to the thirty competency statements were
analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences,
Version X (SPSSX, 1983). Research questions numbers one
through three were answered using a descriptive technique
analysis. Research question number four was answered using
non-parametric analysis and research question number five
was answered using a multiple regression analysis because of
the technique's ability to isolate the predictor variable to
explain the variation in the criterion variable, and its
ability to measure the overall strength associated between
the criterion variable and the full set of predictor

variables.

Research question 1.

> According to the perceptions of field incumbents (high
> school principals and assistant principals), what
> competencies are needed to administer secondary
> special education programs at the school-based
> level as determined by index of value and
> priority ratings?

> A frequency distribution was obtained for each
> competency statement as rated by the individual
> subgroups as essential to the administration of
> school-based special education programs.

Research question 2.

> What is the index of value assigned to each competency
> statement as perceived by the field incumbents ?

> A frequency distribution was obtained for each
> competency statement and function area according
> to the sub-group's perceptions of index of value.

Research question 3.

> What priority rating index is assigned to each
> competency statement as determined by the field
> incumbents ?

> A frequency distribution was obtained for each
> competency statement according to the sub-group's

perceptions of the priority rating index.

Research question 4.

   a) Is the index of value rating independent of the
      position of the field incumbent?

   b) Is the priority rating independent of the position
      of the field incumbent?

   A non-parametric test of independence was conducted for
      each competency statement and priority rating. A
      chi-square analysis was obtained which compared
      responses from the two sub-groups.

Research Question 5.

   Are there relationships between priority rating index
      of competency statements and selected demographic
      variables of:

      1) field position (principal, assistant principal)

      2) certification

      3) academic background (level of training)

      4) clock hours of instruction in special education
         or related courses

      5) years experience in current position

      6) school enrollment

      7) percent of school population enrolled in
         special education programs.

   A multiple regression analysis was conducted using

the dependent variables of the priority rating

index and the independent variables of the

individual demographic variables.

Chapter Four

Presentation of the Data

It was the intent of this study to determine
competencies required of secondary school principals and
assistant principals in the administration of school-based
special education programs. The purpose of this chapter is
to report the data and the analysis. As shown in Table 2,
the mailing resulted in a 54% survey return from the total
sample, 47% from high school principals (59 returns) and 61%
from assistant principals (76 returns). The report of the
non-respondent follow-up study can be found in Appendix F.

Data were sought to provide insight into the background
and training of the respondents and demographic and related
educational information about the schools which the sample
represented. The respondents to the surveys presented an
even distribution of schools from urban, suburban, and rural
areas. The demographic data shown in Table 3 reflect a
heterogeneity of responses on the demographic variables of
age, size of school enrollment, and percent of students
enrolled in special education programs. Variables which did
not reflect a heterogeneous distribution were sex and clock
hours of instruction in special education courses.

88

Table 2

Survey Responses

	School Division	Qualified Sample	Number of Returns	Percent of Returns
Principals	139	126	59	47%
Assistant Principals	139	126	76	61%

Table 3

Demographic and Educational Related Information

		Principals		Assistant Principals	
		percent	frequency	percent	frequency
Sex	Male	98.2	58	94.2	70
	Female	1.8	1	5.8	4
Age	26-35	14.5	8	14.3	11
	36-45	56.4	32	41.4	30
	46-55	21.8	12	30.0	22
	55 +	7.3	4	14.3	10
Certification					
	Gen. Ed.	98.1	58	92.8	69
	Spec. Ed.	0.0	0	1.4	1
	Voc. Ed.	1.8	1	5.8	4
Academic Background					
	M.A.	23.2	13	27.1	19
	M.A.+16	53.6	31	67.1	47
	Ed.S.	14.3	9	2.9	2
	Ed.D.	8.9	5	2.9	2

Table 3 (continued)

Demographic and Educational Related Information

	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	percent	frequency	percent	frequency
Clock Hours of Instruction in Special Education				
0-25	67.3	38	73.1	50
26-75	20.0	11	16.4	12
76-100	12.7	7	10.4	8
Years in Present Position				
1-2 years	26.8	15	27.8	20
3-6 years	32.2	18	25.0	18
7-9 years	14.3	8	15.3	11
10-14 years	17.9	10	16.7	12
15 + years	9.0	5	9.8	7
Mean number of years	6.8		6.8	
Experience in Other Administrative Positions				
0-2 years	28.6	16	65.3	47
3-6 years	30.4	17	11.2	8
7-9 years	23.1	13	5.6	4
10-14 years	12.5	7	12.6	9
15 + years	5.4	3	0.0	0
Mean number yrs.	6.0		2.6	

Table 3 (continued)

Demographic and Education Related Information

	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	percent	frequency	percent	frequency
Years Experience Teaching in General Education				
0-2 years	9.0	5	19.5	14
3-6 years	44.6	25	19.5	14
7-9 years	28.6	16	8.4	6
10-14 years	12.6	7	23.7	17
15 + years	5.4	3	23.7	17
Mean number yrs		6.43		8.9
Years Experience Teaching in Special Education				
0 years	96.4	57	97.1	69
1-2 years	3.6	2	0.0	0
5-6 years	0.0	0	2.8	2
Mean number of years		.054		.162

Table 3 (continued)

Demographic and Education Related Information

	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	percent	frequency	percent	frequency
Percent of High School Students enrolled in Spec. Ed.				
1-2 %	10.8	6	22.4	16
3-4 %	30.4	17	28.4	20
5-9 %	46.4	26	29.9	21
10-15 %	12.5	7	19.4	14
High School Enrollment				
250-499	16.1	10	12.9	11
500-999	51.8	30	51.4	37
1000-1499	21.4	13	21.4	17
1500 +	10.7	6	12.9	9

principals n=59

assistant principals n=76

Of the respondent population, 98.2% of the principals
were male; 56.4% fell in the age bracket of 36-45 years;
98.1% were certified in General Education Administration;
and 53.6% had a Masters degree plus 16 hours; 67.3% of the
principals had between 0 and 25 clock hours of instruction
in special education; 26.8% had been in their present
position for one or two years, and had a mean number of 6.00
years in other administrative positions. The greatest
percentage of respondents, 44.6%, reported having between
three and six years teaching experience, with a mean of 6.43
years teaching experience; 96.4% reported no experience in
teaching special education; 46.4% reported the enrollment of
special education students in their schools were between 5%
and 9% of the total school population; and 51.8% reported
their high school enrollment was between 500 and 999
students.

The responding assistant principal population reported
94.2% were male; 41.4% fell in the age bracket of 36-45
years; 92.8% were certified in General Education
Administration; and 67.1% had a Masters degree plus 16
hours. Seventy-three and one tenth percent of the assistant
principals had between 0 and 25 clock hours of instruction
in special education; and 27.8% had been in their current
position for one or two years. The mean number of years in

other administration positions were 2.63 years. The largest

percentage of assistant principals responding to the survey,

11.8%, reported ten years teaching experience in general

education, with a mean of 8.96 years regular teaching

experience; 97.1% of the assistant principals reported no

experience in teaching special education; 29.9% of the

assistant principals reported between 5% and 9% students

enrolled in special education programs and 51.4% had a

school enrollment between 500 and 999 students.

Research Question 1.

According to the perceptions of the field incumbents

(high school principals and assistant principals), what

competencies are needed to administer secondary special

education programs at the school-based level as determined

by the index of value and priority ratings?

The respondents were asked to respond to each

competency statement by indicating the index of value. The

following scale was used:

    1. Unnecessary: not needed in the normal conduct of

                              administrative duties.

    2. Limited Value: a knowledge of the basic nature of

                              the content is necessary, but knowledge

                              to demonstrate the skill is not needed.

3. Valuable: beneficial in the conduct of administrative duties, but a person could function without it.

4. Highly   a person in the role of the
   Valuable: principal would be impaired in the conduct of duties if the competency was absent.

5. Essential: it is impossible to perform the central functions of the job if you do not have this competency.

To determine what competencies are needed, the mean index of value was computed by summing the number associated with the rating and dividing by the number of respondents. The mean index of value was computed separately for each sample (high school principals and assistant principals). The higher the mean, the higher the index of value.

Principals rated the competency statements in the following descending order: competency statements concerning rules for discipline (29); selection of personnel (25); and implementation of due process (2) had respective means of 4.73; 4.54; and 4.57; enable improvement of instruction for personnel (16); implement programs according to regulations (12); and promote positive attitudes (11), had respective means of 4.41; 4.37; and 4.25; Competency statements

concerning education in the L.R.E. (4); communication with parents and other schools (20); and redesign programs to include handicapped students (9), had respective means of 3.98; 3.98; and 3.94; coordinate transportation (27); chair eligibility committees (5); and assist in I.E.P.s for particular students (6), had respective means of 3.38; 3.17; and 3.16. As a group, the principals did not rate any competency statement low enough to obtain a mean score equal to or less than 3.00. The principals' responses in order of competency statements are reflected in Table 4. The principals' rank order of competency statements according to index of value are reflected in Table 5.

For ease of readability of the tables, abbreviated versions of the competency statements have been included. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix D.

The mean index of value was also computed for the responses from the assistant principals. The assistant principals rating of competency statement were as follows: rules for discipline (29); selection of personnel (25); improvement of instruction for personnel (16); and implement programs according to regulations (12), had respective means of 4.57; 4.47; 4.32; and 4.30. Competency statements addressing communication with parents and other schools (20); physical accessibility (28); and research for program

Table 4

Mean Value and Rating of Competency Statements by Principals

and Assistant Principals

Competency Statement	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	Ranking	Mean	Ranking	Mean
1.evaluation for referred students	15	4.02	20	3.90
2.implement due process	3	4.51	5	4.28
3.interagency coordination	27	3.50	29	3.31
4.education in the L.R.E.	17	3.98	22	3.86
5.chair eligibility committees	29	3.17	26	3.51
6.assist in I.E.P. development	30	3.16	30	3.14
7.discipline for handicapped students	12	4.05	11	4.13
8.decisions regarding placement	25	3.53	27	3.48
9.redesign programs to include handicapped students	19	3.94	23	3.81
10.assess needs according to regulations	8	4.19	9	4.21

Table 4 (continued)

Mean Value and Rating of Competency Statements by Principals
and Assistant Principals

Competency Statement	Principals Ranking	Mean	Assistant Principals Ranking	Mean
11.promote positive attitudes	6	4.25	6	4.26
12.implement programs according to regulations	5	4.37	4	4.29
13.provide variety of instruction	14	4.02	14	4.07
14.evaluation of curriculum	22	3.82	19	3.90
15.in-service for personnel	16	4.00	13	4.08
16.enable improvement of instruction for personnel	4	4.41	3	4.32
17.identify eligible students	24	3.62	24	3.69
18.confidentiality of records	7	4.20	10	4.19
19.programs for interpersonal relations	26	3.51	25	3.64
20.communication with parents and other schools	18	3.98	16	3.97
21.community relations	13	4.03	15	4.01
22.use of advisory committee	23	3.82	21	3.86

