

## ABSTRACT

### Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty Who Prepare K–12 Principals in Texas

Francene Haliburton, Ed.D.

Mentor: James L. Williamson, Ed.D.

Research shows that the role of the K–12 principal is a significant factor in school improvement. Principal preparation programs have been criticized for inadequately preparing their graduates for the challenges they must face in K–12 schools. Since higher education faculty members directly impact the success of their programs (Bartlett, 2003), principal educators are responsible for reforming principal preparation programs.

This study described higher education faculty members in Texas who prepare K–12 principals and their workloads. It also examined the faculty members' perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. The research findings included:

- The majority of the principal educators who participated in the study were white males, between the ages of 36 and 60 years old. Thirty-seven percent of them have never been a K–12 principal.
- The study participants spent more time on teaching and preparing to teach than time on research activities and service activities. Differences in workloads existed when faculty participants' gender, highest degree earned, and tenure status were considered.

- Differences in faculty participants' workloads existed when the Carnegie Foundation classification of each participant's institution was considered and when their program's national accreditation status was considered.
- Differences in principal preparation program characteristics did not exist when faculty members' demographic characteristics were considered.
- Differences in two principal preparation program characteristics existed when each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification was considered.
- The majority of the participants were satisfied with their jobs.
- The majority of the participants believed their program graduates perform well on the ExCET/TEExES.

Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty  
Who Prepare K–12 Principals in Texas

by

Francene Haliburton, B.S., M.Ed.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Educational Administration

---

Robert C. Cloud, Ed.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree  
of  
Doctor of Education

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

---

James L. Williamson, Ed.D., Chairperson

---

Robert C. Cloud, Ed.D.

---

Laine Scales, Ph.D.

---

Randy M. Wood, Ph.D.

---

Sarah Stone, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School  
May 2010

---

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2010 by Francene Haliburton

All rights reserved

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables .....	vii
Acknowledgments .....	xii
Chapter One .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Workload Allocations and Institutional Types .....	2
Principal Preparation Programs .....	5
ExCet/TExES .....	8
Job Satisfaction .....	9
The Problem Statement .....	10
The Purpose of the Study .....	10
Research Questions .....	12
Significance of the Study .....	13
Basic Assumptions .....	14
Delimitations and Limitations .....	14
Definition of Terms .....	15
Organization of the Study .....	16
Chapter Two .....	17
Review of the Literature .....	17
Introduction .....	17
Workload .....	18
Student-Centered Work .....	20
Disciplinary or Professional-Centered Work .....	21
Community-Centered Work .....	21
Teaching .....	23
Research .....	24
Service .....	26
Carnegie Foundation Classification and Workload .....	27
Technology and Workload .....	31
Field Based Experience Requirements and Workload .....	34
Redesigning Principal Certification Programs and Workload .....	37
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education .....	40
The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation .....	42
National Demographics of Higher Education Faculty .....	43
Demographics of Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education Faculty .....	46

Ethnic Diversity, Gender, and Academic Rank.....	47
Ethnic Diversity, Gender, and Academic Tenure.....	48
Adjunct/Part-time Faculty.....	49
Aging Higher Education Faculty.....	51
Experience.....	52
Morale/Job Satisfaction.....	53
Chapter Three.....	57
Methodology.....	57
Introduction.....	57
Research Design.....	58
Instruments.....	59
Participants/Respondents.....	61
Procedure for the Collection Data.....	61
Method of Data Analysis.....	62
Chapter Four.....	65
Findings and Data Analysis.....	65
Introduction.....	65
Analysis of Demographic Characteristics.....	67
Research Question 1.....	67
Analysis of Faculty Members' Workloads.....	80
Research Question 2.....	80
Analysis of Faculty Members' Perceptions.....	88
Research Question 3.....	88
Analysis of Differences Among Workloads and Demographic Characteristics.....	106
Research Question 4.....	106
Analysis of Differences in Workloads and Institutional Characteristics.....	137
Research Question 5.....	137
Analysis of Differences in Principal Preparation Program Characteristics and Demographic Characteristics.....	150
Research Question 6.....	150
Analysis of Differences in Principal Preparation Program Characteristics and Institutional Characteristics.....	152
Research Question 7.....	152
Analysis of Differences in Workloads, Institutions, and Certification Passing Rates.....	158
Research Question 8.....	158

Chapter Five .....	160
Discussion and Recommendations .....	160
Introduction .....	160
Discussion of the Findings .....	161
Discussion of Demographic Characteristics of Principal Educators in Texas .....	161
Research question 1 .....	161
Discussion of Faculty Members' Workloads .....	166
Research question 2 .....	166
Discussion of Faculty Members' Perceptions .....	167
Research question 3 .....	167
Discussion of Differences in Faculty Workloads and Demographics .....	171
Research question 4 .....	171
Discussion of Differences in Faculty Workloads and Institutional Characteristics .....	173
Research question 5 .....	173
Discussion of Differences in Program Characteristics and Faculty Demographics .....	175
Research question 6 .....	175
Discussion of Differences in Program Characteristics and Institutional Characteristics .....	176
Research question 7 .....	176
Discussion of Differences in Passing Rate Data and Faculty Workload, Institutional Characteristics, and Principal Preparation Program Characteristics .....	178
Research question 8 .....	178
Recommendations for Further Research .....	181
Recommendations for Universities .....	181
Appendices .....	183
Appendix A .....	184
Appendix B .....	186
Appendix C .....	189
Appendix D .....	190
References .....	202

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Primary Activity.....	68
2. Full Time Faculty.....	68
3. Faculty Gender.....	69
4. Faculty Age.....	69
5. Academic Rank.....	70
6. Administrative Title.....	71
7. Racial/Ethnic Group.....	71
8. Primary Interest.....	72
9. Highest Degree Earned.....	73
10. Year Highest Degree Earned.....	73
11. K–12 Principal Experience.....	74
12. Number of Years as a K–12 Principal.....	75
13. Years Since Being a K–12 Principal.....	76
14. Number of Years Teaching in Higher Education.....	76
15. Number of Years Teaching at Current Institution.....	77
16. Annual Salary 2008-2009.....	77
17. Annual Faculty Salary 2008-2009.....	78
18. Tenure Status.....	79
19. Number of Years Tenured.....	79



20. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent Teaching – Spring 2009 .....	80
21. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Preparing to Teach .....	81
22. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent Advising and Counseling Students .....	82
23. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Committee Work/Meetings .....	83
24. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Administrative Duties .....	83
25. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Research and Scholarly Writing .....	84
26. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Other Creative Products/Performances .....	85
27. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Community/Public Service .....	86
28. Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Outside Consulting/Freelance Work in School Districts .....	86
29. Number of Hours Supervising Field Experiences/Internships in K–12 Schools .....	87
30. Job Satisfaction .....	89
31. Teaching Load as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	90
32. Committee Work as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	91
33. Faculty Meetings as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	91
34. Colleagues as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	92
35. Students as Source of Stress During the Last Two Year .....	93
36. Research/Publishing Demands as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	94
37. Institutional “Red Tape” as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	94
38. Keeping Up With Technology as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years .....	95
39. Review/Promotion Process as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years...	96

