

ABSTRACT

Larry E. Price. Perceptions of Former Graduate Students Toward the Educational Administration and Supervision Program at East Carolina University. (Under the direction of Dr. James Pressley) Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, April 1988.

The purpose of this study was to determine the adequacy of preparation provided by East Carolina University's graduate program in Educational Administration and Supervision as perceived by the graduates of that program. More specifically, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What were the graduates' perceptions of the adequacy of preparation received through East Carolina University's Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in preparing the student for an administrative or supervisory role?
2. What were the graduates' perceptions of the overall quality of the preparation received at East Carolina University?
3. What problems, if any, did graduate students of Educational Administration and Supervision experience during the process of completing their program(s)?

The results of statistical analysis of the data from this study indicate that for every statement in the survey,

the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University is doing quite well in meeting the needs of the students. There are no mean scores that indicate that any particular area of the program is a weakness or that a less than adequate job is being done to meet the needs of the students. In part I of the instrument, six items received ratings of "very adequate." In part II, four items received the "very adequate" rating. In part III of the instrument, five items were rated as strengths of the program. In part IV, all items were rated as "very adequate."

On the surface these ratings appear to be very good, but one must not be lulled into a false sense of security. Nineteen of the items had very high numbers of respondents who rated various components of the program as adequate or less than adequate. Although the means support the overall program in Educational Administration and Supervision, there is room for improvement. The results of this study show that the program must work to improve itself, so that the overall confidence level of the program is much higher. Work must be done to reach for the exceedingly adequate rating and for program components to be rated as strengths. The respondents did not perceive any area of the program to be exceedingly adequate. None of the items in part III were rated as weaknesses. Five of the items were rated as acceptable. Those items had large numbers of respondents who rated the items on the bottom of the scale.

The results of this study indicate that East Carolina University's Department of Educational Administration and Supervision is doing a good job overall, but there is room for improvement in every phase of the program. The department should analyze its program including each course and make needed changes to improve the quality of the program.

Perceptions of Former Graduate Students Toward
the Educational Administration and Supervision Program
at East Carolina University

by

Larry Eugene Price

A Thesis
submitted to the School of Education
at East Carolina University

Greenville, NC

April 1988

19930463

Perceptions of Former Graduate Students Toward
the Educational Administration and Supervision Program
at East Carolina University

by

Larry E. Price

APPROVED BY:

James S. Dressler
Thesis Director

Wilton S. Joyner
Committee Member

James W. Batten
Committee Member

Charles Clark
Dean of the School of Education

Joseph H. Boyette
Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the many people who have assisted with this study. A special thanks is extended to James Pressley, Associate Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision, and thesis director, for his guidance and assistance in the planning and completion of this study.

Appreciation is also extended to James Batten, Professor Emeritus, and Wilton Joyner, Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision, thesis committee members, for their interest and guidance with this study.

Special thanks is given to B. K. Burton, Principal of North Edgecombe High School, for his cooperation and support through this process.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his deepest appreciation to his wife, Cindy, and his daughter, Ginger, whose patience, encouragement, assistance, and sacrifice have made the effort possible and worthwhile.

BIOGRAPHY

Larry Eugene Price was born in Wilson, North Carolina on June 14, 1958. He entered grammar school in 1964 in Red Springs, North Carolina. He also attended schools in Hoke, Wilson and Nash Counties and graduated from Southern Nash Senior High School in June 1976.

After high school, Price farmed for two years . He and his family farmed tobacco, soybeans, corn, and cucumbers. In January of 1978, Price enrolled in the Agricultural Education Program at North Carolina State University where he graduated with a Bachelor of Science in May 1981 and a Master of Science in May 1985. Price also graduated from East Carolina University with the degree of Educational Specialist in in Educational Administration in May 1987.

Price was employed by Martin County Schools as a vocational agriculture teacher at Williamston High School for five years. He was assistant principal at North Edgecombe High School in Tarboro, North Carolina for two years and is currently principal of Clinton High School in Clinton, North Carolina. Currently, he is nearing completion of a doctoral program in education at North Carolina State University.

Table of Contents

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Need for the Study.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Assumptions.....	5
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	7
Summary.....	13
3. METHODOLOGY.....	15
Population.....	15
Procedures.....	16
Developing the Instrument.....	17
Statistical Procedures.....	18
4. ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA.....	19
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	28
Summary of Research.....	28
Findings.....	30
Conclusions.....	33
Discussion.....	40
Recommendations.....	42

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	48
APPENDICES.....	52
A. Letter to Pilot Study Group.....	53
B. Pilot Study Instrument.....	54
C. Letter to Research Sample.....	55
D. Research Instrument.....	56

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Summary of Ages of Respondents.....	21
2. Present Employment Positions of Respondents.....	21
3. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Statements Measuring Perceptions Toward the Educational Adminintration and Supervision Program at East Carolina University.....	23
4. Frequency Distribution for Responses to Statements.....	26
5. Statements In Which 40% or More of the Responses Fall in the Lower End of the Range of Scores.....	27

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Beginning with the publication of A Nation at Risk, a report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, considerable attention has been focused on the educational system of our country during the past few years. Educators, politicians, and community leaders have presented many ideas about how the educational system could be improved. While simple solutions for the problems facing education are not available, an effort to solve these problems must continue.

The problems that education has encountered over the years have precipitated some other areas of concern. A smaller percentage of college students are choosing education as their major field of study. (Blackmon, 1982) This situation has led to a shortage of teachers in some subject areas. The problem is compounded by the large number of teachers leaving the teaching profession for various reasons. (Armstrong, 1984)

Other than personnel concerns, there are many other problems, such as increased educational accountability, fiscal issues, school discipline, equity, equality, staff

morale problems, effective schools, transportation, and concerns about increased legal liability. This list is not all inclusive, but does represent the multitude of areas in which effective school administrators should be competent.