Table 4 (continued)

Mean Value and Rating of Competency Statements by Principals
and Assistant Principals

Competency	Principals		Assistant Principals	
Statement	Ranking	Mean	Ranking	Mean
23.evaluate personnel	9	4.14	8	4.24
24.qualify staff	11	4.05	12	4.09
25.select personnel	2	4.14	2	4.47
26.fiscal accountability	10	4.53	7	4.26
27.coordinate transportation	28	3.38	28	3.47
28.physical accessibility	21	3.83	17	3.96
29.rules for discipline	1	4.72	1	4.57
30.enable research	20	3.90	18	3.93
	n=59		n=76	

Table 5

Principals' Rank Order for Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank by Mean
29. rules for discipline	4.72	.52	1
25. select personnel	4.53	.76	2
2. implement due process	4.51	.87	3
16. enable improvement of instruction	4.41	.73	4
12. implement programs according to regulations	4.37	.72	5
11. promote positive attitudes	4.25	.83	6
18. confidentiality of records	4.20	.91	7
10. assess needs according to regulations	4.19	.72	8
23. evaluate personnel	4.14	.94	9
26. accountability (fiscal)	4.14	1.00	10
24. qualify staff	4.05	.88	11
7. discipline for handicapped students	4.05	.94	12
21. community relations	4.03	.83	13

Table 5 (continued)

Principals' Rank Order of Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank by Mean
13. provide variety of instruction	4.02	.83	14
1. evaluation for referred students	4.02	1.02	15
15. in-service for personnel	4.00	.83	16
4. education in the L.R.E.	3.98	.84	17
20. communication with parents and other schools	3.98	.86	18
9. redesign programs to include handicapped students	3.94	.77	19
30. enable research	3.90	.77	20
28. physical accessability	3.83	.76	21
14. evaluation of curriculum	3.82	.87	22
22. use of advisory council	3.82	.91	23
17. identify eligible students	3.62	.96	24

Table 5 (continued)

Principals' Rank Order of Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank by Mean
8. decisions regarding placement	3.53	.93	25
19. programs for interpersonal relations	3.51	.71	26
3. interagency coordination	3.50	.87	27
27. coordinate transporta-tion	3.38	1.00	28
5. chair eligibility committees	3.17	.91	29
6. assist in I.E.P. development	3.16	.93	30

----

development (30), had respective means of 3.97; 3.96; and
3.93; decisions regarding placement (8); coordination of
transportation (27); and interagency coordination (3) had
means of 3.48; 3.47; and 3.31. As a group, the assistant
principals did not rate any competency statement low enough
to have a mean score equal to or less than 3.00. The
assistant principals' responses to index of value in
competency statement order are reflected in Table 4. The
assistant principals' rank order of competency statements
according to index of value are reflected in Table 6.

The matrix used to generate the original instrument was
also used to organized the individual competency statements
into eight function areas. Overall means were calculated for
these function areas and then ranked according to mean.
Competency statements one through nine comprised the
function area of Organizing Special Education Programs (A);
ten through twelve were included in Managing the Total
Educational Process (B); thirteen and fourteen were included
in Supervision of Curriculum Development (C); fifteen and
sixteen were included in Staff Development (D); seventeen
through nineteen were included in Student Personnel
Activities (E); twenty through twenty-two were included in
School Community Relations (F); twenty-three through
twenty-five were included in Evaluation of Personnel (G);

Table 6

Assistant Principals' Rank Order of Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank by Mean
29. rules for discipline	4.57	.78	1
25. select personnel	4.47	.85	2
16. enable improvement of instruction	4.32	.81	3
12. implement programs according to regulations	4.29	.98	4
2. implement due process	4.28	1.02	5
11. promote positive attitudes	4.26	.85	6
26. accountability (fiscal)	4.26	.93	7
23. evaluate personnel	4.24	1.00	8
10. assess needs according to regulations	4.21	.87	9
18. confidentiality of records	4.19	1.04	10
7. discipline for handicapped students	4.13	1.02	11
24. qualify staff	4.09	.96	12
15. in-service for personnel	4.08	1.01	13

Table 6 (continued)

Assistant Principals' Rank Order of Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank by Mean
13. provide variety of instruction	4.07	.87	14
21. community relations	4.01	.98	15
20. communications with parents and other schools	3.97	.91	16
28. physical accessibility	3.96	.92	17
30. enable research	3.93	.96	18
14. evaluation of curriculum	3.90	.90	19
1. evaluation for referred students	3.90	1.23	20
22. use of advisory committee	3.86	1.03	21
4. education in the L.R.E.	3.86	.99	22
9. redesign programs to include handicapped students	3.81	.91	23
17. identify eligible students	3.69	.98	24

Table 6 (continued)

<u>Assistant</u> <u>Principals'</u> <u>Rank</u> <u>Order</u> <u>of</u> <u>Competency</u> <u>Statements</u>

Competency Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank by Mean
19. programs for interpersonal relations	3.64	.92	25
5. chair eligibility committees	3.51	1.12	26
8. decision regarding placement	3.48	1.08	27
27. coordinate transportation	3.47	.96	28
3. interagency coordination	3.31	.96	29
6. assist in I.E.P. development	3.14	1.20	30

and twenty-six through thirty were included in Managing

Fiscal Operations (H). The principals gave the highest

ranking to the function of Managing the Total Educational

Process (B), reflecting a mean of 4.27; the Evaluation of

Personnel (G) as second with a mean of 4.26; and Staff

Development (D) as third with a mean of 4.20. Similiar

rankings were given by the assistant principals. Evaluation

of Personnel (G) received the highest ranking with a mean of

4.26, followed by Managing the Total Educational Process (B)

with a mean of 4.25, and Staff Development (D) with a mean

of 4.19. The mean value ranking of function areas are set

forth in Table 7.

Research Question 2.

What is the index of value assigned to each competency

statement as perceived by the field incumbents?

The thirty competency statements were rated individually

for index of value using a Leikert scale. The values ranged

from 1, unnecessary, to 5, essential. The principals'

responses were distributed across the five categories with

the categories of essential, highly valuable, and valuable

chosen most often. The distribution of selected responses

did not include the category of limited value,(2), for

competency statements 9, redesign programs to include to

Table 7

Mean Value Ranking of Function Areas by Principals and

Assistant Principals

Function	Competency Statements	Principal Ranking	Mean Rating	Ass't P. Ranking	Mean Rating
A. Organizing Special Education Programs					
	1-9	8	3.76	8	3.69
B. Managing Total Educational Process					
	10-12	1	4.27	2	4.25
C. Supervising Curriculum Development					
	13-14	5	3.91	5	3.98
D. Staff Development					
	15-16	3	4.20	3	4.19
E. Student Personnel Activities					
	17-19	7	3.77	7	3.89
F. School Community Relations					
	20-22	6	3.90	6	3.94
G. Evaluation of Personnel					
	23-25	2	4.26	1	4.26
H. Managing Fiscal Operations					
	26-30	4	3.99	4	4.03

handicapped students; 10. assess needs according to
regulations; 11, promote positive attitudes; 13, provide
variety of instruction; 16, enable improvement of
instruction; 23, evaluate personnel; 25, select personnel;
and 29, rules for discipline. Nor did the principals chose
the category of unnecessary, (1), for competency statements
3, interagency coordination; 4, education in the L.R.E.; 10,
assess needs according to regulations; 12, implement
programs according to regulations; 13, provide variety of
instruction; 14, evaluation of curriculum; 15, in-service
for personnel; 16, enable improvement of instruction; 18,
confidentiality of records; 19, programs for interpersonal
relations; 20, communication with parents and other schools;
21, community relations; 28, physical accessibility; or 29,
rules for discipline. A separate analysis was conducted to
determine the valued percent of the competency statements.
The frequencies and corresponding valued percentage for each
index of value was computed and adjusted for missing
values. The valued percent demonstrated the overall picture
of the responses according to the number of responses to the
index of value. Because of the limited number of replies to
the mail out survey, the reporting of the mean alone may not
accurately reflect the total picture.

Competency statement 29, category 5 (essential),

rules for discipline, received the highest overall rating with a frequency of 42 and a valued percentage of 76.4. Competency statement 2, category 5, implement due process, received the second highest overall rating with a frequency of 39 and a valued percentage of 69.6. Competency statement 5, category 5, select personnel, received the third highest overall rating with a frequency of 36 and a valued percentage of 64.3. The distribution of principals' indicies of value are set forth in Table 8.

The responses from the assistant principals showed a more even distribution of categories in their responses to the index of value. The distribution of assistant principals' responses did not include category 2, limited value as a response for competency statements 11, promote positive attitudes and 29, rules for discipline. The assistant principals did not select category 1, unnecessary, for competency statements 10, assess needs according to regulations; 19, program for interpersonal relations; 26, fiscal accountability; and 28, physical accessibility. The highest overall rating for a competency statement was statement 29, rules for discipline, category 5, essential, with a frequency of 51 and a valued percentage of 70.8. The second highest ranking was competency statement 25, select personnel, category 5, essential, with a frequency of 47 and

Table 8

Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements, Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. evaluation for referred students	22	40.0	17	30.9	13	23.6	1	1.8	2	3.6
2. implement due process	39	69.6	10	17.9	5	8.9	1	1.8	1	1.8
3. interagency coordination	6	10.7	24	42.9	18	32.1	8	14.3	0	0
4. education in the L.R.E.	16	28.6	26	46.4	11	19.6	3	5.4	0	0
5. chair eligibility committees	4	7.1	14	25.0	29	51.8	6	10.7	3	5.4
6. assist in I.E.P. development	4	7.1	15	26.8	25	44.6	10	17.9	2	3.6
7. discipline for handicapped students	19	33.9	26	46.4	8	14.3	1	1.8	2	3.6
8. decisions regarding placement	7	12.5	24	42.9	19	33.9	4	7.1	2	3.6
9. redesign programs to include handicapped students	12	21.4	31	55.4	12	21.4	0	0	1	1.8

Table 8 (continued)
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements, Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
10. assess needs according to regulations	21	37.5	25	44.6	10	17.9	0	0	0	0
11. promote positive attitudes	25	44.6	22	39.3	8	14.3	0	0	1	1.8
12. implement programs according to regulations	28	50.0	22	39.3	5	8.9	1	1.8	0	0
13. provide variety of instruction	18	32.1	21	37.5	17	30.4	0	0	0	0
14. evaluation of curriculum	14	25.0	21	37.5	18	32.1	3	5.4	0	0
15. in-service for personnel	17	30.4	24	42.9	13	23.2	2	3.6	0	0
16. enable improvement of instruction	31	55.4	17	30.4	8	14.3	0	0	0	0
17. identify eligible students	11	19.6	20	35.7	19	33.9	5	8.9	1	1.8
18. confidentiality of records	27	49.1	14	25.5	12	21.8	2	3.6	0	0