40. Perceptions About Field-based Experiences for Students.....	96
41. Perceptions About the Need to Hire More Women.....	97
42. Perceptions About the Quality of Students Enrolled in the Program.....	98
43. Perceptions About the Programs' Reputation for Academic Quality.....	98
44. Perceptions About the Commitment of Full Time Faculty Members to the Welfare of the Program.....	99
45. Perceptions About the Commitment of School District(s) and Practicing Administrators to the Welfare of the Program.....	100
46. Perceptions About the Adequate Supervision of Internships and Other Field-based Experiences.....	100
47. Perceptions About Reduced Teaching Loads to Work With Local School(s) or District(s).....	101
48. Perceptions About Reduced Teaching Loads for Research and Publications.....	102
49. Perceptions About Whether the University's Leadership Values the Program.....	102
50. Perceptions About the Fair Treatment of Full Time Faculty.....	103
51. Perceptions About the Need for More Full Time Faculty.....	103
52. Perceptions About the Need for More Adjunct/Part-time Faculty.....	104
53. Perceptions About the Fair Treatment of Adjunct/Part-time Faculty Members.....	105
54. Perceptions About the Commitment of Adjunct/Part-time Faculty to the Welfare of the Program.....	105
55. Perceptions About the ExCET/TEExES as a Good Measure of Success.....	106
56. Administrative Duty Workload by Gender.....	108
57. Research/Scholarly Writing by Highest Degree Earned.....	109
58. Number of Refereed Articles by Highest Degree Earned.....	110

59. Cumulative Publications by Highest Degree Earned.....	112
60. Schedule Teaching Hours by Tenure Status.....	113
61. Hours Committee Work by Tenure Status.....	115
62. Administrative Duty by Tenure Status.....	116
63. Workload (Research and Scholarly Writing) by Tenure Status.....	118
64. Workload (Number of On Campus Doctoral Courses) by Tenure Status.....	119
65. Workload (Number of Refereed Articles) by Tenure Status.....	121
66. Workload (Number of Off Campus MA/MS Courses) by Tenure Status.....	123
67. Workload (Number of Non-refereed Articles) by Tenure Status.....	124
68. Workload (Chapter in Edited Volume) by Tenure Status.....	126
69. Workload (Cumulative Publications) by Tenure Status.....	128
70. Workload (Number of Published Professional Writings) by Tenure Status.....	130
71. Workload (Number of State Presentations) by Tenure Status.....	131
72. Workload (Number of National Presentations) by Tenure Status.....	133
73. Workload (Cumulative Publications in the Last Two Years) by Tenure Status.....	135
74. Workload (Developed a New Course) by Tenure Status.....	136
75. Workload (Research and Scholarly Writing) by Carnegie Classification.....	139
76. Workload (Number of Published Professional Writing) by Carnegie Classification.....	141
77. Workload (Scheduled Teaching Hours) by National Accreditation Status.....	143
78. Workload (Hours Advising and Counseling) by National Accreditation Status.....	145
79. Workload (Hours Committee Work and Meetings) by National Accreditation Status.....	146

80. Workload (Consulting Hours) by National Accreditation Status .....	148
81. Workload (Number of On Campus MA/MS Courses) by National Accreditation Status .....	149
82. Principal Preparation Program Characteristics (Students Know How To Conduct Research) by Carnegie Classification .....	155
83. Principal Preparation Program Characteristics (Students Know How To Provide Opportunities for Continuous Learning) by Carnegie Classification .....	157

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge those named, as well as those unnamed, who provided me encouragement and support during the completion of this dissertation. University professors, Waco ISD colleagues, friends, and family members provided support and assistance during this project: among the named my sister and doctoral candidate, Nita F. Haliburton; my assistant principal, Verlean West; and my principal, Bobby Jacobs.

I wish to express my gratitude to my dissertation chair, Dr. James L. Williamson for guiding me through this process and for stretching my intellect to a level of potential I did not know was possible; to Dr. Janis Hunter, for her guidance and feedback throughout this project; and to Baylor University statistical doctoral candidate, Linda Njoh, who shared many hours discussing and assisting me with the data for this study.

Much appreciation goes to each member of my dissertation committee: Dr. Robert Cloud, Dr. T. Laine Scales, Dr. Randy Wood, and Dr. Sara Stone. Thank you for sharing your insights and suggestions to strengthen this research project.

A special note of thanks is passed to Dr. Betty Jo Monk for her nurturing spirit, friendship, support, and encouragement. Thank you for the spark that inspired me to complete this project.

I especially wish to thank my parents: William F. Haliburton and Delois Vonner-Haliburton for their lifelong, unconditional love and godly guidance. Thank you for teaching me to value the will of God.

I am eternally grateful to the late Dr. and Mrs. Leon Fernandez Hardee (Johnnie Dee) for instilling in me the godly principles that continue governing my life.

A thank you goes to Dorzelbra K. Thompson for her patience throughout the years I spent pursuing this degree. I appreciate her cooperation while my time and attention were focused on completing this dissertation. Thanks go to my sister, Cheryl A. Haliburton for the countless number of times she provided the assistance I needed that allowed me to stay focused on this endeavor.

Last, but not least, love and a very special thanks to Dr. Monty E. Francis for his unwavering confidence and faith in my ability to complete this task. I am grateful for his inspiration and for his words of encouragement.

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

The role of the principal in K–12 schools is more complex and more important than ever. Principals must manage a wide range of challenges including decision-making, instructional leadership, high stakes testing, and accountability. These challenges make the preparation program for principals a high priority for states and universities. A 2004 study of university based principal preparation programs in Texas investigated the perceptions of 163 program completers (Border, 2004). The researcher also investigated the perceptions of the program completers' supervisors. Border concluded, "As witnessed through the data, principal preparation is not effective in this study as perceived by program completers and supervisors" (p. 148).

The study also revealed that universities must evaluate and modify their programs to be effective in their principal preparation programs (Border, 2004). Border writes, "There is a critical need to identify characteristics of quality university-based principal preparation programs that will ensure that future principals acquire the skills necessary for effective leadership" (p. 6). It is time for universities to create school leadership preparation programs that will make a difference in improving schools and student achievement.

How school leaders are prepared is an area of increased interest. State and national policy makers, funders, and researchers have focused on enhancing leadership capacities in schools. Educational leaders need training to guide school improvement efforts in this age of heightened performance accountability. Educational leaders need to

be capable of managing the complexity of the job. Effective school leadership is essential for educational improvement and reform (Bathon & Black, 2007).

### *Workload Allocations and Institutional Types*

There has been limited study of workload theory and practice, yet it is important to make the best use of the time and expertise of higher education faculty. Institutions of higher learning established as cornerstones of their tripartite mission: teaching, research, and service. Each university weighs these components according to the university's priorities (Marson, 2002). Good administrative practices and procedures ensure the development of policies to guide faculty effort. Faculty effort, workload, expectations, recordkeeping, and accomplishments allow the university to relate faculty effort to components of its tripartite mission. Faculty effort is important (Adams et al., 1995; Porter & Umbach, 2001). Pressure to make the best use of the time of higher education faculty is increasing. Faculty should have a clear understanding of the effort that the institution expects them to provide in each area of the mission (Porter & Umbach).

