University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

1985

Critical elements for effective teacher inservice education: A synthesis of related literature

Elizabeth Ellen Kilgard
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Kilgard, Elizabeth Ellen, "Critical elements for effective teacher inservice education: A synthesis of related literature" (1985). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2688.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2688

Critical elements for effective teacher inservice education: A synthesis of related literature

Abstract

Teacher inservice education is and has been a topic 1 of concern with numerous national publications, professional organizations, government agencies, and local school districts. With recent public criticism of the American educational system through published literature including A Nation at Risk (1983), "Public Attitude Toward Public Education" (Gallop, 1983), "U.S. Pupils Rank Low in Eight Nation Test" (Walton, 1983), as well as position statements of special interest groups; such as, Fundamentalists, National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, parents, administrators, and school boards, it becomes increasingly evident that the public is demanding accountability regarding the competence of practicing professionals and the achievement of students (Collins, 1981).

CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHER INSERVICE EDUCATION:

A SYNTHESIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

———————

A Research Paper

Presented to

The Department of Educational Administration

and Counseling

University of Northern Iowa

———————

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

———————

by

Elizabeth Ellen Kilgard

August, 1985

This Research Paper by: Elizabeth Ellen Kilgard

Entitled:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHER INSERVICE EDUCATION:

A SYNTHESIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement

for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Norman McCumsey

6-24-85
_____
Date Approved   Director of Research Paper

Donald L. Hanson

6-24-85
_____
Date Approved   Second Reader of
                       Research Paper

Norman McCumsey

6-24-85
_____
Date Received   Graduate Faculty Adviser

Norman McCumsey

6-24-85
_____
Date Received   Head, Department of
                       Educational Administration
                       and Counseling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Teacher inservice education is and has been a topic
of concern with numerous national publications,
professional organizations, government agencies, and local
school districts. With recent public criticism of the
American educational system through published literature
including A Nation at Risk (1983), "Public Attitude Toward
Public Education" (Gallop, 1983), "U.S. Pupils Rank Low in
Eight Nation Test" (Walton, 1983), as well as position
statements of special interest groups; such as,
Fundamentalists, National Education Association, American
Federation of Teachers, parents, administrators, and school
boards, it becomes increasingly evident that the public is
demanding accountability regarding the competence of
practicing professionals and the achievement of students
(Collins, 1981).

These public outcries for reform are not new to the
educational process. An academic reform movement affected
education after books such as Why Johnnie Can't Read were
published and the Russian launching of Sputnik. Additional
reforms followed calling for integration and multicultural
education, and on its heels, came the technical reform with
the introduction of television, multimedia learning

systems, and computers into the classroom. Most recently the reform cry is for competency-based education and a move toward accountability (Joyce, 1980, p. 10).

As a result of these reforms, change in curricula and facilities were incorporated into the mainstream of the educational process, but how did teachers manage to adapt to these changes? A decade and more ago, teachers were more mobile and new teachers with new ideas were prevalent in most school districts. Thus, mainstay personnel were introduced to new educational ideas. Today this is no longer true. There is now a decrease in available jobs and people are not changing positions as frequently. This results in a more static workforce in the teaching profession (Collins, 1981).

Today's teachers need to keep their professional knowledge, skills, and methodologies current. Teacher inservice education is one solution, but inservice education has a bad reputation. McCarthy and Popchock (1980) found that "Inservice, more often than not, conjures up images among classroom teachers, who see it as something handed to or done for them" (p. 1). Teachers often complain that staff development programs are poorly designed and that they do not meet teachers' needs (Burden & Wallace, 1983). The reputation and effectiveness of

inservice education can be changed by providing teachers with well-designed inservice education that will meet their needs.

Statement of the Problem

With the current attention given to mediocrities within the public education system, and changes brought on through educational reforms and the legislative process, it is imperative that implementations of new teaching processes be accomplished. The purpose of this paper is to provide a syntheses of relevant literature regarding effective inservice methodologies and to compare current practices of a selected sample of midwestern area school districts to recommended methodology.

Four questions are addressed regarding teacher inservice education and its effect on school districts and their teaching personnel.