Need for the Study

A Nation at Risk was the beginning of the current reform movement during which many articles and research have indicated a need for reorganization and reconfiguration of schools. The reform movement has spoken to school administration and has addressed the skills necessary for good school management. Administration has already been affected by the reform movement with changes in teacher evaluations, institution of career ladder approaches to merit pay, and new approaches in school funding. With these changes, as well as many others that have and will take place, it is important to know how effective the Educational Administration and Supervision Program at East Carolina University was in meeting the needs of practicing school administrators and what improvements are needed to better meet the needs of current graduate students.

Education is an ever changing field and the leaders of the educational systems and schools must be prepared to handle all of the changes and the problems or conflicts that changes precipitate. This study was designed to determine the perceived strengths and weaknesses in the Educational Administration and Supervision Program at East Carolina University. A follow-up study of the graduates of this program has not been conducted since 1981. That study, preceded the current reform movement and another detailed study was needed so that courses and program guidelines could be revised where the graduates of the program indicated that improvements should be made.

With the results of this study, the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision should consider the revision of course offerings and program guidelines to more appropriately meet the needs of the students and to enhance the competencies of school administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the adequacy of preparation provided by East Carolina University's graduate program in Educational Administration and

Supervision as perceived by the graduates of that program. More specifically, this study attempted to address the following questions:

1. What were the graduate's perceptions of the adequacy of preparation received through East Carolina University's Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in preparing the graduate student for an administrative or supervisory role?
2. What were the graduate's perceptions of the overall quality of the graduate preparation received at East Carolina University?
3. What major problems, if any, did graduate students experience during the process of completing their graduate program(s)?

The information obtained from this study will allow the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision to evaluate the quality of the current program which trains school administrators and supervisors. The information obtained from practicing administrators should be the best barometer of the effectiveness of the program and will allow the program to make adjustments and/or changes to address perceived weaknesses or areas of needed improvement.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to:

1. The instrument used for data collection and to the extent that the responses were accurate and true in each section of the instrument.
2. The degree of validity and reliability of the researcher prepared items used in the collection of data.
3. The 1975-1986 graduates of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University who were Assistant Principals, Principals, Supervisors/Coordinators/Directors, Assistant/Associate Superintendents, or Superintendents in the Public School Systems in North Carolina for the 1986-1987 school year.

Assumptions of the Study

1. The sample selected is a representative sample of the graduates of the Department of Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University.
2. All responses were true and accurate and were not biased by loyalty to the Department.

3. The graduates' perceptions were not affected by the degree they received from East Carolina University. Graduates with Master's Degrees had the same perceptions as those with Educational Specialist Degrees.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research has been done to determine the problems in education at the public school and higher education levels. This research suggests areas that need immediate attention as well as other areas for which school officials ought to be planning. Society has also changed over the years and there are problems with students at all levels of education that schools must prepare to encounter.

This review is primarily devoted to the research on the implications of the reform movement in education at the public school and higher education levels and previous follow-up studies. The issues school officials will face in the coming years is also discussed. The mixture of these three sources of literature provides the basis for the need of this follow-up study and periodic program review in order to provide better training of school administrators.

The decade of the eighties might be remembered as the decade of substantial attempts to reform education at the public school level as well as the college and university level. Cross (1987) said that since A Nation at Risk some

30 major reform reports have appeared that are in agreement that education in the public schools and in colleges and universities fails to provide students with what has become known as "excellence in education." Shannon (1986) reported that perilous times confront the leaders of our nation's schools in light of the major forces buffeting school board members and administrators. Those forces include complete restructuring of public schools and the drive to put policy decisions at the local school level. He shows that school leaders must be prepared and trained to handle these forthcoming changes. Ordovensky (1986) stated that the first wave of educational reform began with A Nation at Risk and continues to spread throughout the states, leaving in its wake tougher graduation requirements, tests for teachers, career ladders, longer school days, and other state-mandated reforms.

Ordovensky (1986) also said that a rumbling is now being heard which will be the second wave of educational reform. It will address areas that have been untouched by the other reform movements such as school comparisons, textbook selections, teacher and administrator training and on-the-job assessment of school administrators by school employees from the teachers to the janitors. According to

Glickman (1987), the second wave comes as a response to the implementation of the first reform movement.

Glickman also showed that the reform of education is a journey into the unknown, but it is an effort that we can approach creatively and constructively if school leaders are well trained and prepared to tackle the task of implementing changes in education. Tyler (1987) states that the effectiveness of education can be improved and that the public call for education reform is a stimulus for improvement. The leadership of a reform movement cannot be left in the hands of individuals who have little understanding of schools, teachers, parents, and students. (Tyler, 1987) Cross (1987) reports that the reform reports of the 1980's for both secondary and post-secondary education have one thing in common: both look beyond the classroom teacher for action. The advocates of reform in the secondary schools think that the responsibility for improvement lies with those who train, select, and supervise teachers.

This thought causes one to consider whether colleges and universities are doing what they should to improve the quality of their graduates in undergraduate and graduate disciplines. Cross (1987) said reformers seem especially

reluctant to enter the classrooms of higher education. Reasons for this reluctance include academic freedom being equated with the sanctity of the college classroom, perceptions that college professors are authorities in their disciplines, and the following questions which have not been answered to everyone's satisfaction: What constitutes effective teaching in the college classroom? Who should evaluate professors and how? Can good teaching be recognized and rewarded? Hodgkinson (1986) reported that there are many reasons for a major reform of higher education. He further states that there has never been a major national effort to improve the quality of American higher education. Wisniewski (1986) said the professor of education must evaluate himself in an effort to improve and stay abreast in his field. Hodgkinson (1986) indicated that follow-up studies must serve as springboards for program improvement without a major reform movement. Goodlad (1983) said that teacher education programs are disturbingly alike and almost uniformly inadequate. Rodman (1988) reports that the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) is calling for substantial changes in the way colleges and universities prepare school administrators. AACTE urges institutions that train administrators to shift

the focus of their programs from management training to "leadership education."