While faculty members are typically charged to perform the roles of research, teaching, and service, often quality of programs in higher education are determined primarily by the research productivity of the faculty members (Bartlett, 2003; DeMuse, 1987). Increasingly, even higher education institutions that did not consider research a priority, presently reward faculty largely based on research (Remler & Perma, 2009).

Faculty members are the key component of higher education programs and directly impact program success (Bartlett, 2003). It is important, therefore, to know about the workload, characteristics, values, and perceptions of educational administration



faculty. Success of prospective principals, as measured by the Texas State Certification Examination, is important and needs to be examined in relation to faculty information.

In 1990, Ernest Boyer looked closely at the roles of faculty and the expectations concerning teaching, research, and service. The debate among higher education groups continues over the weighted value of each part of the tripartite mission. Research seems to get primary attention because it increases a university's status. Tenure and promotion are the rewards of research activities. However, the teaching mission of universities also needs increased attention. The public cares about the teaching mission (Fairweather, 2002). Although research enhances institutional stature among peers, political and public support for academic institutions rests on the perception of the institutions' commitment to teaching and learning.

Boyer (1990) advocated for teaching to be considered as a form of scholarship to increase its status on college campuses. Foundations have begun to require grant applicants to state how their research will affect their teaching effort (Fairweather, 2002). Some researchers use self-reported percentages of time to determine the amount of time higher education faculty spend on teaching. Other researchers have used the number of courses or student credit hours to measure teaching workload. If faculty at research universities were required to do more teaching, significant cost savings would result (Porter & Umbach, 2001).

Arthur Levine (2007) thinks that education schools need to be stronger in the research mission and in preparing future scholars. He warns scholars that organizations are engaging in education research and are a threat to university based education research. The education research community must act. Educational research is needed to

strengthen education policy, improve practice, and advance the understanding of how humans develop and learn. The weakened condition of education as a field is reflected in how little the research is cited by scholars or read by practitioners and policymakers. High quality educational research is well funded and is valued by policymakers, practitioners and/or scholars (Levine). Unfortunately, research duties are usually the first to suffer when student advising and course workload activities become overwhelming for higher education faculty (Boice, 2000).

It is important to understand what educational practices are most effective. Principals suggest that preparation program delivery be improved in the areas of internship/hands-on experiences and in content areas such as foundations, research methods, and school board relations (Petzko, 2004). It is also important to find answers to present educational challenges and to prepare the next generation of scholars to study education and to teach in universities and colleges (Levine, 2007).

The third component in higher education's tripartite mission is service. In a study at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, faculty was asked to define service. The responses varied from, "activity provided gratis" to "everything you do outside of your salaried job" to "providing expertise whether it is paid or not" (Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007, p. 1).

Faculty service and the scholarship of faculty service may have been lost in efforts to evaluate faculty workload and its effectiveness. Brazeau (2003) suggests investigating how service activities can be used to integrate or enhance teaching and research activities. Unfortunately, current methods of evaluating and rewarding faculty effectiveness still cause faculty to separate their service endeavor from the research and

teaching activities (Brazeau). What faculty members do and how their activities are perceived and related to the reward structures of tenure, promotion, and salary increases is as central an issue as can exist in the academic world (Mancing, 1991; Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007). “Service has been, is, and will likely remain the least regarded and most ill-defined of the traditional tripartite faculty role (teaching, research, and service)” (Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007, p. 29).

The absence of teaching is considered by some a measure of faculty and institutional quality. All faculty members teach; how much and how well, and how much time is left for other activities, are the issues. Faculty members with greater research skills and training are expected to produce more research (Porter & Umbach, 2001). Institutions with reduced teaching expectations attract good teachers who are also scholars. Institutions that require faculty members to publish for tenure and promotion should lower teaching loads, especially for junior faculty members (Mancing, 1991; Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007).

### *Principal Preparation Programs*

Principals face new roles and heightened expectations. They require new forms of training. They are required to have a positive impact on student achievement. Accountability for results is placed directly at the school level (Lashway, 2003). According to John Daresh (2002), principals need both academic knowledge and practical experiences. Academic knowledge provides a common language that enables principals to talk about the problems of practice. Practical experiences have obvious values. However, these practical experiences are often based on existing practices that the

leader's integration of personal and professional knowledge can use as a moral compass (Bathon & Black, 2007).

Principals responding to a survey of educational leaders conducted by Public Agenda indicated that traditional leadership preparation programs were "out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's schools" (Farkas et al., 2001, p.1). Principal preparation programs have a history of being highly ineffective. Some programs have been seen as unimaginative, overly theoretical, and impervious to reform (Lashway, 2003).

Theodore Creighton, the Executive Director of the National Council of Professors in Educational Administration (NCPEA) warns, "The existence of mediocre programs will continue to be a problem until all professional organizations and institutions commit to a collaborative effort in a comprehensive and thorough manner" (National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation, 2002, p.1).

Border's (2004) study also revealed that universities must evaluate and modify their programs in order to achieve effectiveness in their principal preparation programs. Border writes, "There is a critical need to identify characteristics of quality university-based principal preparation programs that will ensure that future principals acquire the skills necessary for effective leadership" (p. 6). It is time for universities to create school leadership preparation programs that will make a difference in improving schools and student achievement.

Some school districts and universities have banded together to replace traditional principal candidate coursework with programs that place greater emphasis on curriculum and instruction, the supervision of teachers, and professional development (Russo, 2004).

Border (2004) suggests, “Partnerships between school districts and universities may serve as the catalyst in the reform of principal preparation programs” (p. 149). John Norton cautions that the use of standards alone to reform principal preparation programs is probably not enough. New standards must rethink content, delivery, and assessment to be effective.

Demands on education leaders to raise student achievement are high. Policy standards can help leaders meet these growing expectations. Educational Leadership Policy Standards serve as a model for states and districts in developing, evaluating, or updating their own standards. The standards allow states to create a common language and bring consistency to educational leadership policy at all levels: superintendents and other district leaders, principals, teacher leaders, and mentors. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) 2008 are the updated policy standards. The standards reflect the wealth of new information and lessons learned about educational leadership over the past decade. They have been adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (2005).

A representative sample of 83 empirical and 47 sources of knowledge references support the 2008 ISLLC standards. The standards are as follows (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008):

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (p. 1)

### ExCET/TExES

In 2006, Texas changed its certification examination program from the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) test to the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) test. The TExES test for principals is Test 068. The Principal's test measures the requisite knowledge and skills that a principal in Texas public schools must possess. It is a requirement for candidates seeking principal certification. The TExES (068) covers nine competencies: (1) campus culture, (2) school community, (3) ethics, (4) curriculum, (5) professional development, (6) personnel management, (7) effective learning environments, (8) effective leadership, and (9) physical plant and support systems (State Board for Educator Certification, 2008b).

Schools and departments of education are diverse by region, control, religion, racial composition, gender makeup, and by the Carnegie Foundation's institutional classifications. Other diverse characteristics of education schools include: the programs they offer, the credentials of their faculty, the degrees they award, and their emphases on teaching and research. This study focused on what higher education faculty in Texas who

prepare K–12 principals do and their perceptions about how what they do impacts their programs when considering: age, gender, degree earned, tenure status, and Carnegie classification of the institutions, rather than focus on the outcomes of achievements of their programs.