1. How important is teacher inservice education towards the implementation of change in the educational system?

2. Are there specific teacher inservice education methodologies which prove more effective than others?

3. To what extent are effective teacher inservice education procedures followed by individual school districts?

4. What causes school districts to fail in their attempts to implement change through teacher inservice education?

Importance of the Study

A review of the literature indicates a recent national renewal of attention and emphasis towards inservice education. A variety of recent educational journals have entire issues devoted to inservice education. This refocus of attention may be due to three reasons. One, teachers are less mobile today. Two, the current pressure placed on education with the emphasis on teacher competence and accountability. Third, increased media focus on education which has stirred political interest and action towards education (Collins, 1981).

Because of the renewed interest in education and inservice education, it is relevent to research the elements which constitute an effective teacher inservice education. Most school districts set aside days or part of days specifically for inservice education (McCarthy & Popchock, 1981). It, therefore, seems important for those participating in teacher inservice education to receive a program conceived using effective methodology.

Assumptions

Four basic assumptions are relevant to this study.

1. Teachers today are remaining in a teaching position longer than in the past (Yarger, 1982).

2. Most school districts produce ineffective teacher inservice education programs (McCarthy & Popchock, 1980).

3. There are reliable methodologies which produce effective teacher inservice education which are employed by a few school districts (Joyce & Showers, 1983).

4. A pilot survey revealed the extent to which midwestern school districts provide effective teacher inservice education. It was assumed the respondents' answers were true and complete to the best of their knowledge.

Limitations of the Study

There is an abundance of literature relative to inservice teacher education. Most of the literature relates to models of effective teacher inservice education, not to cause and effect relationships of particular variables which might influence aspects of those models. As a result, one model cannot be proved as more effective over another model.

The sample of an area of midwestern school districts may restrict the generalizability of the results, as the sample was restricted to one specific area and to one

specific group, elementary and secondary principals. Some districts may employ special personnel, other than principals, to direct teacher inservice education.

A final limitation is the survey instrument. The survey was constructed by the researcher, thus results may be limited by the lack of reliability and validity of the instrument. Because the survey allowed for open-ended responses, interpretations of the responses may also be limited.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this paper the following terms were defined:

1. Effective teacher inservice education--All activities engaged in by practicing teacher professionals that promote the transfer of educational change designed for professional, school, and/or student improvement (Hass: cited in Yarger, 1982).

2. Methodology--A particular procedure or set of procedures (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1985).

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In the literature an array of descriptors are used to describe inservice teacher education. From one article to the next, it may be termed inservice teacher education, inservice teacher training, faculty or staff development, professional training, educator education inservice programs, or teacher improvement. With the multiplicity of terms it would seem, on the surface, that it would be difficult to agree on a definition, establish a common goal, or provide workable methodologies that serve as a guide in establishing effective inservice teacher education at the grass-roots level. However, this is not the case. When taking a closer look at the literature, most authors agree that inservice education refers to certified teachers currently practicing their profession engaged in a variety of activities which contribute to professional improvement (Hass: cited in Yarger, 1982).

Where the articles from the literature depart is on specific methodology that produces effective teacher inservice education. In reviewing a variety of models, it became apparent that inservice teacher education is continuous in nature, and that the various methodologies

can be condensed into four broad categories: (a) needs

assessment, (b) strategies of implementation,

(c) training, and (d) evaluation.

Continuous Nature

As the United States moves deeper into the

technological era, it becomes increasingly apparent that

education must somehow adapt to meet the rapid continuous

changing needs of today's students, and workforce and

society of the future. Teacher inservice education program

planners have a responsibility to implement programs which

will promote teacher adaptability toward a progressive

society.

This adaptability is continuous and emphasizes

personal and professional growth (Byrne, 1983; Joyce &

Showers, 1983). The tasks of teacher inservice education

are to continuously expand teachers' general education,

generate continuous efforts to improve schools, and create

continuous professional skill development (Joyce, 1980,

p. 13).

Needs Assessment

Needs assessment is a process for obtaining and

analyzing information on which to build effective teacher

inservice education programs, and it includes goal

definition, program assessment, need identification, and

priority setting (Price, 1982). It is one of the most critical steps for providing effective teacher inservice education (Burden & Wallace, 1983).