Table 8 (continued)
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements, Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
19. program for interpersonal relations	4	7.1	24	42.9	25	44.6	3	5.4	0	0
20. communication with parents and other schools	18	32.1	21	37.5	15	26.8	2	3.6	0	0
21. community relations	18	32.1	24	42.9	12	21.4	2	3.6	0	0
22. use of advisory committee	11	19.6	22	39.3	19	33.9	3	5.4	1	1.8
23. evaluate personnel	23	41.1	22	39.3	9	16.1	0	0	2	3.6
24. qualify staff	19	33.9	24	42.9	11	19.6	1	1.8	1	1.8
25. select personnel	36	64.3	16	28.6	3	5.4	0	0	1	1.8
26. accountability (fiscal)	27	49.1	14	25.5	10	18.2	3	5.5	1	1.8
27. transportation (coordinate)	7	12.7	20	36.4	18	32.7	7	12.7	3	5.5

Table 8 (continued)
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements, Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
28. physically accessible	23	31.9	29	40.3	14	19.4	6	8.3	0	0
29. rules for discipline	42	76.4	11	20.0	2	3.6	0	0	0	0
30. enable research	10	18.2	33	60.0	10	18.2	1	1.8	1	1.8

a valued percentage of 65.3. The third highest were

competency statements 2, implement due process and 12,

implement programs according to regulations. Each received a

frequency of 41 and a valued percentage of 56.9. The

assistant principals' responses to the index of value are

found in Table 9.

Research Question 3.

What priority rating index is assigned to each

competency statement as determined by the field incumbents?

Principals and assistant principals were asked to give

priority ratings to the individual competency statements

they felt should receive first, second, and third priority.

Using the weighted values of three for first priority, two

for second priority, and one for third priority, a weighted

score was obtained for each competency statement. Overall,

no competency statement was omitted from the principals' and

assistant principals' selection for priority statements. The

distribution of selected statements may infer the value of

all competency statements on this survey instrument. The

principals selected competency statement 1, evaluation for

referred students with a weighted score of 29 as the first

priority statement. Other selected competency statements in

descending order were: statement 23, evaluate personnel and

Table 9
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements,
Assistant Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. evaluation for referred students	33	46.5	11	15.5	18	25.4	5	7.0	4	5.6
2. implement due process	41	56.9	17	23.6	9	12.5	3	4.2	2	2.8
3. interagency (coordinate)	6	8.5	26	36.6	26	36.6	10	14.1	3	4.2
4. education in the L.R.E.	22	30.6	25	34.7	20	27.8	3	4.2	2	2.8
5. chair eligibility committee	16	22.2	21	29.2	23	31.9	8	11.1	4	5.6
6. assist in I.E.P. development	10	13.9	19	26.4	22	30.6	13	18.1	8	11.1
7. discipline for handicapped students	33	46.5	21	29.6	12	16.9	3	4.2	2	2.8
8. decisions regarding placement	13	18.3	24	33.8	21	29.6	10	14.1	3	4.2
9. redesign programs to include handicapped students	17	23.6	30	41.7	20	27.8	4	5.6	1	1.4

118

Table 9 (continued)
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements,
Assistant Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
10. assess needs according to regulations	32	44.4	27	37.5	9	12.5	4	5.6	0	0
11. promote positive attitudes	35	48.6	23	31.9	13	18.1	0	0.	1	1.4
12. implement programs according to regulations	41	56.9	16	22.2	12	16.7	1	1.4	2	2.8
13. provide variety of instruction	25	34.7	31	43.1	13	18.1	2	2.8	1	1.4
14. evaluation of curriculum	19	26.4	33	45.8	15	20.8	4	5.6	1	1.4
15. in-service for personnel	32	44.4	20	27.8	16	22.2	2	2.8	2	2.8
16. enable improvement of instruction	36	50.0	25	34.7	10	13.9	0	0	1	1.4
17. identify eligible students	17	23.6	25	34.7	22	30.6	7	9.9	1	1.4

Table 9 (continued)
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements,
Assistant Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5 f	%	Highly Valuable 4 f	%	Valuable 3 f	%	Limited Value 2 f	%	Unnecessary 1 f	%
18. confidentiality of records	37	51.4	20	27.8	9	12.5	4	5.6	2	2.8
19. program for interpersonal relations	13	18.1	29	40.3	21	29.2	9	12.5	0	0
20. communication with parents and other schools	22	30.6	32	44.4	13	18.1	4	5.6	1	1.4
21. community relations	27	37.5	26	36.1	13	18.1	5	6.9	1	1.4
22. use of advisory committee	21	29.2	31	43.1	11	15.3	7	9.7	2	2.8
23. evaluate personnel	36	50.0	25	34.7	5	6.9	4	5.6	2	2.8
24. qualify staff	28	39.4	27	38.0	12	16.9	2	2.8	2	2.8
25. select personnel	47	65.3	15	20.8	8	11.1	1	1.4	1	1.4
26. accountability (fiscal)	38	52.8	20	27.8	9	12.5	5	5.6	0	0
27. coordinate transport	9	12.5	30	41.7	20	27.8	12	16.7	1	1.4

Table 9 (continued)
Distribution of Index of Value for Competency Statements,
Assistant Principals' Responses

Competency Statements	Essential 5		Highly Valuable 4		Valuable 3		Limited Value 2		Unnecessary 1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
28. physically accessible	23	31.9	29	40.3	14	19.4	6	8.3	0	0
29. rules for discipline	51	70.8	13	18.1	7	9.7	0	0	1	1.4
30. enable research	22	30.6	30	41.7	15	20.8	3	4.2	2	2.8

statement 12, implement programs according to regulations, both with weighted scores of 27; statement 10, assess needs according to regulations, with a weighted score of 24; and statement 25, select personnel, with a weighted score of 23.

The weighted scores for the assistant principals' rating of priority statements was computed in the same manner. Although it may appear the assistant principals responded more cohesively, the higher weighted scores are a reflection of the greater number of assistant principals who responded to the survey. The assistant principals selected competency statement 11, promote positive attitudes as first priority with a weighted score of 57. Other selected competency statements were: statement 29, rules for discipline, with a weighted score of 40; statement 12, implement programs according to regulations, with a weighted score of 28; statement 13, provide variety of instruction, with a weighted score of 27; and statement 25, select personnel, with a weighted score of 24. The principals' and assistant principals' priority rating of competency statements according to weighted scores is found in Table 10. The distribution of selection of priority statements by principals and assistant principals is found in Table 11.

Table 10

Principals' and Assistant Principals' Priority Rating of
Competency Statements According to Weighted Scores

Principals

Statement	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Weighted Score
1. evaluation for referred students	8x3	1x2	3x1	29
23. evaluate personnel	4x3	5x2	5x1	27
12. implement programs according to regulations	5x3	5x2	2x1	27
10. assess needs according to regulations	6x3	2x2	2x1	24
25. select personnel	5x3	3x2	2x1	23

Assistant Principals

Statement	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Weighted Score
11. promote positive attitudes	12x3	7x2	7x1	57
29. rules for discipline	8x3	4x2	8x1	40
12. implement programs according to regulations	7x3	3x2	1x1	28

Table 10 (continued)

Principals' and Assistant Principals' Priority Rating of
Competency Statements According to Weighted Scores

Assistant Principals

Competency Statement	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Weighted Score
13. provide variety of instruction	6x3	1x2	7x1	27
25. select personnel	2x3	5x2	8x1	24

Table 11

Distribution of Principals' and Assistant Principals'
<u>Selected</u> <u>Priority</u> <u>Statements</u>

	Principal				Assistant Principal			
	Priority			Weighted	Priority			Weighted
	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total
Competency Statements								
1.	8	1	3	29	5	4	0	23
2.	2	2	3	13	2	1	0	8
3.	0	1	2	4	0	2	2	4
4.	2	0	0	6	3	3	2	17
5.	2	0	3	9	0	2	2	6
6.	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	6
7.	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
8.	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	2
9.	1	3	0	9	0	5	2	12
10.	6	2	2	24	5	1	2	19
11.	3	4	4	21	11	7	7	57
12.	5	5	2	27	7	3	1	28
13.	2	2	2	12	6	1	7	27
14.	0	1	1	3	0	0	3	3
15.	0	1	3	5	0	3	2	8
16.	3	4	2	19	3	6	2	23
17.	1	4	1	12	1	2	2	9
18.	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
19.	1	0	2	5	1	0	1	4
20.	0	2	0	4	0	1	0	2
21.	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	7
22.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
23.	4	5	5	27	2	4	2	16
24.	0	1	1	3	0	1	0	2
25.	5	3	2	23	2	5	8	24
26.	1	5	1	14	0	1	3	5
27.	1	2	0	7	0	0	0	0
28.	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	9
29.	2	2	2	12	8	4	8	40
30.	0	0	4	4	2	1	3	11

Research Question 4.

4a) Is the index of value rating independent of the position of the field incumbent?

A chi-square analysis using responses from the total sample of principals and assistant principals was conducted to determine the relationship between the index of value and the position of the person generating the index. All of the analyses on individual competency statements were found to be significant. A second chi-square analysis was conducted on thirty adjusted pairs. Adjusted pair responses are responses from the principal and assistant principal from the same school. Using the adjusted pairs, a chi-square analysis was conducted on the thirty competency statements. All statements were found significant. If the null hypothesis of no relationship between the responses of the principals and assistant principals were tested, then the chi-square analysis can be interpreted to mean the two groups' responses on the index of value were dependent upon the field position. The chi-square for competency statements can be found on Table 12.