### *Job Satisfaction*

The mission of land-grant institutions is to provide educational programs to meet the needs of citizens. Citizens utilize the resources and expertise of the universities to solve problems. This relationship is more effective when a positive relationship exists between them. Positive relationships can be achieved when faculties display a high level of job satisfaction. Increasing job satisfaction could increase productivity of all faculty members. Employees work harder and perform better if satisfied with their jobs (Nestor & Leary, 2000).

Literature supporting job satisfaction and age indicates that overall job satisfaction increases as faculty members mature. The literature supporting job satisfaction and gender is divergent. Some studies found that male faculty members were more satisfied with their jobs than female faculty. Other studies found that female faculty members have increased job satisfaction over males (Nestor & Leary, 2000).

Faculty members are foundational components of higher education and directly impact program success (Bartlett, 2003). Higher education faculty who prepare K–12 principals possess a great deal of influence and responsibility. Providing a well-trained cadre of principals and superintendents is a challenge (Drake & McCord, 2004). In earlier years, the employment practices of educational leadership departments were criticized. Professors with too little K–12 leadership experiences taught by recounting “war stories.”

War stories have been replaced by problem-based learning strategies and performance standards. Professors report having extensive experience in K–12 public school districts (Drake and McCord).

### *The Problem Statement*

How school leaders are prepared has become an area of increased interest to state policy makers, funders, professional organizations, and researchers. Effective school-level leadership is central to educational improvement and educational reform. The effectiveness of principal preparation programs is linked to the abilities, training, attitudes, experiences, and perceptions of faculty who prepare future principals in university-based programs. However, relatively little is known about those individuals who prepare school principals (Bathon & Black, 2007). The problem of the study is an examination of the characteristics and perceptions of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and how their tripartite (teaching, research, and service) workloads impact and relate to the success of graduates as measured by the state certification examination, ExCET or TExES.

### *The Purpose of the Study*

The overall purpose of the study is to describe higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and to examine their perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. Also the success of graduates, as measured by the ExCET or TExES, was studied in relation to a number of faculty characteristics, values, and perceptions. Objectives of the study are:



1. To describe the demographic characteristics of the faculty members.
2. To describe the workloads of the faculty members.
3. To examine the perceptions of the faculty members related to morale, including: salary, workloads, program characteristics, institutional support, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and success rate of program graduates at their institutions as measured by the ExCET or TExES.
4. To determine the differences that exists among faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, and tenure of faculty members.
5. To determine the differences that exist among faculty workloads when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and the national accreditation status of the program.
6. To determine the differences that exist among principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by faculty members, and tenure status.
7. To determine the differences that exist among principal preparation program characteristics when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and its programs national accreditation status.
8. To determine the differences that exist among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates when considering the following factors: faculty members' workload, each university's Carnegie Foundation classification, each institution's program's national accreditation status, and each institution's principal preparation program characteristics.

### *Research Questions*

The study describes characteristics of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K–12 principals and examines their perceptions about their tripartite (teaching, research, and service) workload allocations using the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics?
2. What are the workloads?
3. What are the perceptions about faculty morale including: salary, workloads, program characteristics, institutional support, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and success rate of program graduates at their institutions as measured by the ExCET or TExES?
4. Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members, and tenure status?
5. Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and the program's national accreditation status?
6. Is there a significant difference in principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members and tenure status?
7. Is there a significant difference in the principal preparation program characteristics when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and each program's national accreditation status?

8. Is there a significant difference among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 when considering the following factors: faculty members' workload, the institutions' Carnegie Foundation classification, the institutions' principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status?

### *Significance of the Study*

Higher education faculty is the key to the success of principal preparation programs. Faculty members develop and implement the programs that prepare K–12 principals for the challenging roles they must face. In a study by Border (2004) many university-based principal preparation programs in Texas were rated as inadequate and in need of improvement by their program completers. Higher education faculty who prepare K–12 principals in Texas are responsible for program improvement and the success of school principals. Given the importance of their responsibilities, it is important to know about these faculty members, their institutions, the structure of their principal preparation programs, and the passing rate on the state certification examination of those who complete their principal preparation programs.

This study provides a state base line of the characteristics of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K–12 principals and explain their perceptions about the impact their workload allocations has on their institution's principal preparation programs. Administrators, faculty members, and graduate students will be able to use this study to improve principal preparation programs. The business community and state

legislators will be interested in the results of the study because they are under pressure to find ways to increase productivity among higher education faculty.

### *Basic Assumptions*

For this study, the following assumptions are made:

1. Individuals responding to the survey instrument will be honest in their responses.
2. Participants will meet the criteria for higher education faculty who prepare K–12 principals in Texas as specified by the researcher.
3. All participants will be able to interpret the survey instrument and will answer accurately with respect to their perceptions and their universities.

### *Delimitations and Limitations*

Delimitations of the study will include the following:

1. The study included the 45 universities in Texas with approved principal preparation programs (Appendix A).
2. Only higher education faculty who prepare K–12 principals for those identified universities were invited to respond to the survey instrument.
3. Only the TExES (068) Passing Rate from 2004, 2005, and 2006 were used in the study.

The study was subject to all limitations recognized in collecting self-reporting data through electronic means and mailed questionnaires. The study involved only Texas faculty members; therefore, the results may not be generalized beyond the state. Also, the data affected by each institution's Carnegie Foundation Classification cannot be

generalized because too few faculty members from the Research Universities Very High classification participated in the study.

### *Definition of Terms*

1. *Carnegie Foundation's Institutional Classifications* – the traditional typology used to categorize institutions of higher education according to their shared characteristics.
2. *Effort Allocations in Workload* – how faculty time is spent.
3. *Faculty* – higher education faculty who prepare K–12 principals
4. *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)* – leadership standards to improve teaching and learning for all children.
5. *National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) Productivity* – a measure of what faculty produces with time spent on workload.
6. *Principal educator* – higher education faculty members who prepare K–12 principals.
7. *Publication* – articles in refereed journals; published reviews of books, articles or creative works; books, textbooks; monographs; and chapters in edited volumes.
8. *Research activities* – publications, presentations, and grants.
9. *Service activities* – working with schools and school districts, committee work, working with professional organizations.
10. *Teaching activities* – adapting syllabi for courses, guiding and counseling students, and mentoring students who present research.

11. *Tenure* – a status granted after a trial period to a teacher protecting him/her from a summary dismissal.
12. *TExES/ExCET* – Texas Examination of Educator Standards/Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas.
13. *Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)* – The agency that regulates state funded higher education institutions.
14. *Texas Principal Preparation Network (TPPN)* – a project established to provide improvement efforts by all principal preparation programs in Texas.
15. *Tripartite Mission* – teaching, research, and service.

#### *Organization of the Study*

The study is presented in five chapters and includes a list of references. The five chapters are as follows:

- Chapter One – Introduction
- Chapter Two – Review of the Literature
- Chapter Three – Methodology
- Chapter Four – Findings
- Chapter Five – Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of the Literature

#### *Introduction*

Principals have been at the forefront of numerous research studies since the early 1980s when the effective schools research recognized them as keys to successful schools (Jackson & Kelly, 2002). The enterprise of educational leadership preparation is dependent upon the program professoriate. Faculty experiences and preparation are foundational to work in developing successful and innovative principal preparation programs (Jackson & Kelly). However, relatively, too little is known about the educational administration professoriate (Pounder, Crow, & Bergeson, 2004).