A needs assessment can be accomplished by a variety of methods or combination of methods, a preferred technique (Swenson, 1981). Distributing a checklist, brainstorming at a faculty meeting, or conducting a personal interview with each staff member are suggested methods (Healy, 1983). There are also several needs assessment models covered in related literature. Price (1982) has compiled a five-point criteria which would provide a comprehensive needs assessment: (a) involve a broad spectrum of persons affected, (b) match concerns of people with available facts, (c) provide an open-ended assessment, (d) focus on learner needs, not institutional needs, and (e) report the needs in such a manner that action will occur to meet the needs.

Throughout the literature it is noted that a school district's staff is spread on a continuum of career stages. There is a consistent pattern of teacher career development, and these stages cannot be ignored in planning effective teacher inservice education programs (Burden & Wallace, 1983). Beginning teachers have much different needs than those with several years of experience, as well as, elementary teachers have different needs than the more

departmentalized secondary teachers. Therefore, through a needs assessment, inservice education programs can be aligned with teachers' needs as they progress in their career.

Strategies of Implementation

A second step is to decide on the appropriate strategy for implementing a specific change, whether it be in a behavior, procedure, or curriculum area. The need is to match the problem with the correct problem-solving strategy (Hutson, 1979). There are several strategies or activities to choose from that have been termed "inservice." Lemon and Minier (1981) list several: professional meetings, institutes or brief intensive courses of instruction or seminars, workshops, professional related materials (i.e., journals, teaching aids), demonstrations, and courses for credit. This is another area where selection depends on the needs of the individuals receiving inservice as none of the activities mentioned has priority over another. Any one or combination is a satisfactory strategy to accomplish change.

Training

A third step is to decide on a method for deployment of a strategy. A popular model established by Joyce and Showers (1983) was mentioned often in the literature. Through analyzing fifty-six studies on teacher training

and curriculum implementation, they were able to support
their training procedures with the goal to "bring new
methods into a teacher's repertorie" (p. 4). Joyce and
Showers' (1983) training plan includes:

1. The study of the theoretical basis or the
   rationale of a teaching method.

2. The observation of demonstrations by persons
   who are relatively expert in the model.

3. Practice and feedback in relatively protected
   conditions such as trying the strategy on
   each other and then on children who are
   relatively easy to teach.

4. Coaching one another as teachers work the new
   model into their repertorie providing
   companionship, helping one another to learn
   to teach the appropriate responses to their
   students and to figure out the optimal uses
   of the model in their courses, and providing
   one another with ideas and feedback.

The main goal of this procedure is long-term transfer,
lasting changes in teaching behavior.

Mohlman (1982) discussed a study of inservice training
based on this procedure. The sample, N=20, was divided
into three groups. Group one received presentation,
demonstration, practice, and feedback. Group two reviewed

the aforementioned plus peer observation. Group three received the initial four procedures plus trainer coaching. Group two gained the most which included all elements of Joyce and Showers' model. The main drawback of this study is the sample size. Therefore, the external validity is in doubt. However, the results give credence to experiment further using this model.

Another study, McKibbin and Joyce (1980), attempted to apply Maslow's theory of personality to the study of staff development. The school under study was the site of a Teacher Corps project of four years which involved a large number of staff development opportunities. The task was to place the teacher into one of Maslow's five personality categories. The authors found that:

> The general milieu of the school and the social
> movements of the times interact powerfully with
> the personalities of the teachers to create
> personal orientations which greatly influence
> how teachers view the world (and themselves in
> it), and those views largely control what the
> individual can see as possibilities for personal
> and professional growth and the kind of options
> to which they can relate (p. 254).

These findings would indicate that the final aspect of Joyce and Showers' training procedure would be difficult to

implement as many teachers would feel threatened or
inadequate to coach one another into perfection. McKibbin
and Joyce did not find their observations conclusive but
they were convinced that personality needs must be taken
into consideration because (a) they have implications for
each individual's ability to profit from options, and
(b) normative pressures are generated by the collection of
personalities in the school. It, therefore, seems apparent
that a good training model must be interwoven carefully
into the climate of the school which houses teachers not
only at various career stages, but also at various
personality stages.

Evaluation

The culminating step in providing effective teacher
inservice education programs is evaluation. The best
evaluators are the participants as they know if their needs
have been met. The importance of evaluation feedback is
for the success of future programs. Through participant
evaluation positive features of a program can be filtered
from the negative, and the positive features can be
incorporated into future programs (Healy, 1983).