School administrators must deal with problems today that school administrators of the past did not even dream of facing in a school setting. Dowdney (1987) reports that the national average of school dropouts is 26 percent, but some school districts face 40 percent dropout rates. Kenny (1987) said that about 65 percent of school administrators view teen pregnancy as one of the top 10 problems facing their schools. Gallup (1987) in his annual poll for Phi Delta Kappa reported that 52 percent of the people surveyed in the most recent study cited the use of drugs and the lack of discipline as the biggest problems facing the schools.

According to Capps (1987) a crisis looms in the light of the reform movement. That crisis is a teacher shortage. He indicated that half of those teaching now will leave the classroom by 1992. He also said that one million new teachers will be needed over the next five years which is compounded by the fact that there has been an overall decline in the teacher education graduates during the past decade. Other concerns in personnel must also be addressed by school administrators today. According to Engelking (1987) further efforts must be made to enhance and

supplement existing rewards for teachers by providing opportunities for advancement and professional growth and by alleviating conditions in the school that limit the realization of intrinsic rewards that are a major source of teacher job satisfaction. The principal of today must also concern himself with the increasing role of the instructional leader of the school. Anderson and Nicholson (1987) list 32 items that a school administrator, who calls himself an instructional leader, must address in order to meet the criteria of instructional leadership. Rodman (1988) said, "the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education believes that most principals are trained as managers and are simply not prepared to meet the school's needs in instructional leadership."

Currently, administrators are also forced to deal with greater requirements in teacher observations and evaluations. Burke and Lind (1987) reported that teacher evaluators must be trained in order to assess teachers in Career Ladder Advancement programs. School administrators are no longer observing teachers to see if they are teaching, but to determine if they receive merit increases or advance on the career ladder. (Burke and Lind, 1987)

There have been many follow-up studies done on various graduate programs. Tirado (1978) wrote that his follow-up study of graduates from the Graduate Studies Department at Puerto Rico University found that most graduates were pleased with the training they received, but there were still numerous suggestions for program improvements made by the participants in the study. Stolworthy (1986) reported that his study determined the adequacy of the preparation of students in the Graduates Studies Program at Washburn University. Most of the respondents rated their preparation as adequate, but weaknesses and problems within the program were identified. Dale (1975) indicated that in her follow-up study 32 conclusions were drawn and 14 recommendations were made based on the conclusions and implications of the study.

Summary

This sampling of the literature supports the use of follow-up studies, and shows the need for programs to be evaluated so the best possible training can be provided to for students. School administrators should be prepared to deal with a multitude of problems and pressures, and the training they receive must be sufficient to allow them to

make intelligent decisions. The training institutions must accept the responsibility to train future school administrators so they may be prepared for the task of managing and leading the schools during the coming decade.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The design, organization, and description of this study is included in this chapter. The method of selecting the sample as well as the procedures for conducting the study are also discussed. Information regarding the development of the instrument and the method of collecting the data is described.

Population

The population for this study were 675 graduates of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University from 1975-1986. Members of the population were assistant principals, principals, supervisors/directors/coordinators, assistant/associate superintendents or superintendents during the 1986-1987 school year. Each member of the population has received a Master of Education and/or an Educational Specialist Degree from East Carolina University.

The sample size for the study was determined by the formula used when Likert-type scales are employed. (Oliver and Hinkle, 1981) The sample was selected by the random

sample selection procedures in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) statistical package. It consisted of 225 persons which was 33 percent of the population.

Procedures

This study was conducted with a population of the Master of Education and/or Educational Specialist degree graduates from East Carolina University from 1975 to 1986 who were working in North Carolina during the 1986-87 school year. Information was compiled from records of the Information Services Division of the State Department of Public Education.

On January 4, 1988, a copy of the survey was mailed to each of the subjects selected. The survey instrument was divided into two sections. Section I contained questions pertaining to demographic information. Section II of the survey solicited graduate's perceptions of the Educational Administration and Supervision Program at East Carolina University. The surveys were mailed along with a return envelope. The participants were asked to return the instrument within two weeks. A follow-up letter was mailed to those who did not respond to the first survey within three weeks of the original mailing date.

Developing the Instrument

The instrument for this study was developed by evaluation of two previously used instruments. One is from the University of Wisconsin in Menomonie, Wisconsin, and the other from Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas. The researcher also added statements to the questionnaire based on his knowledge of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University and after consultation with members of the thesis committee. The instrument was field tested by sending it to 30 randomly selected members of the population who were not selected as part of the study sample. They were asked to review the instrument and make any comments or suggestions they felt would improve the survey instrument. Responses were received from 21 individuals. Only three respondents indicated that they felt minor editorial changes should be made. The remaining respondents indicated that the instrument was clear, easy to understand and needed no revisions. A reliability estimate of 0.84 was determined using Cronbach's Alpha. (Cronbach, 1951) Content validity was determined by a panel of experts.

Statistical Procedures

The data were analyzed by using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) statistical package. Interval/Ratio statistics were used to determine the frequency, mean, median, range, and standard deviation of each item in the survey. Since this study is descriptive rather than comparative, a test of significance was not undertaken because the participants in the study were not divided into groups and no hypotheses were developed. The statistics were computed for the data by using the SAS Proc Frequency and Proc Means Procedures.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

The participants included the 1975-1986 graduates of East Carolina University's Department of Educational Administration and Supervision who were school administrators or supervisors in North Carolina during the 1986-1987 school year. There were 675 persons in the population of which 225 were selected as members of the survey sample. A total of 172 responses were received in the first mailing and 21 responses came later which accounted for 85.77 percent of the selected sample of 225. An analysis of variance was performed on the questions making up Part II of the questionnaire comparing the responses of the 172 respondents on the first mailing to the 21 respondents of the second mailing and there were no significant differences found between the two groups.

The respondents were from 54 of North Carolina's 141 public school districts. Most of these systems were located in North Carolina Public School Region's I, II, III and IV. The respondents included 75 persons who have earned a Master of Arts in Education and 51 with only the Educational

Specialist degree. Sixty-seven have received both a Master of Arts in Education and an Educational Specialist degree from the School of Education. In a cumulative manner, 118 respondents or 65.3 percent of the respondents have received an Educational Specialist degree. Only 45 respondents or 23.3 percent of the population have pursued graduate work beyond their work at East Carolina University. Eight of the respondents have pursued and obtained doctorates at various institutions. The mean year of graduation was 1981, but 142 respondents or 64.8 percent of the respondents graduated from 1980-1986.