The abilities and training of those who prepare future principals in university-based programs has become a growing concern. An increase in principal preparation programs and in student enrollment in these programs has augmented the use of part-time and adjunct faculty. Another concern is that some full-time faculty lack expertise in the areas they teach (Levine, 2005). Also, many full-time faculty members do not produce rigorous research that is relevant to the field or to practicing administrators (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004).

Data regarding the faculty responsible for preparing educational leaders seems in short supply. The most recent comprehensive study of tenure-track educational faculty was conducted over 10 years ago by McCarthy and Kuh (1997) and may not be representative of faculty in the 21st century. It is important to know who is teaching our future leaders in university based educational leadership programs in order to determine

their leadership practices and organizational factors that impact schools (Bathon & Black, 2007).

### *Workload*

During colonial times, the higher education professors who were recruited believed they were serving the cause of religion. In 1888, institutions of higher education began connecting the work of professors to the real world. In his effort to reform higher education, President Francis L. Patton of Princeton implemented a business model. Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard faced resistance with his threefold view of reform: the ideal of university, the ideal of liberal education, and the ideal of freedom of learning. Andrew F. West at Yale advocated a more traditional liberal arts education. Eliot's elective system proved to be a move toward efficiency in higher education (Van Patten, 1994).

Faculty workload is the amount of time spent on teaching, research, and service. The standard formula for faculty workload is 40-40-20; that is, 40% of a faculty member's time is spent on teaching, 40% on research, and 20% on service. Not all institutions adhere to this distribution of time allocations because their needs vary. At research universities, for example, the emphasis on research is sometimes more important than teaching and service (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008).

State legislators and many in the business community became major critics of the quality and productivity of universities at the close of the 20th century. Concerns over the high cost of higher education merged with concerns over the workforce's need for a postsecondary education in order to access better jobs. As a result, pressure mounted to



find ways to improve productivity in higher education. This pressure led to several studies to collect data on faculty workload (Fairweather, 2002; Meyer, 1998).

Policy debates have increased over higher education faculty members' workload, productivity, use of time, and performance. Public demands have made necessary a greater understanding of faculty members' teaching, research, and service. The need to ensure that they are productive resulted in higher demands for performance in all three areas of faculty work (Rosser, 2004).

Michael Middaugh (2001) wrote about what faculty in U.S. colleges and universities do and what they do not do. Middaugh indicated that higher education faculty members engage in far more teaching, researching, and performing services than the public perceived. He also blamed universities for not communicating what faculty members were expected to do. Objective institutional research on faculty activity can provide a long overdue picture of what faculty members do (Middaugh). Meyer (1998) distinguished productivity from workload and time allocations as follows: "Workload . . . captures how their [the faculty] time is spent, while productivity is a measure of what is produced with that time" (pp. 45–46). Higher education institutions need consistent and reliable quantitative and qualitative information on faculty productivity and accountability (Middaugh, 2001).

According to a 1999 publication by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, full-time faculty members worked about 55 hours a week, and part-time faculty worked nearly 40. The American Association of University Professors (2008) identified duties among, and in addition to, professors' teaching, research, and service duties as:

### *Student-Centered Work*

- Updating a course to incorporate new research findings, or creating a new course.
- Helping students with subject matter in person, by e-mail, or by way of an electronic bulletin board.
- Developing a class Web site to further student involvement in a course, or advising students about how to use technology in the field.
- Working with colleagues to modify the curriculum to keep up with changes in the discipline.
- Advising students about their choice of major or mentoring graduate students.
- Coaching students who want to go beyond the required coursework in a class.
- Counseling students about personal problems, learning difficulties, or life choices.
- Writing letters of recommendation to help students enter graduate programs or secure jobs or internships.
- Keeping in touch with alumni to assist with employment searches or career changes.
- Reading student research papers, undergraduate honors theses, or doctoral dissertations.
- Directing or serving on a student's master's or doctoral committee.
- Establishing a foreign study program or supervising students overseas.
- Sponsoring a student literary journal or overseeing a drama club.

### *Disciplinary or Professional-Centered Work*

- Serving on a committee interviewing candidates for new faculty positions.
- Evaluating a colleague's work for promotion or tenure.
- Participating in a departmental self-study.
- Reviewing potential library resources and advising on acquisitions.
- Writing a recommendation for a colleague for a fellowship or award.
- Serving on a university committee that writes policies for academic programs, student scholarships, or financial aid.
- Applying for a grant for the department, or helping to raise money for the university.
- Participating in the activities of a professional association to advance standards and research in the field.
- Giving a scholarly presentation at a disciplinary society meeting.
- Editing a professional journal to help disseminate new knowledge in the field.
- Reviewing articles and books submitted to journals and publishers and advising about whether to publish them.

### *Community-Centered Work*

- Giving a presentation to a business or school group, often at no expense to the group.
- Providing professional advice to local, state, or national government.
- Providing professional advice to associations, businesses, or community groups.
- Answering phone calls from citizens and offering professional expertise.

- Helping to keep the public informed about issues by talking to the media.
- Serving on the boards of local, state, or national groups.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Eastern Kentucky University (2009) posted on their website a job description for a vacant tenure-track faculty member. The site stated that the successful candidate will represent the university in a statewide consortium that is redesigning the principal preparation program. Other expectations included:

- Design an on-campus program.
- Design an on-line program.
- Teach courses on campus.
- Teach courses off campus.
- Teach courses on-line.
- Advise students.
- Serve on student committees.
- Provide service to local school districts.
- Represent the department on university committees.
- Represent the department on community committees.
- Be involved in professional organizations.
- Be involved in statewide initiatives.
- Maintain a research agenda.
- Be a productive scholar.

## *Teaching*

Faculty productivity studies traditionally looked at productivity in research. Only a few studies examined faculty productivity in teaching and service. The majority of the studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s indicated that faculty worked over 40-50 hours per week. Longitudinal data indicated that time spent teaching exceeded all other efforts; however, there was a decline in the number of hours spent teaching (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1990, 1995; Bartlett, 2003). Faculty members at institutions that emphasize teaching over research productivity were consumed by large classes, heavy course loads, substantial committee work, and commuting to distant off-campus teaching sites (Levine, 2005).

The results of an empirical workload study described computer and information sciences (CIS) faculty. The study examined the relationship between their workloads and their individual characteristics, occupational characteristics, and organizational context. The study participants were 307 full-time Computer and Information Sciences faculty members (Bartlett, 2003).

The faculty reported spending an average of 40.6 hours a week on paid duties. Teaching was reported as the principal role of 231 of the participants. Undergraduate teaching took 43.7% of their time and graduate teaching took 11.0%. Research activities took 16.9% of their time. These activities included preparing and reviewing articles, preparing for conferences, seeking outside funding, and reviewing proposals. Department and institutional wide committees were the next largest area and took 11.7% of their time. Service activities took the least amount of time (16.7%). The study found that the CIS professoriate would like to spend less time teaching undergraduate students and on

administrative duties and more time on research and professional growth. The researcher concluded that the majority of faculty workload is spent on teaching but the majority of program and faculty evaluation is based on research (Bartlett, 2003).