Evaluation needs to be furnished to provide information
which reveals the extent the program's objectives were met,
to assess affective reactions of the participants, and to
set a follow-up procedure in motion to assess whether

individual and district changes have been made (George & McCallon, 1976). This kind of evaluation system for program analysis allows for better future programming.

There are several methods by which evaluation can be employed. The most common is the nameless end-of-session evaluation form. Evaluation of this type is useful, but feedback should be more substantial than this (Silver & Moyle, 1984). Lemon and Minier (1981) view the evaluation process as one of cooperation between all major interest groups, and the people who are affected by the program need to be involved.

Summary

A review of the literature indicated a strong renewed interest in teacher inservice education. The cause of this renewal is based on two reasons. First and foremost, the current public pressure on education is calling for a move away from an educational atmosphere of mediocrity to an educational atmosphere of excellence. This pressure has created political action which has resulted in changes in educational practices. A secondary reason of renewed interest lies with the status of the teaching profession. The public demands competence and accountability from a profession which is less mobile and faces a rapidly changing society. In order for teachers to keep pace with

this society, they must deal with change and maintain an openness to continuous growth that corresponds with their continuous teaching career.

There is strong evidence in the literature that promotes teacher inservice education as a viable method of acquiring educational excellence and promoting teacher growth. There is also evidence of successful methodology which can provide effective teacher inservice education. That methodology includes:

1. A needs assessment that allows participants to be involved with program planning and establishes programs that are responsive to the needs of the participants.

2. A variety of strategies to implement needed programs.

3. A training model that promotes the needed change.

4. An evaluation procedure which establishes the degree of success of each inservice program.

Chapter Three

PILOT STUDY

Introduction

A pilot study was conducted for the purpose of comparing current teacher inservice practices of midwestern school districts with effective teacher inservice methodology recommended in current relevant literature. This chapter includes: (a) survey development and questions, (b) the population, (c) procedure of data collection, and (d) results.

Survey

The pilot study survey included seven biographical data questions and thirteen open-ended questions relating to teacher inservice education. The questions were designed by the researcher, and no validity or reliability measures were established. The following questions were surveyed:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Number of certified teachers in district.
2. Number of building administrators employed by district.
3. Number of students district currently serves.
4. Circle the principalship(s) currently held by you.
   elementary   middle school   junior high   secondary

5. Number of years as an administrator.

6. Number of years of teaching experience.

7. Number of certified staff members for which you're responsible.

OPEN-FORM SURVEY

1. How do you define teacher inservice education?

2. Is there an assigned person in charge of teacher inservice education in your district?

3. Who (position) is in charge of teacher inservice education in your district?

4. How many contract hours on the average are set aside yearly for teacher inservice education?

5. Does your district have an established procedure that is followed in planning and conducting teacher inservice education?

   Is the procedure in writing?

6. Briefly list the steps followee by your district in planning teacher inservice education.

7. Briefly list acceptable activities for teacher inservice education.

8. How does your district generate ideas for topics included in teacher inservice education programs?

9. Is teacher inservice education a district budget line item in your district?

10. If teacher inservice education is not a budget line item, from which budget areas is funding generated?

11. What percentage of the total budget is targeted for teacher inservice education?

12. What do you perceive as the strengths of your district's teacher inservice education program?

13. What do you perceive as its weaknesses?

Population

The population surveyed consisted of elementary and secondary public school principals from a cluster of districts in a midwestern state. Non-public principals were eliminated because the current reform movement addresses public schools, more teachers are employed in public schools, and non-public schools do not fall under the complete jurisdiction of public governance. Principals were chosen because teacher inservice education falls within administrative jurisdiction.

Procedure

A list of elementary and secondary principals was obtained from a master computer mailing list from the specified area. Public school principals were separated from non-public principals, and a list of 97 public school principals remained. All 97 principals were sent a cover letter, biographical data sheet, and an open-form survey.

The envelope for each survey was coded for follow-up procedures.

The surveys and self-addressed envelopes were sent in early March, 1985. A week was allowed for respondents to complete and return the survey. From the 97 surveyed, 54% completed and returned the survey, and 3% returned the survey uncompleted.