The respondents were predominantly white males. One hundred twenty-one or 62.7 percent of the respondents were male and 145 or 75.1 percent of the respondents were white. Table 1 provides a summary of the ages of the graduates at the time of graduation. The mean age was 38.66 years old. Most of the respondents were principals (n=71) or assistant principals.(n=62) Table 2 provides a summary of the employment positions of the survey sample during the 1986-87 school year.

These school administrators had various degrees of teaching experience before they entered an administrative

Table 1

Summary of Ages of Survey Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Percent
20-29	18	9.3
30-39	92	47.7
40-49	65	33.7
50-59	18	9.3
	193	100.0

Table 2

Present Employment Positions of Respondents

Position	Frequency	Percent
Assistant Principal	62	32.1
Principal	71	36.8
Supervisor/Director	39	20.2
Assistant/Associate Superintendent	12	6.2
Superintendent	9	4.7
	193	100.0

or supervisory position. One hundred ten respondents or 57.0 percent of the survey sample had less than 10 years

teaching experience. Sixty-nine respondents or 35.7 percent had from 11 to 20 years experience and 14 or 7.3 percent had 21 to 31 years of service before entering an administrative or supervisory position. The range of 3 to 5 years of experience was the time period during which most respondents left teaching for an administrative or supervisory position. Forty respondents or 20.8 percent of the survey sample left teaching between three and five years to assume an administrative or supervisory position.

Forty percent or 78 members of the survey respondents taught at the secondary level and 58 respondents or 30 percent of the respondents taught at the elementary level. The subject areas of math and social studies produced 39.0 percent of the administrators or supervisors surveyed in this study. Of the persons surveyed 19.8 percent were former math teachers and 19.2 percent were former social studies teachers.

This study was designed to obtain the perceptions of former students toward the adequacy of preparation for administrative or supervisory positions in education provided by the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. The results of the statistical analysis on the data are provided in Table 3. The means and standard

deviations are shown which indicate the overall perceptions of the survey sample toward the Educational Administration and Supervision program in the School of Education.

Table 3

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Statements Measuring Perceptions Toward the Educational Administration and Supervision Program At East Carolina University

N	Statement	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
Part I Degee of Preparation in Developing an Understanding of: (a)			
1.	Administrative responsibilities in the areas of Elementary, Secondary and Central Office Organization	2.414	0.920
2.	Techniques of recruiting and supervising employees	2.803	0.811
3.	Administrative responsibilities in the area of school management	2.253	0.792
4.	Successful techniques for effective decision making	2.378	0.882
5.	Programs for developing positive public relations between the school and the community	1.994	0.793
6.	Public school law and its application to daily school activities	1.766	0.811
7.	Public school finance and the role of the federal, state, and local governments	2.129	0.929
Part II Adequacy of Preparation in Developing Skills In: (a)			
8.	Evaluation of School Climate and Designing and Implementing Climate Changing Programs	2.476	0.777
9.	Building Support for Schools	2.440	0.789
10.	Dealing with Personnel Problems	2.544	0.841
11.	Developing School Curriculum	2.580	0.793
12.	Instructional Management	2.430	0.768

(Table 3 continued)

N	Statement	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
13.	Educational Research, Evaluation, Problem Solving, and Planning	2.481	0.810
14.	Staff Evaluation	2.740	0.915
15.	Staff Development	2.782	0.825
16.	Allocating Financial Resources	2.642	0.890
Part III Perceptions of Program Components (b)			
17.	Quality of Instruction	1.575	0.733
18.	Provisions for Advisement	1.606	0.729
19.	Level I Internship Requirement	1.419	0.695
20.	Level II Internship Requirement	1.243	0.748
21.	Field Study Requirement in Level II Internship	1.341	0.808
22.	Student Faculty Relationship	1.388	0.585
23.	Theoretical Foundations of Courses	1.704	0.521
24.	Oral and Written Comprehensive Exams	1.502	0.578
25.	Library and Research Materials	1.533	0.603
26.	The Overall Quality of the Educational Administration and Supervision Program	1.455	0.558
Part IV Perceptions of Personal Concern in the Educational Administration Program (c)			
27.	Program advisement was available when needed.	1.564	0.754
28.	Program advisement was sound.	1.549	0.756
29.	Research materials were available and were of sufficient quality.	1.761	0.863
30.	Graduate School admission requirements were realistic.	1.632	0.739
31.	The program allowed adequate selection of elective courses.	1.797	0.794
32.	Required course work was realistic and appropriate to my program.	1.709	0.769
33.	Overall course instruction was professionally presented.	1.632	0.724

(Table 3 continued)

N	Statement	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
34.	Overall course instruction was effective.	1.699	0.745
35.	Written comprehensive exams were commensurate with course instruction and objectives.	1.683	0.720
36.	Oral comprehensive exams were commensurate with course instruction and objectives.	1.673	0.792
37.	Needed classes were easily scheduled.	1.678	0.684
a.	1 = Exceedingly Adequate 2 = Very Adequate 3 = Adequate 4 = Inadequate 5 = Very Inadequate		
b.	1 = Strength 2 = Acceptable 3 = Weakness		
c.	1 = Strongly Agree 2 = Agree 3 = Undecided 4 = Disagree 5 = Strongly Agree		

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Responses to Statements

Question	1	2	3	4	5
1	21	90	72	6	4
2	9	57	92	33	2
3	33	86	67	6	1
4	29	84	59	20	1
5	56	87	45	5	0
6	82	79	27	4	1
7	49	85	44	13	2
8	16	83	80	13	1
9	21	76	87	7	2
10	16	77	76	22	1
11	17	64	94	18	0
12	19	80	84	10	0
13	19	79	77	18	0
14	14	65	72	40	2
15	11	57	89	35	1
16	21	54	89	29	0
17	99	76	18		
18	94	79	20		
19	107	77	9		
20	116	74	3		
21	105	80	8		
22	123	64	6		
23	63	124	6		
24	100	87	6		
25	95	90	8		
26	107	82	4		
27	103	78	6	4	2
28	110	64	15	3	1
29	83	85	14	9	2
30	92	88	6	6	6
31	75	90	21	6	1
32	83	89	15	5	1
33	92	84	12	5	0
34	84	87	17	5	0
35	83	92	13	5	0
36	76	89	15	13	0
37	82	95	12	4	0

Table 4 contains a frequency distribution of the responses to each of the 37 statements in section II of the survey instrument. In Table 5 there are 19 statements for which more than 40 percent of the responses are located in the lower end of the scale for that particular statement.