### *Research*

A 2005 study entitled A Study of Texas Principals' Perceptions of Barriers to Research Utilization by Eileen Scanks was based on a 1991 study of Tennessee school administrators (West & Rhoton, 1994). Six general barriers to research utilization were identified using a factor analysis procedure (Scanks, p. 15):

- 1) Non-practical focus of research – The research did not relate to day-to-day activities and professional capacity.
- 2) Complex nature of research reports – The research articles are complex and difficult to understand. Research should be written in a clearer and less technical manner.
- 3) Lack of organizational support – The school district does not encourage the use of research or provide resources to lead to the use of research.
- 4) Added time and expense – There is no time allowed during the school day to read research, study, discuss, and plan research implementation. Money is not allocated for obtaining, accessing and learning the information through journals, workshops, or other media.
- 5) Limited utility of research findings – The research does not apply to our school and the needs of our community. Implementing new programs will not cause anything to change.
- 6) Inaccessibility – Research was not available at their school. (Scanks, p. 15)

Scanks concluded that Texas principals were not concerned about a lack of appreciation for research or access to research. Their concerns focused on the gap between research and practice. The Texas principals surveyed believed that research should have a practical emphasis and be easier to understand. A third concern was about the need for college classes to focus on applying and using research more than focusing on research methods.

The impact of research in schools and in policy formulation depends on educators valuing the research. “Enlightened educators look to research to help them do a better job with the children they serve” (Slavin, 2004, p. 27). Decisions to improve student achievement must be based on data and careful data analysis (Creighton, 2001). Barriers that prevent research utilization should be identified, addressed, and removed (Scanks, 2005).

In a 2003 article entitled, *The Use of Research to Improve Professional Practice: A Systematic Review of the Literature*, Hemsley-Brown and Sharp emphasize the importance of useful research. Researchers should target what really counts.

For ideas to be accessible to educators and policy-makers, researchers have to market their knowledge to the education community as well as to the research community. Marketing, in a research context, means anticipating and identifying the needs of the users (practitioners and policy-makers), meeting those needs through participative research activities, and effectively disseminating research findings through the word-of-mouth recommendations of successful user-opinion-leaders. (p. 4)

Research that focuses on improving student achievement should be rigorous. Educational research should be more than cause and effect. It should include advancing higher theories (Olson, 2002).

In a study about the quality of educational research, Levine (2005) addressed a single question, “Do current preparation programs have the capacity to educate researchers with the skills and knowledge necessary to carry out research required to improve education policy, strengthen education practice, or advance our understanding of how human beings develop and learn” (p. 71)? The quality of educational research is weaker than it is strong, with low readership by practitioners and policymakers and has resulted in low citation rates by scholars.

Levine's (2005) study was conducted over a period of four years. The results were developed in three reports. The first report focused on the education of school administrators and the second on the education of school teachers. The third report examined the quality of education research and the preparation of education scholars and researchers. Levine offers five recommendations to strengthen research preparation in education schools. They are as follows:

- Recommendation One: Award the Ph.D. and only the Ph.D. to students who have successfully completed doctoral programs to prepare researchers. (p. 72)
- Recommendation Two: Diversify the research missions of America's colleges and universities; offer programs to prepare education researchers at only Doctoral Extensive universities and selected Doctoral Intensive institutions. (p. 73)
- Recommendation Three: Establish high and clearly defined standards for education research and doctoral preparation in research; close doctoral programs that do not meet those standards. There are two elements here-research quality and doctoral program quality. (p. 75)
- Recommendation Four: Establish effective means of quality control within the education research community. (p. 77)
- Recommendation Five: Strengthen connections between education research and the worlds of policy and practice; establish closer ties between education researchers and their colleagues in the arts and sciences. (p. 78)

### *Service*

Committee and service work activities can quickly consume faculty members' valuable time, yet it is important for them to serve the academy. Committee and service work is the third tripartite responsibility of faculty members in teaching, research, and service. When those duties overwhelm faculty members' time, committee and service duties can be more of a barrier than an enhancement to earning tenure and promotion (Rosser, 2004). It remains a common practice for time-consuming service tasks and



responsibilities to be assigned to women faculty members and ethnic minorities (Denton & Zeytinoglu, 1993; Modern Language Association of America, 2009; Rosser, 2004).

Full-time faculty employed at eight Mississippi public universities participated in a study about higher education faculty members' perceptions on the meaning of *service* and service activities. Institutions were rated from lowest to highest as Level One Relevance, Level Two Relevance, Level Three Relevance, or Level Four Relevance based on whether the institutions had the following: operational definitions of service, specific performance benchmarks, priorities for service activities, and guidelines for documenting service. The investigation found that many faculty had not even considered the relationship between service and scholarship (Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007).

Faculty at institutions with low relevance ratings had more negative perceptions about service than faculty at institutions with high relevance ratings. Institutions should have clear definitions of service policies that include whether the beneficiaries of the service activities are the institutions, the academic discipline, the community, or society as a whole. Institutions should also have written reward and compensation policies (Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007).

### *Carnegie Foundation Classification and Workload*

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was begun in 1970. Typically, faculty responsibilities fall into three basic categories: teaching, research, and service to the campus and to the community. The Carnegie Classification groups American colleges and universities according to their institutional missions. The foundation funnels public investment toward diverse types of institutions. The classification is the most widely recognized basis for comparing colleges and universities.

It is understood among universities that the higher a school's status in the Carnegie classification, the greater its prestige (McCormick, Pike, Kuh, & Chen, 2009).

The Carnegie Foundation updated its classification categories in December, 2006. The new categories are not comparable to those previously used. Most of the research referenced in this study uses the previous typology. Therefore, it was necessary to use both the former and present category listings.

The updated classification categorizes institutions that award at least 20 doctoral degrees per year as follows (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009).

- RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)
- RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)
- DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities

Institutions that award at least 50 Master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees per year are classified as follows (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009).

- Master's/L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)
- Master's/M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)
- Master's/S: Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)

The former system sorted America's universities into three broad Carnegie classes: 1) institutions granting the baccalaureate degree, 2) colleges awarding the master's degree, and 3) research universities granting the doctorate. The Carnegie typology identified two types of institutions within each of these classes as follows (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009):

*Baccalaureate General*

- up to half of all degrees awarded by the college are in the liberal arts

*Baccalaureate Liberal Arts*

- more than half of degrees awarded are in the liberal arts

*Masters I*

- predominantly regional public universities
- award 40+ masters degrees/year across 3+ disciplines

*Masters II*

- mostly private, tuition dependent colleges
- award at least 20 degrees annually without regard to field

*Doctoral Research Extensive (DRE)*

- award 50 or more doctoral degrees per year in at least 15 disciplines
- most research-oriented of education schools
- highest publication rates
- highest grant dollars for research
- stress publication in hiring faculty
- proportion of faculty with Ph.D.'s

*Doctoral Research Intensive (DRI)*

- award 10 doctoral degrees per year in three disciplines or at least
- 20 doctorates overall, regardless of field

The Carnegie Classification system highlights some key differences among higher education campuses. The amount of time given to research and the volume of scholarly contributions differs across college and university professors. Faculty work is influenced by the institutional culture and by the scholarly field in which faculty members' work. Research universities place a high priority on faculty scholarship (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009).