Respondents from the largest district suggested contacting a specific person who was the director of teacher inservice education for that district. Since 8% of the nonrespondents came from this district, a follow-up letter and survey was sent to this director, and a complete response was obtained. No other follow-up procedure was undertaken since a large response was obtained with the initial survey and one follow-up.

Results

Seven questions termed biographical data provided specific information regarding each individual respondent and their respective district. The results are presented by one of the following methods: (a) a range is given, (b) a percentage is given based on the total of completed responses, or (c) an average is given based on the total of completed responses. Because some districts are represented by more than one response, it was not feasible to average certain items.

Analysis of the data indicates that the districts represented vary in size which influences the range of certified employees, building administrators, and students. The range for each question item was:

1. Certified teachers in district: 23-760.

2. Building administrators: 1.5-35.

3. Students served: 315-13,000.

4. Certified staff under respondent's direction: 10-95.

The respondents represented principal positions and a director of elementary education. Percentages for position were elementary, 42.5%; middle school, 4.2%; secondary, 23%; and 25.5% held a combination of positions.

Thirteen questions were included in the open-form survey. The results were arrived at by the researcher determining common, similar, responses, tallying number of each common response, and presenting the results by percentage based on the total of completed responses (N=48).

Question 1: How do you define teacher inservice education?

The results yielded 48 individual answers. The commonalty was noted in the phrase, "to improve instructional skills". This phrase appeared in 25% of the respondents' definitions. "Activities" was included in

8.3%; "conceptual knowledge" in 6.25%; "staff effectiveness" in 6.25%; and "maintenance of skills" was in 4%. The remaining 44% shared no commonalty.

Question 2: Is there an assigned person in charge of teacher inservice education in your district?

The responses to this questioned were tallied, and the results are expressed in percentage. The yes responses totaled 58.7% and the no responses 41.3%.

Question 3: Who (position) is in charge of teacher inservice education in your district?

Six categories were mentioned in the responses to this question. The results are listed by percentage: superintendent, 17.7%; principal 17.7%, committee, 20%; combination of principal and superintendent, 33%; a director, 8%; and no one in 2.2%.

Question 4: How many contract hours on the average are set aside yearly for teacher inservice education?

A wide range, eight to sixty-four hours, was reported for the amount of time set aside for teacher inservice education. The average allotment of time was 26.5 hours.

Question 5: Does your district have an established procedure that is followed in planning and conducting teacher inservice education; is the procedure in writing?

There were three possible combinations of responses: yes/no, yes/yes, or no/no. The precentage for each follows: 19%, 23.8%, and 5.7%.

Item 6: Briefly list the steps followed by your district in planning teacher inservice education.

The respondents listed one of four planning methods of planning inservice. The results are listed by percentage. Input from a combination of both staff and faculty, 65.2%; input by administration only, 19.5%; input 10.8%; and no method .2% were the most common mentioned.

Item 7: Briefly list acceptable activities for teacher inservice education.

A listing of responses follows which shows the wide range of acceptable activities: professional meetings, workshops, guest speakers, school visitations, support consultants, curriculum development, textbook selection, seminars, planning sessions, make-and-take sessions, work in classrooms, teacher effectiveness, and educational issues.

Question 8: How does your district generate ideas for topics included in teacher inservice education programs?

The responses were tallied, and a percentage was assigned each of the following: student achievement scores, 1.7%; models of instructional learning, 2.1%;

submission of topics from school personnel, 84.7%; needs

of the district, 6.5%; trends in education, 3.5%; and

speakers, 2.1%.

Question 9: Is teacher inservice education a district

budget line item in your district?

The three common responses were yes, no, and not sure.

The results are given in the following percentages: yes,

53.4%; no, 37.2%; and not sure, 9.3%.

Question 10: If teacher inservice education is not a

budget line item, from which budget areas is funding

generated?

The results were based on the no responses from

Question 9. The six common responses and their percentages

follow: professional serviced, 4%; area agencies, 4%; not

sure, 40%; general fund, 40%; activity account, 4%; and

travel account, 8%.

Question 11: What percentage of the total budget is

targeted for teacher inservice education?

The four most common responses and their percentages

follow: less than one percent, 14.8%; greater than one

percent, 29.7%; not sure, 53.1%; and none, 2.1%.