Table 12
Chi-square Analysis for Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Adjusted Pairs Chi Square	df	Significance	Total Sample Chi Square	df	Significant
1. evaluation for referred students	33.47	4	.0000	62.53	4	.0000
2. implement due process	87.44	4	.0000	157.25	4	.0000
3. interagency coordination	31.12	4	.0000	64.64	4	.0000
4. education in the L.R.E.	16.35	3	.001	67.81	4	.0000
5. chair eligibility committees	37.59	4	.0000	51.22	4	.0000
6. assist in I.E.P. development	22.29	4	.0000	34.79	4	.0000
7. discipline for handicapped students	46.71	4	.0000	83.12	4	.0000
8. decisions regarding placement	25.31	4	.0000	48.48	4	.0000

Table 12 (continued)
Chi-square Analysis for Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Adjusted Pairs Chi Square	df	Significance	Total Sample Chi Square	df	Significant
9. redesign programs to include handicapped students	41.56	4	.0000	89.40	4	.0000
10. assess needs according to regulations	22.00	3	.0000	54.51	3	.0000
11. promote positive attitudes	33.76	3	.0000	60.09	3	.0000
12. implement programs according to regulations	55.38	4	.0000	121.22	4	.0000
13. provide variety of instruction	22.12	3	.0000	83.92	4	.0000
14. evaluation of curriculum	15.88	3	.001	71.30	4	.0000
15. in-service for personnel	40.68	4	.0000	72.97	4	.0000
16. enable improvement of instruction	9.73	2	.008	74.44	3	.0000

Table 12 (continued)
Chi-square Analysis for Competency Statements

Competency Statement	Adjusted Pairs			Total Sample		
	Chi Square	df	Significance	Chi Square	df	Significant
17. identify eligible students	31.85	4	.0000	53.76	4	.0000
18. confidentiality of records	23.81	3	.0000	92.24	4	.0000
19. programs for interpersonal relations	19.65	3	.0000	40.16	3	.0000
20. communication with parents and other schools	26.94	3	.0000	73.29	4	.0000
21. community relations	37.59	4	.0000	74.87	4	.0000
22. use of advisory committees	39.50	4	.0000	59.63	4	.0000
23. evaluate personnel	55.68	4	.0000	103.13	4	.0000
24. qualify staff	44.72	4	.0000	81.52	4	.0000
25. select personnel	75.23	4	.0000	181.54	4	.0000

Table 12 (continued)
Chi-square Analysis for Competency Statements

	Adjusted Pairs			Total Sample		
Competency Statement	Chi Square	df	Significance	Chi Square	df	Significant
26. fiscal accountability	26.47	3	.0000	99.44	4	.0000
27. coordinate transportation	30.09	4	.0000	50.44	4	.0000
28. physical accessibility	22.00	3	.0000	37.08	3	.0000
29. rules for discipline	37.44	2	.0000	161.05	3	.0000
30. enable research	56.12	4	.0000	98.48	4	.0000

4b) Are the priority ratings independent of the position of the field incumbent?

A chi-square analysis was conducted on the priority statements. Using the null hypothesis of independence, the relationship between the priority rating and the position of the person generating the rating was examined. The chi-square for the first priority statement was 31.200 with 17 degrees of freedom and p=.019. The selection of priority statement one was dependent on the position of the field incumbent (principal and assistant principal). The chi-square analysis for the second and third priority statements did not show significance. The chi-square was 19.933 with 21 degrees of freedom and p=0.525 for the second priority statement and 26.738 with 23 degrees of freedom and p=0.267 for the third priority statement. The results can be interpreted to mean the selection of the second and third priority statements were independent of the position of the field incumbent (principal and assistant principal). The chi-square analysis for the priority statements is found on Table 13.

Research Question 5.

Are there systematic relationships between the priority rating index of competency statements and the

Table 13

Chi-square Analysis for Priority Statements

	Chi-square	df	Significance
Priority 1	31.200	17	0.019
Priority 2	19.933	21	0.525
Priority 3	26.738	23	0.267

n = 60

----

selected demographic variables of: field position,

certification, academic background, clock hours of

instruction in special education or related courses, years

experience in current position, school enrollment, and

percent of students enrolled in special education programs

in the school?

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to analyze

the relationships between a dependent variable and a set of

independent or predictive variables. The priority statements

designated by the respondents as first, second, and third

priority were used as dependent variables. The principals

selected competency statement 1, evaluation for referred

students, as first priority; 25, selection of personnel, as

second priority; and 12, implement programs according to

regulations, as third priority. The assistant principals

selected competency statement 11, promote positive

attitudes, as first priority, 29, rules for discipline as

second priority, and 12, implement programs according to

regulations, as third priority. The three statements were

separately used as dependent variables. A multiple

regression was conducted using academic background, number

of years in current administrative position, number of clock

hours in special education instruction, and percent of

students enrolled in special education programs as

independent variables. In this instance, the multiple
regression was used to determine the percent of the variance
in the criterion variable (multiple r), and to determine the
regression coefficients that would have been obtained if the
various predictor variables were equal to one another in
terms of means and standard deviations (beta). The larger
the beta weight, the better the predictor. None of the
independent variables were found to be statistically
significant. The multiple regression analysis can be found
on Table 14.

Summary of Research and Findings

In summary, the major outcome of the study was the
identification and prioritization of competencies necessary
for a principal or assistant principal to administer
school-based special education programs.

According to principals and assistant principals, the
following competency statements are necessary in the
administration of school-based special education programs:
rules for discipline; selection of personnel; implement due
process; enable improvement of instruction; implement
programs according to regulations; promote positive attitude
toward handicapped student; fiscal accountability;
evaluation of personnel; access needs according to

Table 14

Multiple Regression Analysis for Demographic Predictor

Variables and Priority Competency Statements

	Time in Current Position		Percent of Students in Spec. Ed.		Academic Background		Clock hours of Instruction	
	Beta	%	Beta	%	Beta	%	Beta	%
Competency Statement								
Principals								
1.	.032	.83	.077	.59	.011	.94	.038	.79
23.	.093	.36	.091	.51	.043	.73	.032	.83
12.	.167	.24	.072	.61	.013	.93	.018	.90
10.	.079	.57	.151	.28	.137	.32	.192	.17
25.	.051	.73	.114	.42	.031	.83	.022	.88
Assistant Principals								
11.	.331	.99	.056	.67	.036	.78	.145	.28
29.	.031	.80	.188	.43	.218	.08	.021	.88
12.	.036	.77	.200	.12	.206	.10	.044	.73
13.	.044	.65	.129	.19	.089	.37	.106	.28
25.	.081	.56	.101	.47	.040	.82	.036	.83

regulations; and confidentiality of records.

The index of value assigned to the competency statements by the principals and assistant principals were either essential, highly valuable, or valuable. Very few statements received an index of value rating lower than three. All of the competency statements received a vote of priority from either a principal or assistant principal. The principals rated competency statement 1, evaluation for referred students, as first priority. The assistant principals rated competency statement 11, promote positive attitude toward handicapped students as first priority. When examined for independence, the index of value rating for the individual competency statements was dependent on the field encumbent's position. The priority ratings of competency statements were dependent upon the field encumbent's position for the first priority statement, but independent for the second and third priority statements. Seven demographic variables were investigated for their relationship to the priority ratings. None were significant predictors of priority statements.

Chapter Five

Findings, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Presented in this chapter are findings, conclusions
drawn from the findings, a discussion of the conclusions,
and recommendations for special education and general
education administration. Recommendations for future
research are presented.

Summary of the Findings

1) Principals identified the competencies necessary in the
administration of school-based special education programs by
rating the thirty competency statements on an index of value
scale. The highest mean values were given to competencies
addressing: rules for discipline, selection of personnel,
implementing due process, enable improvement of instruction,
and implement programs in accordance with regulations. The
assistant principals identified the same five competency
statements as necessary, but did not rate the competency
statements as having the same index of value. As in this
study, discipline was cited as a necessary competency in
Betz's (1977) study on competencies for elementary school
principals in the adminstration of school-based special
education programs. The competency statement "selection of

136

personnel", was found as necessary in Betz's (1977); Nevin's (1977); Waters' (1977); and Leitz & Towle (1978) studies on competencies. Nevin's study investigated the perceptions of superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors of special education, and elementary and secondary school principals in Vermont. Waters investigated the competencies as perceived by doctoral graduates in special education administration and employing officials, while Leitz similiarly investigated competencies as perceived by Wisconsin elementary principals, directors of special education, and superintendents.

Nevin and Leitz identified the necessity of competencies in "due process", while the competency of "input into instruction" was identified in studies by Betz, Nevin, Waters, and Newman (1970). Newman studied directors' of special education perceptions on the ideal versus the actual performance in the ranking of tasks used in the administration of special education programs. The competency of "design and implement programs according to regulations" was cited in studies by Betz, Nevin, Leitz, and Newman. The competency concerning "promote positive attitude" was not cited in any of the aforementioned studies.

Of the five competency statements which received the

highest mean index of value, the Pearson R coefficient of stability was low on the competency statements concerning "rules for discipline", "select personnel", and "implement programs according to regulations". The pilot sample consisted of general education teachers as opposed to the study's sample which consisted of educational administrators. The pilot sample's inexperience with administrative tasks could have been an extraneous factor which contributed to the low correlation coefficient. Other competency statements demonstrating coefficients which did not reflect stability were: "education in the least restrictive environment"; "qualify staff"; "identify eligible students"; and "fiscal accountability".

2.   Competency statement #29, "establish and implement rules for conduct in the schools", was selected most often as an essential competency. Discipline is still a major concern of general education administrators (Burns, 1985). Burns cites three reasons why discipline continues to be a major problem in the schools:

    1) no consistency in enforcing simple rules;

    2) no discussion in regard to expectations;

    3) no assistance in true reoccurring discipline
       problems.

Several articles published by Phi Delta Kappa have addressed the problem of discipline. Baker (1985) feels a discipline problem in the schools leads to student, teacher, and ultimately learning as victims. Baker supports the idea that a good educational environment is determined by discipline. This philosophy of improving discipline by improving the general quality of education is supported by Hyman and D'Alessandro (1985) and Bauer (1985). Bauer's article on restoring order to public schools supported President Reagan's efforts toward improved discipline and reduction in school violence. Reagan has established the National School Safety Center; supported Department of Education research into school discipline, and the Department of Education and National Institute of Justice joint project to help local school districts prevent school crime; and worked with the Department of Justice on friend-of-the-court briefs which assist in increasing the authority of teachers, principals, and other school administrators in dealing with the problem of school discipline.

The literature is quite supportive of the need for discipline in quality education. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the subjects in this study assigned the rating

of essential to the competency of "establish and implement rules for conduct".

3. Although no competency statement received a mean rating of unnecessary (1), the competency statement with the lowest mean score was "assist in the development of individual educational programs for particular students". Many of the principals (51.8%) and assistant principals (31.9%) rated this competency as valuable. It is assumed that although this competency may be important, the task is most likely delegated to other personnel.

The Education For All Handicapped Act (1975) specifies the participants involved in the I.E.P. process. Regulation 300.344 states one of the participants must be "a representative of the public agency other than the child's teacher, who is qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of special education." The term "qualified" was addressed in an Education for the Handicapped Law Report, Schenck, EHA 211:264 (1981). In response to the inquiry on the definition of the term "qualified", the Digest of Response by Shirley A. Jones stated, "state and local education agencies may define who is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of special education with the understanding that the individual must have the authority to

commit agency resources." Tne assigning of a low index of

value score to the competency statement addressing the

development of I.E.P. programs for particular students may

indicate some confusion on the part of the principals

concerning the intent of the law and a possible lack of

knowledge in regard to specific guidelines for procedural

safeguards. Generally, the principal or assistant principal

are the most logical "other representative" given the low

number of special education supervisory staff in Virginia

school divisions.