Sean Foley (2006) researched the expected work of faculty based on the Carnegie Classification of institutional type. He found that the type of work a faculty engages in is distinctly different by institutional types. Foley analyzed restricted data from the 1999 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty. The data revealed that there were relatively

strong positive correlations between scholarship and salaries and relatively strong negative correlations between teaching and salary.

The demographic variables: tenure status, years teaching, base salary, age, minority status, sex, and rank were able to predict the structures of teaching, scholarship, and institutional service (Foley, 2006). Faculty members with tenure, in Research Extensive institutions spend more time in service activities than do faculty without tenure. Full professors and professors with tenure produce slightly more scholarly works than non-full professors and those without tenure. Female faculty members spend more time in service activities than males. Foley found that Research Extensive institutions did not have a significant relationship between salary and scholarship.

Higher education is a discipline rooted in practice. The literature of a discipline reflects its development. The study of higher education institutions reveals certain characteristics of practice. An educational leadership study conducted at the University of North Dakota examined 474 journal articles in eight research journals in higher education. Among the many findings, the results indicated that over 60% of the authors were affiliated with Research Extensive Institutions (Enger, 2003).

Minorities in Research Extensive institutions had more refereed works than minorities in other institutional types (Foley, 2006). White faculty members teach more students and chair more committees in Research Extensive institutions. There is relatively little influence on salary based on teaching activities. Faculty members who have more students and faculty who spend more time with students outside of class receive higher salaries. Consequently, faculty members who teach more courses receive lower salaries. More mature faculty chair more committees and produce slightly more scholarly works

than younger faculty. In Research Extensive institutions tenured and tenure-track faculty have the highest average salary. Unfortunately, they also have the highest salary differences between the sexes (Foley).

In Research Intensive institutions, faculty with higher scores on teaching, faculty with higher scores on service, and faculty with higher scores on scholarship have higher salaries than those with lower scores on these three factors (Foley, 2006). Tenured faculty members have higher service scores than non-tenured faculty. Research Intensive institutions define themselves as teaching institutions, yet their highest correlation was between scholarship and salary. Teaching was the second highest in correlation to salary (Foley).

Only Research Intensive institutions appear to financially reward faculty work in three areas of the tripartite mission: teaching, service, and research (Foley, 2006). However, Foley found that financial rewards in each area were awarded for specific duties: 1) in teaching, for teaching more students, 2) in service, for chairing committees, and 3) in research, for writing journal articles. Unfortunately, faculty salaries continue to be unequal between the sexes (Foley).

### *Technology and Workload*

Several more recent, technology-related developments also impact issues about faculty workload. Higher education faculty members face challenges about how they use technology, as well as how they should use technology in their professional work. The increase in demands for delivering courses on campus and at a distance is also challenging faculty members' technical abilities (Rice & Miller, 2001).

Technology support may be perceived as less positive to tenured faculty members. “The infusion of technology in all areas of teaching, research, and service either in the classroom or through innovative delivery methods are adding to the insurmountable demands on faculty members’ time and their professional worklives” (Rosser, 2004, p. 289). Skills deficits, technology frustrations, and software incompatibility are all numbered among the challenges to using on-line technology (Duncan, 2005; Morse, 2003).

Distance education can often create an overwhelming workload for faculty. A study that compared faculty time requirements of an online course format to a traditional course format found that the online format took significantly more time (Holt, 2005). Web-based courses require more time and effort from faculty than classroom courses of comparable size, content, and credit (Tomei, 2006). Teaching and advising interactions may increase faculty workload. One teacher may have hundreds of individual interactions rather than delivering the same instruction and advisement simultaneously to a class (Mansour, 2006).

Faculty participation in developing and teaching online courses are inhibited by concerns about workload and release time. A longitudinal case study examined the workload for teaching three asynchronous online courses at The University of Michigan Dearborn. Distance education instructors with an average of 25 students each revealed that the time needed to teach online courses falls within the range of the time needed to teach live courses. The study measured the amount of time required for an instructor to complete the following activities: 1) reading and responding to emails; 2) reading, participating in, and grading 10 online discussions; and 3) grading one assignment. The

data collected indicated that teaching online courses requires between 3½ and 7 hours per week. However, graduate level courses require 30-45 minutes per week longer (Lazarus, 2003).

Distance education has increasingly become an alternative method for delivering academic course work to students. The format often creates challenges that may impact the quality of the distance education program. Included among the faculty challenges are workload, space allocation, and faculty development (Mansour, 2006).

“The role of the instructor in a Web-based pedagogical format is a dramatic change from one in the traditional classroom” (Thurmond & Wambach, 2004, p. 8). In a traditional format, the instructor takes center stage as lecturer. In a Web-based format, the instructor serves as a facilitator (Conrad & Pedro, 2009; Gutierrez, 2000). Online instructors must develop and manage their courses such that students view their engagement with the technology in a favorable light (Thurmond & Wambach).

Interaction allows faculty to reinforce student understanding of the material and to clarify course information. Distance learning courses must be designed differently than traditional courses to assure the effectiveness of interactivity. In a Web-based course, this type of interaction must occur by electronic means, such as chat discussions or email, rather than by a face-to-face meeting. In Web-based courses, instructors must provide timely feedback since student success in those courses is dependent on frequent and personalized contact (Restauri, 2001). Untimely feedback can contribute to students’ frustration (Barnes, Gooden, & Preziosi, 2004; Hera & Kling, 1999; Restauri et al., 2001).

Instructors of distance learning courses must also understand different learning styles and design their courses to facilitate student success. The instructor's role is to encourage the students to actively participate and help each other overcome the barriers of distance learning. Instructors must be accessible and provide progress updates on a regular basis (Barnes, Gooden, & Preziosi, 2004; Jefferies & Seden, 2006).

Many teachers admit that they lack the skills necessary to implement on-line courses effectively. In most cases, in-service training was the only solution offered to them (Wonacott, 2001). Faculty resistance to teaching online courses is influenced by their perceived lack of institutional support, lack of training, and lack of technical training (Clark, 1993; Conrad & Pedro, 2009; Lazarus, 2003). Supporting a distance education program requires major investments in hardware and software. As more and more students choose online courses, the need for physical space declines. This may result in programs losing space in spite of increased student enrollment (Wonacott; Mansour, 2006).

#### *Field Based Experience Requirements and Workload*

Expectations for school leadership are forcing many universities to redesign their principal preparation programs; thus, impacting the workload of those who must research, plan, and implement the new programs. Aspiring principals need opportunities to participate in monitored field based experiences and opportunities to reflect on and discuss those experiences with peers and mentors (Muth, 2002). Aspiring principals need to begin initial socialization into a new community of practice (Harris & Crocker, 2008; Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991).



A plethora of studies have proven that field experiences in educational leadership are important. One study explored how field experiences were offered in the educational leadership programs in the state of Georgia (Tubbs, 2008). The study yielded a 73% return rate from 8 of the 11 programs. One particular area of interest in the study addressed the role of faculty members in offering practicum experiences. The study found that an average of 57.89% of the full-time educational leadership faculty members participated in supervisory responsibilities of the field experiences, while part-time faculty averaged 45.8%. Programs involving a larger number of candidates also reported a higher percentage of faculty involvement. “This is a strong indication that providing educational leadership field experiences is burdensome and time consuming” (Tubbs, p. 40).