Question 12: What do you perceive as the strengths

of your district's teacher inservice education program?

The top six most common responses follow and listed

with each is its percentage: programs based on teacher

needs, 54.3%; activities offered, 17.5%; programs based on district's needs, 5.2%; coordinator, 3.7%; flexibility of program, 3.7%; and no strengths, 3.7%.

Question 13: What do you perceive as its weaknesses?

The top six most common responses follow and listed with each is its percentages: time alloted, 28.9%; methods of program planning, 14.4%; funding 11.5%; lack of continuity, 8.6%; content, 8.6%; and no weaknesses, 5.7%.

Chapter Four

CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

The pilot study survey responses indicate a wide variety of methodology that constitute teacher inservice education, and that the methodology employed varies from district to district. None of the districts responding met the four provisions which the literature indicates promotes successful effective teacher inservice education. The following discussions attempt to address the four questions posed in the introduction of this paper by comparing the relevant literature to the survey results.

Question 1: How important is teacher inservice education towards the implementations of change in the educational system?

The literature indicates that teachers must change because the stress in the definitions of inservice education is on professional improvement. If professionals are in need of improvement, then they must need to move from where they are currently to some other level. That movement is change. The key to change mentioned in the literature was to promote long-term lasting changes (Joyce & Showers, 1983).

The survey results indicate that current practices of teacher inservice also expect change as the greatest mentioned phrase was improvement of instructional skills. Not one response mentioned anything denoting long-termed improvement; however, it could be assumed the respondents would agree that long-term change is desired based on the meaning of improvement. Because of the high incidence of stress on improvement of skills in defining teacher inservice, it seems realistic to assume that teacher inservice education is important to the implementation of change in the educational system.

Question 2: Are there specific teacher education methodologies which prove more effective than others?

The literature indicates that there are methods that seem to be more effective, but it is also noted that a lack of variable manipulation and research in this area causes the answer to this question to be inconclusive. Teacher and administrative attitudes toward inservice education may have a bearing on the effects of success of a specific methodology.

The survey results indicate problems in effectiveness because many weaknesses in programs were noted. This aspect will be discussed in relation to Question 4.

Question 3:   To what extent are effective teacher inservice procedures followed by individual schools?

The survey results indicate that the districts do not comply with the recommended methods stressed in the literature. Many districts do assess the needs of their personnel and try to match those needs with inservice programming. The districts also provide a variety of strategies to bring about change. The breakdown seems to occur with the final two recommended procedures; training and evaluation. From the survey results, it was inconclusive as to how or if a needed change occurs by using current practices. However, not one respondent indicated evaluation of inservice programs as a procedure in inservice programming.

Question 4: What causes school districts to fail in their attempts to implement change through teacher inservice education?

The literature indicates that failure is possibly caused by attitude of participants and lack of planning that causes long-term lasting change. The survey results also indicate reasons for failure. Time alloted to cover a topic is inadequate. A lack of continuity from one program to another. Not enough funding for inservice programs. Lack of good methods in program planning. Teacher attitudes are poor. Lack of a coordinator to

to provide effective programs. The aforementioned survey results indicate that educators are aware that failure of inservice is a reality; the problem that now needs to be addressed is changing the failure of teacher inservice education into success.

Recommendations

It seems ironic that educational systems expect educators to produce quality programs that will provide for the needs of the students they teach, but cannot produce quality inservice programs that are effective in order to generate quality programs. From the review of the literature and the survey results the following recommendations were derived:

1. Generation of adequate funding for teacher inservice is necessary.

2. A specific coordinator is desired to direct inservice programming.

3. Program planning should include: (a) a needs assessment, (b) strategies for programming, (c) training, and (d) evaluation.

4. Inservice education needs to upgrade its reputation.

5. Educational institutions need to acquaint themselves with and provide effective teacher inservice programming.

References

Burden, Paul R. & Wallace, David. (1983, October). Tailoring staff development to meet teachers' needs. Paper presented to the Mid-America Mini Clinic of the Association of Teacher Educators, Wichita, KS. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 506).

Byrne, Robert. (1983). Inservice programs--What are the essentials for making them effective? NASSP Bulletin, 67 (461), 1-7.