4.   An index of value of essential, highly valuable, or

valuable was assigned to almost every competency statement.

Both the principals and assistant principals felt the thirty

competency statements were valuable as reflected in the mean

scores of 3.16 or higher for each competency statement.

These findings are supported by the aforementioned studies

on competencies necessary to administer special education

programs. Competency statements cited as necessary in this

study were also cited in studies using other populations.

5.   Principals and assistant principals were asked to

identify first, second, and third priority statements. The

principals identified the competency statements of

"evaluation for referred students", "evaluate personnel",

"implement programs according to regulations", "assess needs according to regulations", and "select personnel" as priority statements. The assistant principals identified "promote positive attitudes", "rules for discipline", "implement programs according to regulations", "provide variety of instruction", and "select personnel" as priority statements. Other studies on competencies have identified many of these competency statements as either necessary or as priorities. The competency statement on "evaluation of personnel" was identified as necessary in Waters' and Leitz's studies. "Assess needs according to regulations" was identified in Betz's study and in Nevin's study where a similiar competency on least restrictive environment was cited. The competency statement on "promote positive attitudes" was not identified in any of the previous studies.

6. The chi-square test for independence was conducted on the thirty competency statements. The chi-square analysis examined the total group score for the individual competency statement and the scores on the five separate index of value categories within the competency statement. The index of value rating scale was dependent on the position of the field incumbent. The chi-square test was also conducted on

the principals' and assistant principals' selection of
priority statements. The selection of the first priority
statement was dependent on the position of the field
incumbent while the second and third priority statements
were independent of the position. The chi-square analysis
separated each competency statement by index of value
rating. In essence, the chi-square analyzed each competency
statement five times, once for each index of value rating.
For this reason there were more differences than
similarities in the principals' and assistant principals'
ratings of competency statements, hence the index of value
rating was dependent on the position of the person
generating the index of value. When the priority statements
were analyzed, the chi-square analysis examined the
similarities and differences of the responses of the
principals and assistant principals. There were fewer
variables to be analyzed in the chi-square analysis of
priority statements. The selection of the first priority
statement was dependent on the position of the person
generating the selection. The second and third priority
statements were independent of the position of the person
generating the selection of priority statements.

7. Of the demographic variables analyzed for their

relationship to the priority statements, none were found to
be significant predictors. The predictor demographic
variables were: certification, academic background, clock
hours of instruction in special education courses, years
experience in current position, and percent of students
enrolled in special education programs. Nevin investigated
the relationship between the rating of competencies and the
demographic variables of position, years experience,
academic level, years in current position, and presence of a
handicapped person in the family, and found none had a
relationship with the rating of competencies. Newman found a
direct relationship between training in exceptional children
education and performance in the administrative tasks of
planning, directing, and in-service training. She also found
a relationship between experience in teaching special
education and the administrative tasks of curriculum
planning, development of programs, and evaluation of special
education teachers.

Discussion

The provision of educational and related services for
handicapped children has been examined in relation to
competencies required of state directors of special

145

education, local directors of special education, and elementary school principals. Prior to the conduct of this study, no one had researched competencies required of secondary school principals in the administration of school-based special education programs. The major purpose of this study was to identify competencies needed by secondary principals and assistant principals to effectively develop, supervise, monitor, and evaluate school-based special education programs.

Competency statements were generated from the literature and validated by a panel of experts. Data were gathered on principals' and assistant principals' perceptions of competency statements by rating the competencies on a scale which categorized the competencies into five value areas; essential, highly valuable, valuable, limited value, or unnecessary. In addition, from these thirty competency statements, principals and assistant principals identified the top three statements which received first, second, and third priority ratings. The total response to the instrument was 54% (135 returns). Data were reported in tables with responses tabulated by raw data (frequencies), means, and standard deviations. Data which compared the responses of principals and assistant

principals were reported in tabular form.

A review of the index of value and priority ratings indicate that the principals and assistant principals perceived all the competency statements used in this instrument as valuable in the administration of school-based special education programs. The panel members who validated the initial instrument expressed the same perceptions as the field incumbents. Competency statements in the function area of "Management of the Total Education Process", including the infusion of special education needs, and competencies on the "design and implementation of special education programs in accordance with state and federal policies and guidelines" were among the competency statements perceived as valuable in the administration of school-based special education programs.

Competency statements reflecting the "evaluation of staff personnel" rated highly valuable on the index of value. These competency statements pertained to competencies needed to assist in the selection and evaluation of personnel. Although secondary principals do not need to possess teaching skills in all instructional areas, they should possess the skills of a Master Teacher so that they can act in the capacity of an instructional leader (Petrie &

Burton, 1980). If the principal and assistant principal

value the selection and evaluation of personnel, it would be

safe to conclude that their instructional knowledge base

would be reflective of a familiarity with the subject

matter, style, and method of delivery appropriate for that

group of students. This assumption can not be made in the

area of special education instruction. Given the specificity

of special education instructional methods, learning

characteristics of handicapped students, and various types

of adapted programs, it would be unrealistic for principals

to possess competencies in all areas of instruction for

handicapped students. However, the principal or assistant

principal should be versed in the day to day building

supervision of these programs and should be exposed to a

variety of instructional programs specifically designed for

handicapped learners. This broad base approach to evaluation

may not make the administrator a master teacher in special

education, but it will allow the administrator to provide

input into programmatic decision making strategies.

Although many administrative competencies apply to

both general and special education, the acquisition of

specific knowledge and skills concerning the administration

of programs for handicapped students should be obtained

through pre- or in-service training. The results of this ✓

study appear to be consistent with the findings of other

researchers. The preferred competency statements which

appear in this study are related to the list of competency

statements rated as essential in Nevin's (1977) study of

competencies generated by general education administrators.

Those competencies included a) assure due process; b)

effectively implement federal and state mandates; c) enable

better communication within various groups; d) comply with

due process and confidentiality requirements; e) determine

staff functions and qualifications required to conduct

programs, including infusion of special education needs, as

essential competencies which principals and assistant

principals should possess. In addition, adherence to special

education policies established by state and local

regulations were also reflected in the findings of this

study.

Although the lack of variance in responses to the

questions on demographic variables and the small number of

respondents may have interfered with the ability to use

number of clock hours of instruction in special education as

a predictor of competency statements, it should be pointed

out that 67.3% of the principals and 73.1% of the assistant

principals reported between 0 and 25 clock hours of
instruction in special education, the equivalent to less
than one academic course.

In the Commonwealth of Virginia a requirement for
certification in School Administration is experience as a
classroom teacher. The Certification Regulations for
Teachers published by the Board of Education, Commonwealth
of Virginia (1982) states the basic preparatory program for
teachers should include a course in professional studies
which enables the learner to "recognize individual
differences, and develop competencies in the recognition of
student exceptionalities and diversity of needs" (1982, page
17). The regulations also state the student teacher
component shall be a learning experience incompassing all of
the roles of a teacher, including experience with
exceptional individuals, including gifted and talented and
those with handicapping conditions. In the section on the
qualifications for Administrative, Supervision, and Related
Instructional and Non-Instructional positions, it states
school principals and assistant principals must "provide
knowledge of and competence in planning, developing,
administering, and evaluating programs for exceptional
individuals, including the gifted and talented and those

with handicapping conditions" (Board of Education, 1982, page 60).

Of the twelve Virginia institutions of higher education that offer courses toward the certification of educational administration, only six offer graduate courses in special education or special education related courses. Of the six institutions, five offer courses on specific content areas in one or more of the recognized categories of disability. Only one institution, Virginia Tech, offers state approved courses in the Administration and Supervision of Special Education. Although these courses are open to all graduate students, until recently special education administration courses were not required as part of the core or applied plan of studies for general education administration students. In 1983 the Educational Administration Program Area required one course in Administration and Supervision of Special Education to be used in the applied area of course requirements for the students' program of studies in General Educational Administration. Courses in Legal Aspects, Contemporary Issues, Administration and Supervision of Special Education Programs, or Administration of Special Programs can be used in fulfilling the requirement for graduate credits in

Educational Administration.

The reform of pre-service course requirements for special education alone is not adequate. All aspects of general education should be willing to reform their programs to meet the needs of a changing society (Corrigan, 1978). Without the interfacing of theory and practice, these special education administration courses will lose their influence on the application of the skills and knowledge learned in training. Instruction for administrators at the pre- and in-service level of instruction should incorporate skills acquired through administration and supervision of special education programs as part of the administrative practices of general educators.

The competency statement "to arrange appropriate evaluation for those students recommended for referral" was rated as a priority statement. This selection complimented the respondent's choice of competency statements which addressed programs in accordance with approved policies, procedures, and guidelines. One could assume that the secondary principals in Virginia possess at least limited information on the state and federal regulations governing the education of all handicapped children. One of the requirements for certification in educational administration

is instruction in School Law. It is likely that information concerning the laws governing all educational programs, including special education programs, are addressed in School Law classes. The literature is supportive of this type of "training in common approach" (Culbertson, 1963, Miklos, 1972). Courses of this nature philosophically approach the interfacing of the two disciplines of general and special education administration.

The interfacing of general and special education law specifically addresses the need principals' have voiced in the provision of programs that are in compliance with state and federal regulations. The desire to address the implications of P.L. 94-142 through general education responsibilities may be reflective of an attitude which increases the individualization of education for all students, not only those mandated by policy or law (Skrtic, Knowlton, Clark, 1979). General school administrators who have neither the personal experience with handicapped persons nor the academic contact with special education areas of instruction should be exposed to other administrative topics that contain special education emphasis.

Conclusions

1.   When asked about competency statements on the
administration of school-based special education programs,
the principals and assistant principals surveyed in this
study did not respond in a similiar manner when rating these
competencies on an index of value. The perceived value of
competency statements is attributed to the position a person
occupies.

2.   Although the mean index of value ratings were
different, the same five competency statements were
generated as having the highest value. The competency
statements were: rules for discipline; select personnel;
implement due process; enable improvement of instruction;
and implement programs according to regulations.

3.   According to the mean index of value rating, all thirty
competency statements on this instrument were rated by
principals and assistant principals as valuable.

4.   Principals selected competency statements in evaluation
for referred students, evaluate personnel, implement
programs according to regulations, assess needs according to
regulations, and select personnel as having highest
priority.

154

5. Assistant principals selected competency statements in promote positive attitudes, rules for discipline, implement programs according to regulations, provide for a variety of instruction, and select personnel as having highest priority.

6. None of the demographic variables surveyed on this instrument were significant predictors of the priority rating of competency statements.

Recommendations

The following recommendations include further research in the field of administration of school-based special education programs and recommendations for utilizing information found in this research study.