For example, item 16 has 65 percent of the responses in the range of 3 to 5 despite the fact that the mean score was 2.642.

Table 5

Questions In Which 40 Percent or More of the Responses Fall in the Lower End of the Range of Scores

Question	Mean	N	Percentage of Scores in Lower Range
1	2.414	82	42
2	2.803	127	66
4	2.378	80	41
8	2.476	94	49
9	2.440	96	50
10	2.544	99	51
11	2.580	112	58
12	2.430	94	49
13	2.481	96	50
14	2.740	114	59
15	2.782	125	65
16	2.642	118	61
17	1.575	94	49
18	1.606	99	51
21	1.341	88	46
23	1.704	130	67
24	1.502	93	48
25	1.533	98	51
26	1.455	86	45

(1-16) 1 = Exceedingly Adequate 2 = Very Adequate 3 = Adequate
4 = Inadequate 5 = Very Inadequate

(17-26) 1 = Strength 2 = Acceptable 3 = Weakness

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The research and literature indicate that there is a very real need for institutions of higher education to do follow-up studies of their programs so that necessary changes can be identified and implemented. Research by Cross (1987), Ordovensky (1986), Glickman (1987), and Goodlad (1983) gave many reasons for periodic evaluation of the higher education programs in general and graduate programs specifically.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were any changes that needed to be made in the Educational Administration and Supervision program within the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University. More specifically, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What were the graduates perceptions of the adequacy of preparation received through East Carolina University's Department of Educational

Administration and Supervision in preparing the student for an administrative or supervisory role?

2. What were the the graduates' perceptions of the overall quality of the preparation received at East Carolina University?
3. What problems, if any, did graduate students experience during the process of completing their graduate program(s)?

To answer the preceding questions, a survey instrument was developed to measure the perceptions of graduates toward their graduate program.

A pilot study was conducted to evaluate the data collection procedures and the instrument before the collection of the research data. The study sample consisted of 225 graduates from a total population of 675 graduates. The sample was randomly selected.

The study was conducted by sending a written survey to the members of the survey sample, asking them to answer questions to obtain demographic information and then to read 37 statements and indicate their perceptions of the statement by selecting a number from a scale which was included in each of four parts of section II of the

instrument. Responses were received from 193 of the 225 persons surveyed.

Statistical analyses were conducted by using the Means and Frequency procedures within the Statistical Analysis System. Means, standard deviations, and frequencies were reported on the data.

Findings

A summary of the following findings can be found in Table 3 on page 23. The mean scores indicate that graduates of the Educational Administration and Supervision program perceive that their preparation in administrative responsibilities in the areas of elementary, secondary, and central office organization was very adequate.(2.414) They also perceived very adequate preparation in administrative responsibilities in the area of school management (2.253), successful techniques for effective decision making (2.378), public school law and its application to daily school activities (1.766), public school finance and the role of the federal, state, and local governments (2.129), and programs for developing positive public relations between the school and the community(1.994). The respondents

reported they had adequate preparation in techniques of recruiting and supervising employees (2.803).

The respondents also indicated that they had adequate preparation in developing skills in dealing with personnel problems (2.544), developing school curriculum(2.580), evaluation of staff (2.740), staff development (2.782), and allocating financial resources (2.642). Very adequate preparation occurred in evaluation of school climate and designing and implementing climate changing programs (2.476), building support for schools (2.440), and instructional management (2.430).

The respondents indicated their perceptions of the program components; level I internship (1.419), level II internship (1.243), field study requirement in level II internship (1.341), student faculty relationship (1.388), and overall quality of the Educational Administration and Supervision program (1.455) were strengths of the Department. The areas of theoretical foundations of courses (1.704), oral and written comprehensive exams (1.502), quality of instruction (1.575), provisions for advisement (1.606), and library and research materials (1.533) were perceived as acceptable program components.

The respondents reported that their perceptions of personal concerns in their graduate programs such as the ability to get program advisement when needed (1.564), sound advisement (1.549), adequate selection of elective courses (1.797), needed classes were easily scheduled (1.678), sufficient availability and quality of research materials (1.761), and realistic graduate school admission requirements (1.632) were very adequately met. Realistic and appropriate course work (1.709), professionally presented course instruction (1.632), effective course instruction (1.699), written exams (1.673) and oral exams (1.673) commensurate with course instruction and objectives were also perceived to be very adequate by the respondents.

Although all of the mean scores are scores which indicate acceptable program components, 19 of the statements had more than 40 percent of the respondents in the lower end of the response scale. The following table lists those 19 statements, the number of respondents and the percent of the respondents rating the item on the lower end of the scale.