Collins, James F. (1981). The state-of-the-art of inservice education and staff development in state departments of education and in the federal department of education. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15(1), 13-19.

Gallup, George H. (1983, September). Public attitude toward public education. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 32-47.

George, James & McCallon, Earl. (1976). Planning a competency-based staff development program. Austin, TX: Learning Concepts.

Hass, C. G. (1957). Inservice education today. In N. B. Henry (Ed.) Inservice Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators: The Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Healy, Sharon. (1983). Planning inservice programs. The Pointer, 28 (1), 12-15.

Hutson, Harry. (1979). Inservice best practices: The learnings of general education. (SP 020 130) Bloomington, IN: Indiana University School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 990).

Joyce, Bruce. (1980). The continuous process of school improvement: Lessons learned from the past. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators.

Joyce, Bruce R. & Showers, Beverly. (1983). Power in staff development through research on training. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lemon, Donald K. & Minier, Judith E. (1981). Inservice education: A how-to-primer. Insights, 13(2), 2-21.

McCarthy, Bonnie & Popchock, Carole. (1980). Involving teachers in continuing professional development: A teacher center model. Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh Area Center for Teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 2119 359).

McKibbin, Michael & Joyce, Bruce. (1980). Psychological states and staff development. Theory Into Practice, 19(4), 248-255.

Mohlman, Georgea G. (1982, March). Assessing the impact
  of three inservice teacher training models. Paper
  prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the
  American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
  (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 971).

A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.
  (1983, May 4). The Chronicle of High Education,
  pp. 11-16.

Price, Robert D. (1982). Determining education and
  training needs. Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning,
  58 (3), 24-31.

Silver, Paula F. & Moyle, Colin R. J. (1984). The impact
  of intensive inservice programs on educational leaders
  and their organizations. Planning and Changing, 15(1),
  18-33.

Swenson, Thomas L. (1981). The state-of-the-art in
  inservice education and staff development in K-12
  schools. Journal of Research and Development, 15(1),
  2-7.

Walton, Susan. (1983, December 21). U. S. pupils rank low
  in eight-nation test. Education Week, p. 1.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1985).
  Springfield, Massachusetts: Merrian-Webster Inc.

Yarger, Sam J.   (1982).   In-service teacher education.
In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.).   Encyclopedia of Educational
Research, Vol. 2, (5th ed.).   pp. 883-890.
New York: Macmillan.

Appendix A

COVER LETTER FOR PILOT STUDY

Elizabeth Kilgard
Independence, IA 50644

Mr. John Doe
High School Principal
Street
City, State Zip

Dear Mr. Doe:

I am currently working towards a degree of Master of Arts
in Education at the University of Northern Iowa. In order
to prepare for writing my research paper, I would
appreciate your taking the time to complete the enclosed
confidential survey.

Please return the biographical data and survey in the
enclosed envelope by March 22, 1985. The number on the
envelope aids me in the follow up of nonrespondents. Your
responses are guaranteed confidentiality through the
destruction of the master list upon completion of follow
up action.

Because this is a pilot study, there is a possibility that
an area of teacher inservice education has been overlooked
by this survey. If you feel that this is the case, feel
free to add any further information or comments on the
back of the survey.

I know that you are a busy person, and I certainly
appreciate your taking the time to assist me in this
project.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth Kilgard

Appendix B

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Please complete the following information:

1. Number of certified teachers in
   district.   _____

2. Number of building administrators
   employed by district.   _____

3. Number of students district
   currently serves.   _____

4. Circle the principalship(s) currently
   held by you.

elementary   middle school   junior high   secondary

5. Number of years as an administrator.   _____

6. Number of years of teaching experience.
                                               _____

7. Number of certified staff members
   for which you're responsible.   _____

OPEN-FORM SURVEY

1. How do you define teacher inservice education?

2. Is there an assigned person in charge of teacher
    inservice education in your district?

3. Who (position) is in charge of teacher inservice
    education in your district?

4. How many contract hours on the average are set
    aside yearly for teacher inservice education?

5. Does your district have an established procedure
    that is followed in planning and conducting
    teacher inservice education?

    Is the procedure in writing?

6. Briefly list the steps followed by your district
    in planning teacher inservice education.

7. Briefly list acceptable activities for teacher
    inservice education.