1. Competency statements in administration of school-based special education programs that surfaced as a result of this study should be task analyzed from a training perspective. The analysis should include separation for the identification of knowledge, and task specification. Specific criteria with performance indicators should be generated to aid in the training process and in the evaluation of administrators' competence.

2. Once identified, these competencies and performance

indicators should be validated in the Virginia Public School

System. The validation between perceived index of value and

actual proficiency in the area of competence could prove

instrumental in the design and implementation of pre- and

in-service training courses for general education

administrators. Although studies on persons responsible for

the administration of special education programs have been

previously conducted (Nevin, 1977; Newman, 1970), research

on the types of competencies required, by whom, and under

what conditions needs to be validated on the Virginia high

school population.

3.   Training materials and delivery systems should be

developed and implemented to assist Virginia's general

education administrators to increase their proficiency in

the relevant competency areas. Further research is needed on

how best to impart information which encompasses cognitive,

attitudinal, and procedural competencies. The results of a

study by Olsen (1982) on Virginia secondary principals'

knowledge and attitude toward Public Law 94-142 showed that

principals expressed a high degree of awareness of two

separate factors specific to P.L. 94-142, mainstreaming and

the least restrictive environment. Principals were least

knowledgeable in two areas basic to the legislation; those

students who should qualify for special education, and the term "appropriateness". Principals demonstrated the least positive attitude toward the local funding of special education programs.

Given the findings of the Olsen study and the findings of this research, a comprehensive state wide administrative training program addressing specific special education administration practices is necessary to identify strengths and weaknesses of cognitive, attitudinal, and procedural competencies. In addition, the training program should be sensitive to the already existing skills and knowledge of practicing adminstrators.

The proposed research should focus not only on the content imparted to administration, but also the best methods of disseminating the information. Sands (1983) reported in her study of in-service training that schools, being the stable institutions they are, often resist change. Only well planned and well executed in-service training will have a significant impact on the participants. Even then, the impact can be felt only over a period of time. Learning will take place when the in-service training is practical and relevant to the participants' environment.

4) The Virginia State Department of Education should

address the need for infusion of special education
administration courses into general education administration
training programs. In the past, certification requirements
have been adjusted to meet the changing needs of students
with the addition of competencies in drug and alcohol abuse
and vocational programs. So too should the system attend to
the growing needs for competencies in school-based special
education administration.

Federal and state rules and regulations pertaining to
personnel development make local and state education
agencies accountable for providing in-service education.
Educational administrators in local education agencies hold
major responsibility for the implementation of P.L. 94-142
and Section 504 regulations. Although pre-service programs
are changing, current pre-service programs are not designed
to meet the needs generated by these responsibilities
(Herda, 1980). The regulations require that annual needs
assessments be conducted to determine in-service training
needs and that on going in-service programs be made
available to all personnel engaged in the education of
handicapped students (Education of Handicapped Children,
1977, 300.139). To ensure the active participation of
appropriate personnel in such programs, each annual program

plan must provide for incentives such as "release time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, salary step credit, certification renewal, or updating professional skills" (Education of Handicapped Children, 1977, 300.139).

According to Skrtic et al. (1979), the following specific guidelines for ongoing in-service education programs should be incorporated for teachers and administrators of handicapped students:

1) In-service education related to the education of handicapped students based on an assessment of the strengths and needs of the general and special education personnel.

2) General and special education personnel should assume roles as planners and teachers of in-service programs.

3) In-service education programs should provide participants many different ways to accomplish individual goals.

4) Evaluation should examine the impact of in-service education on participants' behavior and ultimately on student performance.

5) Local education agencies must make a commitment to

the concept of continuing professional development through implementation of an ongoing coordinated in-service program.

6) In-service education should be a collaborative effort that recognizes and uses the strengths of the local and state education agencies.

By providing incentives and tuition reimbursement, the Virginia State Department of Education could arrange to meet these needs for those administrators who fail to meet a sufficient level of competence in the administration of school-based special education programs. The provision of training should occur through a collaborative effort with Colleges, Universities, local school divisions, and the State Department of Education. By merging fiscal and human resources and obtaining input on specific needs of local school divisions, each member involved in the collaborative effort could feel they have input into the training model. Currently, there are three fiscal resources available for in-service training. Some flow through money is available through Part B of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA, 1975). The state also has the power to apply for Part D funds from EHA which addresses professional development. Part D funding for in-service training is

available to State Departments of Education in the form of grants. A third option would be the allocation of money for in-service training directly from the Virginia State Department of Education budget. However the money is obtained, funds could then be earmarked for the training of personnel and provide the financial base upon which collaborative efforts could be arranged. The coordination of a statewide training project could allow the Virginia State Department of Education to develop a model of exemplary training programs.

REFERENCES

161

References

AASA. (1982) <u>Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators: Superintendent Career Development Series No. 1.</u> Arlington, Virginia.

Anderson, E.B. & Schipper, W.V. (1974). <u>Functions/tasks of State Directors of Special Education.</u> Washington, D.C.: NASDSE.

Austin, D.B. & Brown, H. (1970). <u>Report of the Assistant Princpalship, The Study of the Secondary School Principalship, Volume III,</u> NASSP, Washington, D.C.

Baker, K. (1985). Research evidence of a school discipline problem. <u>Phi Delta Kappan, 66,</u> (7), 482-488.

Bauer, G.L. (1985). Restoring order to the public schools. <u>Phi Delta Kappan, 66,</u> (7), 488-491.

Betz, M.L. (1977). The development of building principal's competencies in the administration of programs for the handicapped. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Black, A.B. (1980). Clarifying the role of the assistant principal. <u>NASSP, Bulletin, 64,</u> (436), 33-39.

Blackhurst, A.E., Wright, W.S., & Ingram, C.F. (1974). <u>Competency specifications for directors of special education resource centers</u> (USOE Project OEG-0-72-4305 (603)). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Board of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia (1982). <u>Certification regulations for teachers.</u> Richmond, Virginia.

Bobroff, J.L., Howard, J.G. & Howard, A.W. (1974). The principalship: Junior high and middle school. The Principalship, 58, 54-61.

Brottman, M.A. (1981). The assistant principal as decision maker. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 493)

Bullock, L.M. (1970). An inquiry into the special education training of elementary school administrators. Exceptional Children, 36, (10), 770-771.

Burgess, L. (1976). The assistant principal: Where now? NASSP Bulletin, 60, (399).

Burns, J.A. (1985). Discipline: Why does it continue to be a problem? NASSP Bulletin, 69, (479), 1-5.

Burrello, L. & Betz, M. (1977). The development and validation of building principal competencies on administration of programs for the handicapped. Bureau for Education of the Handicapped Innovation and Devlopment, USOE.

Childress, J.A. (1973). The challenge of the assistant principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 57, (375), 1-9.

Cochrane, P.V. & Westling, D.L. (1977). The principal and mainstreaming: Ten suggestions for success. Educational Leadership, 34, (7), 506-510.

Cone, W.H. & Hyatt, J.A. (1980). The principal: Key manager in mainstreaming. Interstate Compact for Education, 14, (2) 13-15.

Cook, H.H. & Van Otten, K.P. (1972). A study of prime competencies required to perform the tasks of the secondary school principalship. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah <u>Dissertation Abstracts Internationsl</u> (University Microfilms No. 73-6270).

Corrigan, D.C. (1978). P.L. 94-142: A matter of human rights; A call for change in schools and colleges of education. In Grosenick, J. K. & Reynolds, M. C. <u>Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming</u>. Minneapolis: Minnesota.

Council for Exceptional Children (1976). <u>Guidelines for personnel in the education of exceptional children</u>. Reston, Virginia.

Crossland, C.L., Fox, B.J. & Baker, R. (1982). Differential perceptions of role responsibilities among professionals in the public school. <u>Exceptional Children</u>, <u>48</u>, (6), 356-358.

Culbertson, J. (1963). Common and specialized content in the preparation of administrators. In D.J. Leu & H.C. Rudman (Eds.), <u>Preparation Programs for School Administrators Common and Specialized Learining</u> (pp.34-60). Michigan: Michigan State University.

Culbertson, J. (1979). <u>Planning and Changing</u>, <u>10</u>, (3), 146-149. UCEA Publication, Columbus, Ohio.

Downey, L.W. (1963). The secondary school principal. In D.J. Lau & H.C. Rudman (Eds.), <u>Preparation Programs for School Administrators</u> (pp. 123-136). Michigan: Michigan State University.

Drake, J.M. & Miller, B.P. (1982). The expanding role of the principal in the 1980's. <u>NASSP Bulletin</u>, <u>66</u>, (455-458), 18-27.

Education For All Handicapped Children Act. (1975). Office
    of Education, Department of Health, Education, and
    Welfare. Federal Register, 42, No. 163, Tuesday,
    August 23, 1977.

Farquhar, R.H. & Piele, P.K. (1972). Preparing Educational
    Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature, UCEA,
    Ohio:Ohio State University.

Fields, J.C. (1982). Principals and management training
    needs. NASSP, Bulletin, 66, 450-454.

Franklin, H., Nickens, J.M., & Appleby, S.A. (1980). What
    activities keep principals the busiest? NASSP Bulletin,
    64, 74-80.

Gable, R.K., Pecheone, R.L., & Gillung, T.B. (1981). A needs
    assessment model for establishing personnel training
    priorities. Teacher Education and Special Education, 4,
    (4), p. 8-14.

Geer, W. (1966). Professional standards project report.
    Council for Exceptional Children, 48-52.

Goldhammer, K. (1963). Social sciences and preparation of
    educational administrators. UCEA,
    Ohio:Ohio State University

Gordon, R. & McIntyre, K. (1978). The Senior High School
    Principalship, The Effective Principal, Volume II, NASSP,
    Washington, D.C.

Graff, O.W. & Street, C.M. (1956). Improving Competencies in
    Educational Administration. New York: Southern States
    Cooperative Project in Educational Administration.

Haisley, F.S., & Gilberts, R.D. (1978).Individual
    competencies needed to implement P.L. 94-142. Journal of
    Teacher Education, 29, 30-33.

Harris, B.M. & King, J.D. (1974). Professional supervisor
    competencies: Competency specification for instructional
    leadership personnel in special education, Special
    Education Supervisors Training Project.
    University of Texas, Austin: Texas.

Heller, H.W. (1983). Special education and professional
    standards. Exceptional Children, 50, (3).

Herda, E.A. (1980). Aspects of general education governance
    and Public Law 94-142 implications. Focus On Exceptional
    Children, 12, (5) 1-12.

Hill, P. (1980). The effects of federal education programs
    on school principals: A Rand Note (Contract No. 300 79
    0522). Washington, D.C.: Department of Health Education
    and Welfare.