Table 6

Statements in Which More Than 40 Percent of the Respondents
Rated the Item in the Lower Portion of the Scale

N	Statement	Number of Respondents	Percent
1.	Administrative responsibilities in the areas of Elementary, Secondary and Central Office Organization	82	42
2.	Techniques of recruiting and supervising employees	127	66
4.	Successful techniques for effective decision making	80	41
8.	Evaluation of School Climate and Designing and Implementing Climate Changing Programs	94	49
9.	Building Support for Schools	96	50
10.	Dealing with Personnel Problems	99	51
11.	Developing School Curriculum	112	58
12.	Instructional Management	94	49
13.	Educational Research, Evaluation, Problem Solving, and Planning	96	50
14.	Staff Evaluation	114	59
15.	Staff Development	125	65
16.	Allocating Financial Resources	118	61
17.	Quality of Instruction	94	49
18.	Provisions for Advisement	99	51
21.	Field Study Requirement in Level II Internship	88	46
23.	Theoretical Foundations of Courses	130	67
24.	Oral and Written Comprehensive Exams	93	48
25.	Library and Research Materials	98	51
26.	The Overall Quality of the Educational Administration and Supervision Program	86	45

Conclusions

The findings and conclusions of this study were subject to the following limitations:

1. The instrument used for data collection and to the extent that the responses were accurate and true in each section of the instrument.
2. The degree of validity and reliability of the researcher prepared items used in the collection of data.
3. The 1975-1986 graduates of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina University who were Assistant Principals, Principals, Supervisors/Coordinators/Directors, Assistant/Associate Superintendents, or Superintendents for the 1986-1987 school year.

The following conclusions were formulated as a result of the findings of this study. The Department of Educational Administration and Supervision was performing very adequately in helping students develop an understanding of:

1. Administrative responsibilities in the areas of elementary, secondary, and central office

organization, but they have room for improvement based on the fact that 42 percent of the respondents rated this item as only adequate to very inadequate.

2. Administrative responsibilities in the area of school management.
3. Successful techniques for effective decision making. This area can be improved based on 41 percent of the respondents indicating this item was only adequately to very inadequately met.
4. Programs for developing positive public relations between the school and community.
5. Public school law and its application to daily school activities.
6. Public school finance and the role of the federal, state, and local governments.

It was also found that the Department was performing very adequately in helping students develop skills in:

7. Evaluation of school climate and designing and implementing climate changing programs, but additional work is needed based on the fact that 49 percent of the respondents rated this item as adequately to very inadequately met.

8. Building support for schools; however, additional efforts are needed because 50 percent of the respondents rated this item as adequately to very inadequately met.
9. Instructional management, but efforts are needed to improve this area since 49 percent of the respondents rated this item as adequately to very inadequately met.
10. Educational research, evaluation, problem solving, and planning. Fifty percent of the respondents rated this item as only adequately to very inadequately met.

The Department is performing adequately in helping students develop:

11. An understanding of techniques of recruiting and supervising employees, but further work in this area is needed in light of 66 percent of the respondents rating this item as only adequately to very inadequately met.
12. Skills in dealing with personnel problems. Fifty-one percent of the respondents rated this item as only adequately to very inadequately met.

13. Skills in curriculum development and very much work needs to be done in this area since 58 percent of the respondents rated this item as only adequately to very inadequately met.
14. Skills in staff evaluation, but additional work in this area is needed based on the fact that 59 percent of the respondents rated this item as adequately to very inadequately met.
15. Skills in staff development. Additional work in this area is essential due to the fact that 65 percent of the respondents rated this item as only adequately to very inadequately met.
16. Skills in allocating financial resources, but additional work should be done in this area based on the fact that 61 percent of the respondents who rated this item as adequately to very inadequately met.

The following program components are acceptable:

17. The quality of the instruction in the Department, but 49 percent of the respondents rated this item as only acceptable or a weakness of the program.
18. The field study requirement in the Level II Internship; however, this item may need to be

evaluated since 41 percent of the respondents rated this item as only acceptable or as a weakness in the program.

19. The theoretical foundations of the courses in the Department, but additional consideration of this area is needed since 67 percent of the respondents rated this item as only acceptable or a weakness of the program.
20. Oral and written comprehensive exams in the Department; however, 48 percent of the respondents rated this item as only acceptable or a weakness of the program.
21. The library and research materials for student use, but additional attention is needed in this area because 51 percent of the respondents rated this item as acceptable or a weakness of the program.
22. The provisions for advisement in the Department, but other provisions should be made since 51 percent of the respondents rated this item as only acceptable or a weakness of the program.

The following program components were strengths:

23. The Level I Internship requirement

24. The Level II Internship requirement
25. The student faculty relationship
26. The overall quality of the graduate program.

The graduates' needs were very adequately met in the following areas:

27. Program advisement when needed.
28. Sound program advisement.
29. Sufficient quality and availability of research materials.
30. Realistic graduate school admission requirements.
31. Adequate selection of elective courses.
32. Realistic and appropriate required course work.
33. Professionally presented overall course instruction.
34. Effective overall course instruction.
35. Written comprehensive exams commensurate with course instruction and objectives.
36. Oral comprehensive exams commensurate with course instruction and objectives.
37. Easily scheduled classes.

Discussion

The results of statistical analyses of the data from this study indicate that for every statement in the survey,

the Department is doing quite well in meeting the needs of the students. There are no mean scores that indicate that any particular area of the program is a weakness or that a less than adequate job is being done to meet the needs of the students. In part I of the instrument, six items received ratings of "very adequate." In part II, four items received the "very adequate" rating. In part III of the instrument, five items were rated as strengths of the program. In part IV, all items were rated as "very adequate."

The ratings appear to be very good, but caution is indicated. Nineteen of the items had very high numbers of respondents who rated various components of the program as adequate or less than adequate. Although the means support the overall program, there is room for improvement. The program must work to improve itself, so that the overall confidence level of the program is higher. Work must be done to reach for the exceedingly adequate rating and for program components to be rated as strengths. No means were below 1.500 in the three sections where the scale was from one to five, which indicates that the respondents did not

perceive any area of the program to be exceedingly adequate. Although there were no weaknesses in part III, five of the items were rated as acceptable also had large numbers of respondents who rated the items on the bottom of the scale.

The results of this study show that the Department is doing a good job overall, but every phase of the program should be consistently re-evaluated. The Department should analyze each course and make revisions as needed to improve the overall quality of each course.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. There is evidence that students are not satisfied with their competence in dealing with personnel problems and their techniques of recruiting and supervising employees. To remove this deficiency the courses in Personnel Problems in Education and Supervision of Instruction should be restructured to deal with specific personnel or supervision problems that frequently occur and to pose real and meaningful solutions to these problems. One respondent reported that he needed to know less

about personality profiles and power perception profiles and more about day to day problems like absenteeism, tardies, and evaluations of employees.

2. This study presents evidence that graduates of the Department are not as competent in developing the school curriculum as they would like to be; therefore, a course in curriculum theory should be developed and placed in the course work for graduate students in the department. It is also suggested that part of the content of this course include a detailed study of North Carolina's Basic Education Plan and more specifically, the Standard Course of Study with suggestions on how curriculum development and the Basic Education Plan are to work together.
3. Graduates feel their preparation was not as adequate as they would like for it to have been in dealing with staff evaluation and staff development. To increase the adequacy of the preparation in these areas a course in evaluation of professional and support staff and designing and implementing staff development activities to address deficiencies found in the evaluation

process should be developed. Two levels of this course might be considered. The first level would be in the masters program which would deal with evaluation of teachers, assistant principals, guidance counselors, secretaries, lunchroom workers, and janitorial workers and the second level would include the evaluation of assistant/associate superintendents, coordinators, directors, supervisors, and principals.

4. Although the statement on the graduate's preparation in developing an understanding of public school finance and the role of the federal, state, and local governments received a very adequate rating, the statement on allocating financial resources received only an adequate rating. More emphasis on the allocation and management of financial resources at the school and school system levels is needed. More instruction on handling the financial accounting procedures in the school and less on school system budgets and accounting should be put in place. Consideration should be given to a sequential development of a school based finance and a school system financed program.

5. This study finds evidence that the quality of the instruction of the courses is only acceptable. To improve the quality of instruction steps should be taken to encourage better planning and presentation of the materials. Instructors should present and teach to specific objectives so students will know what they are expected to learn.
6. Evidence suggests that provisions for advisement are just acceptable. Each student should be assigned an advisor to assist the student in developing a program of work which would include the courses the student needed to complete to exit the program. The advisor would also develop written and oral exams based on the courses that the individual student completed. In an advanced program or doctoral program, the advisor would assist in development of a graduate committee for the student.
7. Theoretical foundations of the courses were rated as acceptable. Theory in educational administration is very important and needs to be adequately covered. Students currently get bits and pieces of theory in each course. A course

entitled Theories of Educational Administration be developed and implemented among the first courses students in the department take in the master's degree program. This course should cover the major theories that are important to school administration. The other courses should continue to contain the theory that is applicable to the course as reinforcement of the theory concept.

8. The oral and written comprehensive exams were found to be only acceptable by the survey respondents. One respondent commented that the exams were too comprehensive in that they contained material from courses that they might not have had in their program. Students' comprehensive exams should be individualized based on the courses he or she have taken. Secondly, the Department should use course objectives and write a question pool for each course from which the students' comprehensive exam would be developed.
9. The research suggests that the library and research materials for the department are acceptable. The addition of a doctoral program in Educational Administration, will require that the library and

the research materials be upgraded so that journals, books and other resources that one needs to do research can be located. The library is the research center of an institution and is an important component of the doctoral program. The School of Education at East Carolina University should furnish the university and the library administration with suggestions for upgrading the library to the level of other research institutions. In addition, a Curriculum Materials Center should be developed and located in the School of Education for the deposit of materials related to education with student access for research and reading.

10. The research suggests that the Department does not get the type of feedback on the department and on courses that this study has produced. The department should develop a course evaluation instrument that will actually collect data on the course in a very specific nature for the purpose of identifying changes that may need to be made in the course and/or the department.

Summary

The Department has done and is doing a good job in preparing school leaders for the enormous tasks that they must deal; however, additional research is always needed. The Department must continue to do follow-up studies and evaluate its progress and effectiveness. Efforts must continue to improve the program through its instructors and courses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Carolyn S. and Nicholson, Glen I. (1987). Instructional leadership--can it be measured validly? NASSP Bulletin. 71:502 28-40.
- Armstrong, David G. (1984). New teachers: why do they leave and how can principals retain them? NASSP Bulletin. 68(469), 105-109.
- Bell, Terrel. (1983). A nation at risk. National Commission on Excellence in Education. United States Department of Education.
- Blackmon, C. Robert. (1982). Teacher supply and demand: what are the facts? NASSP Bulletin. 66(458), 71-73.
- Buie, James (1987). Teen pregnancy: it's time for the schools to tackle the problem. Phi Delta Kappan 68:10, 737-739.
- Burke, Peter and Lind, Kathryn. (1987). Performance assessment techniques for teacher career ladder advancement. NASSP Bulletin . 66(500), 27-35.
- Capps, William R. (1987). Teacher shortage - some issues and answers. Voice of the North Carolina School Boards Association. III:1, 27-28.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika. 297-334.
- Cross, K. Patricia (1987). The adventures of education in wonderland: implementing education reform. Phi Delta Kappan. 68:7, 496-502.
- Dale, Dorothy, (1975). A follow-up study of the master of science and educational specialist degree programs in vocational education and a follow-up system suitable for an educational institution. University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, Wisconsin.

- Dowdney, Donna L. (1987). Computers can reconnect potential dropouts. *The School Administrator*. 44:8, 12-16.
- Engelking, Jeri I. (1987). Attracting and retaining quality teachers through incentives. *NASSP Bulletin*. 71(500), 1-9.
- Gallup, Alec and Clark David L. (1987). The 19th annual gallup poll of the attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan* 69:1, 17-30.
- Glickman, Carl D. (1987). Unlocking school reform: uncertainty as a condition of professionalism. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 69:2, 120-122.
- Goodlad, John I. (1983). A place called school: prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hahn, Andrew. (1987). Reaching out to america's dropouts: what to do? *Phi Delta Kappan*. 69:4, 256-263.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. (1986). Reform? higher education? don't be absurd. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 68:4, 271-274.
- Hoyle, John R., English, Fenwick W., and Steffy, Betty E. (1985). Skills for successful school leaders. American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, Virginia.
- Kenny, Asta M. (1987). Teen pregnancy: an issue for schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 68:10, 728-736.
- Oliver, Dale J. and Hinkle, Dennis E. (1981). Determining the sample size: a recurring problem in educational research. Southern Region Research Conference Agricultural Education Proceedings, 99-106.
- Ordovensky, Pat (1986). Education vital signs. Main Events. *American School Board Journal* II:1, 2-6.
- Rodman, Blake. (1988). Teach principals 'leadership,' report says. *Education Week*. VII:22, p. 9.
- Shor, Ida. (1986). Equality is excellence: transforming teacher education and the learning process. *Harvard Educational Review* 56:4.