Hill, P., Wuchitech, J, & Williams, R. (1980). The Effects
    of Federal Education Programs on School Principals, A
    Rand Note, Santa Monica, California.

Hilton, A., Faught, K.K. & Hagan, M. (1984). A yardstick for
    special education. Principalship, 64, (2), 34-36.

Hinkle, D.E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (1979). Applied
    Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Houghton Mifflin
    Co., Boston, Massachusetts.

Huck, S.W., Cornier, W.H. & Bounds, W.G. (1974). Reading
    Statistics and Research. Harper & Row, Inc., New York.

Hyman, I.A. & D'Alessandro, J. (1985). Good, old-fashioned
    discipline: The politics of punitiveness. Phi Delta
    Kappan, 66, (1), 39-45.

Irving Independent School District v. Tatro, 104 S.Ct.3371, January, 1985.

Irwin, B.S. (1983). A descriptive study of the secondary school principal's role in mainstreaming in the Los Angeles Unified School District as perceived by the principal, superintendent, and selected teachers. Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

Johnson, A.B. & Gold, V. (1980). The principal's role in implementing P.L. 94-142. The Clearing House, 54, (1), 32-35.

Jones, P.R. (1981). A practical guide to federal special education law. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston Publishers, New York, New York.

Jones, P.R. & Wilkerson, W.R. (1975). Preparing Special Education Administrators. Theory Into Practice, 14, (2), Ohio State University, College of Education, Columbus:Ohio.

Katz, R.L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 33, 33-42.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research. Second Edition. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., New York.

Klopf, G.J., Scheldon, E. & Brennan, K. (1982). The essentials of effectiveness: A job description for principals. Principal, March, 35-39.

Knezevich, S.J. (1982). Doctorate Needs in Educational Administration During the 1970's and 1980's: A Preliminary Analysis. UCEA, Columbus: Ohio.

Kriekard, J.A. & Norton, M.S. (1980). Using the competency approach to define the assistant principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 64, (436), 1-8.

Leu, D.J. & Rudman, H.C. (Eds.). (1963). Preparation Programs for School Administrators Common and Specialized Learning. Michigan: Michigan State University.

Lietz, J.J. (1980). The interactive relationship between selected demographic and leadership characteristics of public elementary school principals and their special education responsibilities and placement decisions. Doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Lietz, J.J. & Kaiser, J.S. (1979). The principal's role in administering programs for exceptional children. Education, 100, (1), 31-40.

Lietz, J.J. & Towle, M. (1982). The Elementary Principal's Role in Special Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishing Company.

Lietz, J.J. & Towle, M. (1978). The principal's role in special education services. Education Research Quarterly, 4, (3), 12-20.

LoPresti, P.L. (1982). Building a better principal. Principal, March, 32-34.

Mackie, R.P. & Engel, A.M. (1955). Directors and supervisors of special education. U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin #13.

Mann, P.H. (1976). Shared Responsibilities for Handicapped Students. Miami: Banyan Books, Inc.

Martin, T.J. & Lietz, J.J. (1980). Wisconsin principal's role in exceptional programs. AWSA Bulletin, 44, 30-32.

Mazor, G. (1977). The role of special education
    administrators as viewed by principals, superintendents,
    and special education administrators. Doctoral
    dissertation, Boston College, Boston, Massachusetts.

McIntyre, K.E. & Grant, E.A. (1980). How principals,
    teachers, and superintendents view the principalship.
    NASSP Bulletin, 64, (433), 44-49.

Meisgeier, C. & King, J. (1970). Process of Special
    Education Administration.Scranton, Pennsylvania:
    International Textbook Company.

Meisgeier, C. & Sloat, R. (1969). Common and specialized
    learnings, competencies, and experiences for special
    education administrators, The National Consortium of
    Universities Preparing Administrators of Special
    Education. (USOE/BEH Grant OEG-0-8-003212-3212-031).

Miklos, E. (1972). Training In-Common for Educational,
    Public, and Business Administrators, UCEA series on
    administrator preparation. Interstate Printers &
    Publishers, Inc. Danville, Illinois.

Miklos, E. (1983). Evolution in administrators preparation
    programs. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19, (3),
    153-177.

Miller, V. (1964). Common and Specialized Learning for
    Educational Administrators. UCEA, Columbus, Ohio.

Mulhauser, F. (1983). Recent research on the principalship:
    A view from NIE. Paper presented at the meeting of Center
    for Educational Research and Innovation, International
    School Improvement Project, West Palm Beach, Florida.

Nevin, A. (1979). Special education administration
    competencies required of general education
    administrators. Yearbook of Special Education, 5, 48-50.

Nevin, A. (1977). Special education administration
    competencies required of general education
    administrators. Doctoral Dissertation, University of
    Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Newman, K.S. (1970). Administrative tasks in special
    education. Exceptional Children, 36, (7), 521-524.

Nickerson, N.C. (1980). The principalship revisited
    ...again. NASSP Bulletin, 64, (436), 44-50.

Norusis, M.J. (1983). Introductory statistics guide, SPSSX.
    McGraw-Hill Book Company, SPSS Inc.. Chicago, Illinois.

Olsen, J. (1983). Public secondary school principals'
    knowledge of and attitude toward Public Law 94-142 and
    their relationship to the provision of special education
    services at the building level. Dissertation, Virginia
    Poltytechnic Institute and State University.

Owens, R.G. (1970). Organizational Behavior in Schools.
    Prentice Hall, Inc.: New Jersey.

Owens, R.G. & Steinhoff, C.R. (1976). Administering Change
    in Schools. Prentice Hall, Inc.: New Jersey.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (1978). Pennsylvania
    competency-based teacher education inventories of
    specialized competencies, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:
    Department of Education.

Petrie, T.A. & Burton, B. (1980). Levels of leader
    development. Educational Leadership, 37, (8), 628-631.

Purcell, C. (1984). An analysis of the due process rights
    afforded to handicapped and nonhandicapped students as
    they relate to suspension and expulsion from public
    school. Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
    State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Raske, D.E. (1979). The role of general school administrators responsible for special education programs. Exceptional Children, 45, (8), 645-646.

Robson, D. (1981). Administering special education services for the handicapped: Role expectations and perceptions. Exceptional Children, 47, (5), 377-378.

Sage, D.D. (1968). Functional emphasis in special edication administration. Exceptional Children, 35, 69-70.

Sands, J.L. (1983). The acquisition and retention of special education information in regard to needs satisfaction and practicability of inservice training for secondary teachers. Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Schipper, W.V. (1974). Competencies and in-service training needs of State directors of special education. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Logan, Utah.

Skrtic, T.M., Knowlton, E. & Clark, F.L. (1979). Action versus reaction: A curriculum development approach to in-service education. Focus On Exceptional Children, 11, (1), 1-16.

Stile, S.W. & Pettibone, T.J. (1980). Training and certification of administrators in special education. Exceptional Children, 46, (7), 530-533.

Vance, V.L. (1973). A follow-up study of students of special education administration who received USOE/BEH Training Grants. Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Walters, D.E. (1979). Perceptions of administrative
    competencies: A survey of school principals and
    superintendents. Department of Educational
    Administration, Temple University. Philadelphia,
    Pennsylvania. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service
    No. ED 172 361).

Waters, L.L. (1974). Employing officials and doctoral
    graduates' perceptions of special education
    administrators competencies in three midwestern states.
    Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Wynn, R. (1972). Unconventional Methods and Materials for
    Preparing Educational Administrators. UCEA,
    Ohio:Ohio State University.

APPENDIX A

VASSP ENDORSEMENT

VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
Koger Executive Center • 1501 Santa Rosa Road, Suite A-7 • Richmond, Virginia 23288

August 28, 1985

Ms. Melanie Yules
c/o Division of Administrative and
  Educational Services
University City Office Building
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Dear Ms. Yules:

    I am pleased to endorse your study on the "Competencies
Required of High School Principals in the Administration of
School-Based Special Education Programs."

    It is my understanding that this study is being conducted
as part of your research for your doctoral dissertation at
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

    It is my hope that, as many high school principals as possible
will respond to your survey instrument because it appears that
meaningful data may be derived from such a study.

    I wish you much success in your study.

                              Sincerely, _

                              Randy D. Barrack, Ed.D.
                              Executive Director

RDB/nbh

cc: Cecil G. Layman, Jr.
     President, VASSP

APPENDIX B

Matrix of Competency Statements

Matrix of Competency Statements

	Waters	White	NASDSE	Betz	Nevin	Leitz	Literature
Functions and corresponding competency statements							
(A) Organize Special Education Programs							
1.			X		X		
2.			X		X	X	
3.		X			X		+
4.		X			X		
5.		X					
6.	X				X		
7.							*
8.		X					
9.					X	X	+
(B) Manage the total educational process.							
10.	X		X	X	X		
11.	X		X		X		+
12.	X			X	X		
(C) Advise curriculum development operations.							
13.	X	X		X	X		
14.	X	X		X			+
(D) Plan for staff development.							
15.	X	X		X		X	
16.	X	X	X	X			+
(E) Coordinate student personnel activities.							
17.	X	X			X		
18.					X	X	+
19.					X		
(F) Offer information and resources for positive community relations.							
20.	X	X		X	X		+
21.	X			X			
22.					X		
(G) Evaluate staff personnel.							
23.	X	X				X	
24.	X	X		X	X		
25.				X	X	X	
(H) Manage fiscal/plant operations.							
26.	X				X		+
27.		X			X		
28.	X			X	X		+
29.							*
30.				X	X		

+   Bank Street College of Education (1982)

*   Purcell (1983)

APPENDIX C

Letter to Panel Members

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia · 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Dear

    I am currently initiating a dissertation study in the assessment of competencies needed by high school principals in the administration of school based special education programs. This study is being undertaken due to the expanding role of the high school principal as it relates to special education as reported in the literature. Although some similiar studies on competencies in special education have been conducted, no one study has focused on the competencies required of high school principals.

    I would like for you to serve as an expert panel member in the refinement of the instrument which will be used in my dissertation study. Other panel members include directors of special education, university professors, and practicing high school principals. The expert panel's task is to provide feedback on the content, clarity and applicability of the thirty competency statements.

    Enclosed you will find a copy of the instrument and directions to utilize in your review of the instrument. Please return your comments in the enclosed stamped, self addressed envelope. It is most important that you return your reactions as soon as possible.

    We appreciate your assistance in the process of instrument development. Your time and efforts help assure the development of a valid instrument.

Sincerely,

Melanie Yules,
Doctoral Student

Philip R. Jones, Professor
Administration & Supervision
of Special Education

encl.

APPENDIX D

Survey Instrument

Part I

The following questionnaire is designed to assess your opinion regarding
the competencies a high school principal should have in order to
administer school based special education programs. Please respond to the
following competency statements using the criteria below to rate the
index of value.