Stolworthy, Reed L. (1980). Evaluation of master of education graduate degree programs. Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas.

Tirado, Ramon C. (1978). Job reward, individual success and follow-up study of the graduates from the graduate studies department. Puerto Rico University, College of Education.

Tyler, Ralph W. (1987). Education reforms. Phi Delta Kappan. 69:4, 277-280.

Wisniewski, Richard (1986). The ideal professor of education. Phi Delta Kappan. 68:4, 288-292.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

December 8, 1987

Dear ECU Graduate,

I am assistant principal at North Edgecombe High School. I am currently doing some research for East Carolina University as a graduate student. Completion of this research will give me Level II certification in Educational Administration.

I need your help in preparing the instrument for this study. A copy of the current instrument is enclosed. I am asking you to complete the enclosed instrument by answering the questions just as you would if you were in the survey sample. If you feel that the instrument is clear and no changes are needed, please indicate on the pilot study instrument. If there are questions that are not clear or other problems, please put your comments on the pilot instrument and return both the pilot instrument and the survey instrument to me as quickly as possible in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Price

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

Pilot Study Instrument

Please indicate your feeling about the survey instrument on this form.

1. I feel that the survey instrument is clear and easy to understand and I recommend no changes in the questions or the format.

-----yes -----no

2. Some of the questions were unclear to me and I recommend that the following changes be made.
3. Please make any suggestions which you feel would make the instrument better.
4. Please indicate any additions you feel would make the instrument better.

APPENDIX C

December 30, 1987

Dear ECU Graduate,

I am Larry Price, Assistant Principal at North Edgecombe High School. In order to receive my advanced certification in administration, I am doing some research for the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at East Carolina. I am doing a follow-up study of persons who received a graduate degree from ECU from 1975-1986 who are school administrators or supervisors. I hope that each person selected has received a degree from the department mentioned above. The purpose of this study is to receive feedback from former students on their perceptions of the program and to develop ideas about changes that need to be made. It is our hope that research of this nature will enhance and improve the program as well as aid ECU in obtaining a doctoral program in education.

You were selected through a random process from the total population of ECU graduates in Educational Administration to participate in this study. Please complete the enclosed survey and return by January 15, 1988. Your participation in this project is very important. The greater the return rate of the surveys, the more the statistics will mean in terms of inference of necessary changes in the program.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Price

Enclosures

APPENDIX D

Section I

1. What degree(s) in Educational Administration and Supervision have you completed at East Carolina University?
 Master of Arts in Education Educational Specialist
2. In what year did you complete your degree in administration or supervision?
 Master of Arts in Education Educational Specialist
3. Have you pursued any graduate degree(s) beyond those received at East Carolina?
 Yes No If yes, what degree and where? _____
4. Sex: Female Male
5. Race: Black White Indian Other
6. How old were you when you completed your degree(s) at East Carolina?
 Master of Arts in Education Educational Specialist
7. What is your present position?
 Assistant Principal
 Principal
 Supervisor/Coordinator/Director
 Associate/Assistant Superintendent
 Superintendent
 Other (please list) _____
8. How many years did you teach before entering administration/supervision?

9. At what level did you teach?
 Elementary Middle Junior High Secondary
10. If applicable, in what area did you teach?
 English Math Science Social Studies
 Health/PE Cultural Arts Vocational Education
 Other (specify)

Section II

Part I

Indicate the degree of adequacy of preparation in developing an understanding of:

Scale: 1 = Exceedingly Adequate 2 = Very Adequate 3 = Adequate
4 = Inadequate 5 = Very Inadequate

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Administrative responsibilities in the areas of Elementary, Secondary and Central Office Organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Techniques of recruiting and supervising employees | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Administrative responsibilities in the area of school management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Successful techniques for effective decision making | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Programs for developing positive public relations between the school and community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Public school law and its application to daily school activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Public school finance and the role of the federal, state and local government | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Part II

Indicate the degree of adequacy of preparation in developing skills in:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. Designing, Implementing and Evaluating School Climate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Building Support for Schools | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Dealing with Personnel Problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Developing School Curriculum | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Instructional Management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Educational Research, Evaluation, Problem Solving, and Planning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Staff Evaluation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Staff Development | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Allocating Resources | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Part III

Please indicate your perception of each of the following components based on your experience in the graduate program:

Scale: 1 = Strength 2 = Acceptable 3 = Weakness

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 17. Quality of instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 18. Provisions for Advisement | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 19. Level I Internship Requirement | 1 | 2 | 3 |

20. Level II Internship Requirement	1	2	3
21. Field Study Requirement in Level II Internship	1	2	3
22. Student-Faculty Relationship	1	2	3
23. Theoretical Foundations of Courses	1	2	3
24. Oral and Written Comprehensive Exams	1	2	3
25. Library and research materials	1	2	3
26. The overall quality of the Educational Administration and Supervision Program	1	2	3

Part IV

Please indicate your perceptions of each of the following statements in regard to your program in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Scale 1 = Strongly agree 2 = Agree 3 = Undecided
4 = Disagree 5 = Strongly Disagree

27. Program advisement was available when needed.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Program advisement was sound.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Research materials were available and were of sufficient quality.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Graduate school admission requirements were realistic.	1	2	3	4	5
31. The program allowed adequate selection of elective courses.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Required course work was realistic and appropriate to my program.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Overall course instruction was professionally presented.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Overall course instruction was effective.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Written comprehensive exams were commensurate with course instruction and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Oral comprehensive exams were commensurate with course instruction and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Needed classes were easily scheduled.	1	2	3	4	5