1. UNNECESSARY   not needed in the normal conduct of administrative
        duties.
2. LIMITED VALUE a knowledge of the basic nature of the content is
        necessary, but knowledge to demonstrate the
        skill is not needed.
3. VALUABLE   beneficial in the conduct of administrative duties, but
        a person could function without it.
4. HIGHLY VALUABLE a person in the role of the principal would be
        impaired in the conduct of duties if the competency was
        absent.
5. ESSENTIAL   it is impossible to perform the central functions of
        the job if you do not have this competency.

Index of Value   Competency Statements
A. IN ORGANIZING SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
                 SHOULD BE ABLE TO . . .

  1   2   3   4   5   (1). arrange appropriate evaluation for those
                      students recommended for referral.

  1   2   3   4   5   (2). implement due process procedures.

  1   2   3   4   5   (3). coordinate with other agencies
                      serving handicapped children (including those
                      district children in residential institutions).

  1   2   3   4   5   (4). show, with data, that handicapped children are
                      being educated in the least restrictive
                      environment.

  1   2   3   4   5   (5). chair eligibility committees on individual
                      pupil problems.

  1   2   3   4   5   (6). assist in the development of individualized
                      educational programs for particular students.

  1   2   3   4   5   (7). supervise additional procedures necessary for
                      suspension or expulsion of handicapped students.

  1   2   3   4   5   (8). make final decisions regarding placement for
                      special services.

                                          go on to next page

A. IN ORGANIZING SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
        SHOULD BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5 (9). assist regular education staff and faculty in the
                redesigning of their programs to meet the needs of
                handicapped students.

B. IN MANAGING THE TOTAL EDUCATIONAL PROCESS, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
        SHOULD BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5 (10). assess existing needs for special education
                services which conform with federal and state laws
                and regulations.

1 2 3 4 5 (11). promote attitudes of school personnel, parents,
                and community that encourage the acceptance and
                inclusion of handicapped children in regular classes and
                interaction with regular students.

1 2 3 4 5 (12). designate and implement educational programs for
                handicapped children in the schools, in accordance
                with approved policies, procedures, and guidelines
                of the LEA and of the State Department of
                Education.

C. IN SUPERVISING CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD
        BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5 (13). provide a variety of instructional systems to
                enable all students to acquire basic competencies
                (such as career orientation, languages).

1 2 3 4 5 (14). plan for continuous evaluation of and
                experimentation with curriculum and methodology.

D. IN PLANNING FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD
        BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5 (15). identify need for, provide, and coordinate
                in-service training for professional staff.

1 2 3 4 5 (16). provide for improvement of instruction,
                classroom visitations, and consultative services to
                personnel.

E. IN COORDINATING STUDENT PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
        SHOULD BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5 (17). establish activities for identifying, locating,
                and evaluating all children eligible for special
                education services.

1 2 3 4 5 (18). supervise the maintenance of the child's records
                at the school level and protect the confidentiality
                of those records.

1 2 3 4 5 (19). provide programs to assist students to solve
                problems in interpersonal relations with
                handicapped and non-handicapped peers, teachers,
                and family.

F. IN OFFERING INFORMATION AND RESOURCES FOR POSITIVE COMMUNITY
        RELATIONS, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD BE ABLE TO . .

1 2 3 4 5 (20). establish two-way interactive channels of
                communication for interpretation of special programs to
                parents and other schools within the division.

i 2 3 4 5 (21). explain school and school division special
                education instructional policies, procedures, and
                reports; instructional problems; and achievements
                to school constituency.

1 2 3 4 5 (22). use input from special education advisory
                committees in such a way that the advisory committee
                rates the principal's interaction as satisfactory.

G. IN EVALUATING STAFF PERSONNEL, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD
        BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5 (23). evaluate professional personnel with instruments
                and procedures that include professional competence in
                educating handicapped students.

1 2 3 4 5 (24). determine staff functions and qualifications
                that will be required to conduct programs for
                handicapped children.

1 2 3 4 5 (25). assist in the selection of personnel for
                instructional responsibilities.

H. IN MANAGING FISCAL/PLANT OPERATIONS, A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD
        BE ABLE TO . . .

1 2 3 4 5   (26). provide fiscal control and accounting
                 procedures which provide information on performance
                 to the state and public.

1 2 3 4 5   (27). coordinate student transportation and other
                 services to arrange for educational programs within
                 the least restrictive environment.

1 2 3 4 5   (28). plan for initiating and providing appropriate
                 physical environment for exceptional children in
                 coordination with the total school system.

1 2 3 4 5   (29). establish and implement rules and regulations
                 for student conduct in the school.

1 2 3 4 5   (30). budget, allocate, provide, and accept research
                 assistance to enable development of appropriate
                 programs for handicapped learners.

Are there any competency statements you would like to add?

_____

_____

Part II
Please scan your responses to the competency statements listed above and
then list the number of the one competency statement you feel is your
first priority, your second priority, and your third priority.

_____   _____   _____
First Priority   Second Priority   Third Priority

Part III

        General Information: Please check the appropriate box(s)

A.Sex(48)   B.Age(49)   C.Position(50)   D.Certification(51)
___ 1.Male   ___1.through 25 ___1.Principal   ___1.Gen.Ed.Adm.
___ 2.Female   ___2.26-35   ___2.Asst.Principal   ___2.Spec.Ed.Adm.
                 ___3.36-45   ___3.Other_____   ___3.Vocational Ed.
                 ___4.46-55   (indicate)   ___4.Business
                 ___5.55&over   ___5.Other_____
                                                                  (indicate)

E.Academic Background(52)
___ 1.Bachelor's degree +31 + (credit
___ 2.Master's degree   hours)
___ 3.Master's degree +16 +
___ 4.Certificate or Specialist
    degree
___ 5.Doctorate degree

F.Estimate number of clock hours of
instruction in special education(53)
    (one course = 30 clock hours)
___ 1.0-25 hours
___ 2.26-75 hours
___ 3.76-100 hours

G.Number of Years of Experience (by position) in Education (including
        this year)

Spec.Ed. Teacher	Reg.Ed. Teacher	Current Adm. Position	Other Adm. Position
___	___	___	___

H.Percent of students in your
school receiving special
education services(62)
___ 1. none
___ 2. 1-2%
___ 3. 3-4%
___ 4. 5-9%
___ 5. 10-15%

I.Your high school enrollment(63)
___ 1. 249 or less
___ 2. 250 - 499
___ 3. 500 - 999
___ 4. 1000 - 1499
___ 5. 1500 +

J.Would you like a summary of the findings of this study
___ 1. yes
___ 2. no

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please return it
in the enclosed, self addressed, stamped envelop. Again, thank you for
your cooperation.

APPENDIX E

Letter to Participants

VIRGINIA TECH

ivision of Administrative
nd Educational Services

University City Office Building
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear

    I am currently initiating a dissertation study in the
assessment of competencies needed by high school principals
in the administration of school-based special education
programs. This study is being conducted due to the expanding
role of the principal as it relates to special education
programs. The identification of these competencies will
provide information to guide principals in Virginia school
divisions and may provide input concerning the future
training of Virginia educational administrators. I would
appreciate it if you would complete the enclosed
questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self addressed
envelope. It is most important that you return the
questionnaire as soon as possible. Please be assured that
all replies will be held in strictest confidence. If you
would like the results shared with you at the completion of
the study, please indicate your preference on the last page
of the questionnaire.

    Your cooperation and quick reply is deeply appreciated.

                            Sincerely,

                            Melanie R. Yules
                            Doctoral Student

                            Philip R. Jones,
                            Professor and Coordinator
                            Administration & Supervision,
                            of Special Education

encl.

APPENDIX F

The Report on Non-Respondent Follow-Up Phone Calls

The Report on Non-Respondent Follow-Up Phone Calls

The reponse rate to the survey was 54%. A follow-up study was completed on the non-respondents to determine if the respondents to the mail out survey accurately reflected the opinions of the total population. Five high school principals and five assistant principals were randomly selected from the established sample list. The subjects were telephoned at their respective schools during working hours. Of the ten subjects called, eight were available and responded to the follow-up phone call. The summer school session had begun, and classes and meetings in which the principals and assistant principals had to participate were influencing factors in the response rate of the non-respondents.

The format for the follow-up phone calls was as follows:

1. The researcher identified who was calling, the purpose of the phone call, and requested ten minutes of the respondent's time to answer a few questions.

2. A short explanation of the survey was given with the reason for their selection for the follow-up study.

3. The list of the eight function areas with examples

of competency statements were read to the

respondents. They were encouraged to take notes.

4. The respondents were asked to rank the function

areas as first, second, and third priority.

5. The respondents were asked demographic information.

6. The respondents were asked if they had any

comments they would like to add. The respondents were

thanked for their time and cooperation.

This format was repeated with each subject. Some

respondents offered information as to why they didn't

respond to the first mail out survey. The reason most often

cited was the lack of time due to the closing of the school

year. Three principals discussed their feeling about special

education programs, how the programs fit into the

organizational structure of the school, and the delegation

of specific areas of responsibility to assistant principals.

Overall, the respondents to the mail out survey and the

respondent to the follow-up phone calls chose the same

function areas as important to the administration of

school-based special education programs. Both groups of

principals felt Managing the Total Educational Process (B),

should receive first priority. The selected function areas

of the follow-up respondents were too diverse to draw any

conclusions concerning the second priority. However, function area (G), Evaluation of Personnel which was selected as second priority by the mail out survey respondents was mentioned among the function areas selected by the follow-up respondents as second priority. The follow-up respondents selected function area (C), Supervision of Curriculum Development as third priority. This was not in agreement with the mail out survey respondents' selection of Staff Development, (D), as third priority.

As a group, the assistant principal responses to the follow-up phone calls were not in total agreement with each other. The wide range of responses made it difficult to compare priority selection to the mail out survey respondents. Although, at least one assistant principal in the follow-up group agreed with the first and third priority selection of the mail out survey group, Evaluation of Personnel, (G), and Staff Development, (D), none of the assistant principals in the follow-up group were in agreement with the mail out survey group's selection of Managing the Total Educational Process, (B), as a second priority. The majority of the follow-up group selected Organizing Special Education Programs, (A), as a second priority. Discussions which ensued after the priority

statements were selected revealed the responsibility of special education was often delegated to the assistant principal by their respective principals.

The information gathered on demographics reflected similiar characteristics between the two groups. Differences which occured in responses are assumed to be attributed to chance. In summary, responses from the follow-up phone call did not demonstrate total agreement with the mail out survey sample. However, trends in the selection of function areas were similiar for both groups. Given the small sample size and the variations in types of questions asked of the two groups, it is safe to assume that caution should be exercised when drawing conclusions about the representation of the total population.

VITA

The vita has been removed from
the scanned document