Faculty participants in the study identified their duties pertaining to developing efficient and effective field experiences in their educational leadership programs. These duties are as follows (Tubbs, 2008):

- Set goals and objectives.
- Seek appropriate school sites.
- Solicit administrators’ assistance.
- Assign candidates to their corresponding schools.
- Train school administrators to serve as mentors.
- Supervise candidates’ course activities.
- Evaluate candidates’ outcomes.
- Evaluate programs’ outcomes. (p. 40)

The researcher found that faculty participants in the study felt that managing field experiences added to their overwhelming workload (Tubbs).

Harris and Crocker (2008) explored gender issues between mentors and protégés in a principal preparation program in the South. Sixty-nine students enrolled in a cohort principal preparation program selected an administrator on their campus to be their

mentor. Students responded to a survey that asked them to identify their *best mentor* and the individual's gender. Students were also asked whether they preferred a male or female mentor and to explain their choices. Fifty-two percent of the males preferred a male mentor, and 71% of the females preferred a female mentor. Each gender expressed being more comfortable sharing issues with the same gender. Lastly, students were asked to identify issues protégés were most likely to discuss with their *best mentor* (Harris & Crocker).

“Developing effective school leaders requires concerted efforts not only by universities but also by districts” (Browne-Ferrigno, & Muth, 2004, p. 468). Districts demonstrate the value of the principalship and its requirements when they provide aspiring principals leadership and socialization experiences with school administrators (Browne-Ferrigno, & Muth; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998). There are so many challenges for principals that principal educators must not only recruit people for their programs, but they must also struggle to get those they train to accept principal positions. Field based experiences give potential principals the success and confidence needed to assume campus leadership (Brown, 2005; Harris & Crocker, 2008).

“Successful field-based experiences need to have clearly defined purposes and goals for all involved participants” (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004, p. 469). Mentor principals should be carefully selected and trained (Lauder, 2000). Mentor principals should be well respected by their peers and innovative in their leadership (Gordon, 2004). They must be able to provide guidance, engage in reflective dialogue, and honestly communicate expectations for their interns (Williamson & Hudson, 2001). Effective

partnerships between universities and districts will provide the quality of leadership needed in P–12 schools (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004).

### *Redesigning Principal Certification Programs and Workload*

Faculty members who prepare K–12 principals cannot afford to continue ineffective past practices. They must invest time in researching and redesigning programs that will improve school leadership. Lauder (2000) identified seven trends in new principal preparation programs and their role in the success or failure of principals' affects on student achievement.

These seven programs have incorporated the following components: 1) entrance requirements aligned with the demands of the principalship, 2) cohort models, 3) clear performance-based standards, 4) opportunities for individualization, 5) development and assessment of skills, 6) emphasis on reflective practice, and 7) continuous program review with input from current practitioners. (p. 22)

Theodore Creighton and Gary Jones (2001) reviewed 450 principal-certification programs. They were concerned by the scarcity of personal qualities, such as vision, as a requirement in program candidates when vision is a desired quality for today's principals. An even greater concern was that only 40% of the programs listed teaching experience as a requirement, yet today's principals are expected to provide instructional leadership. A 2003 study by the Center on Reinventing Public Education (CRPE) at the University of Washington revealed the need for more practical principal training (Russo, 2004). Interviews with more than 150 principals revealed that the uniform set of courses offered by universities was often inappropriate for many of the schools they actually ended up leading.

Traditional university-based programs cannot deliver the essential skills and important knowledge that principals and superintendents need. Preparation programs

must be redesigned to reflect the findings of research and to attend to belief, attitude, and philosophy while addressing current problems in practice. Principal preparation programs should coordinate their efforts with public schools to provide experiences outside of conventional classroom settings (Grogan & Andrew, 2002).

The growing dissatisfaction with institutions of higher education and their principal preparation programs is among the reasons many states have made alternative pathways for certifying school administrators readily available. In California, for example, candidates for school administrators are able to bypass the completion of a formal preparation program by obtaining a passing score on the School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA). The SLLA is aligned to the standards set by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and is not state-specific (Jensen, 2006).

In Texas, school districts are allowed to employ school administrators who hold master's degrees in management and public policy. School leaders who obtain their certification by examination are encouraged to enroll in coursework that supports identified areas of professional growth and to secure on-going mentoring and support from their employing districts or from outside sources (Jensen, 2006).

Evidence in research suggests that progress has been made in developing effective principal preparation programs (Goodney, 2007). Seven consistent instructional and learning actions establish a framework for carefully designed experiences. The framework includes: curriculum and instruction, clinical learning, internships, mentors, collaborative experiences, authentic assessments, research-based decision-making, and turnkey transitions. When principals apply these behaviors within their leadership and

management routines, they are likely to experience success (Davis & Jazzar, 2005; Goodney, 2007).

Goodney's (2007) study confirmed conclusions offered by Valentine (2001). Principals perceived by teachers as effective school managers, received higher performance evaluations by supervisors, and scored higher on the ISLLC performance assessment, were graduates of programs that have a clear conceptual foundation, are cohort based, and contain robust internship and mentor components (Goodney).

A study was conducted to investigate the perceptions of aspiring administrators from a large suburban university about their preparation as technology leaders. The researchers wrote, "School leaders need to be adequately prepared to effectively facilitate the implementation of technology in today's schools" (Redish & Chan, 2007, p. 126). A survey instrument was developed based on the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (NETS-A). The standards are divided into the six subscales as follows:

Subscale 1 = Leadership and vision

Subscale 2 = Leadership and teaching

Subscale 3 = Productivity and professional practice

Subscale 4 = Support, maintenance, operations, and finance

Subscale 5 = Assessment and evaluation

Subscale 6 = Social, legal, and ethical issues

The instrument was distributed to 58 program candidates in their last semester of the program. The aspiring principals rated their technology preparation slightly above average in all subscales except Subscales 4 and 5. The program's technology preparation

needs to be restructured and realigned more closely to the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (Redish & Chan, 2007).

*National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education*

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2009) is an accrediting agency that establishes high quality teacher, specialist, and administrator preparation through rigorous external review. “NCATE accreditation is a voluntary peer review process of the professional education units responsible for the personnel based on national standards developed by NCATE professors and practitioners” (p. 1).

A study by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) shows that graduates of NCATE-accredited colleges of education significantly outperform graduates who prepare at unaccredited colleges (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Six universities in Texas are accredited by NCATE and have gained “National Recognition” for their principal preparation programs. These universities and the dates they received NCATE accreditation are (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2009):

Sam Houston University	05/18/00
Stephen F. Austin State University	05/18/01
Texas A & M University	12/01/01
Baylor University	01/23/03
Trinity University	09/05/03
University of North Texas	09/05/03

Faculty members are responsible for maintaining their institutions’ NCATE membership status. To gain membership, these departments were required to align their programs to the national educational standards established by the Interstate School

Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). The following is a history of the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders:

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders were written by representatives from states and professional associations in a partnership with the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in 1994-95, supported by grants from the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Danforth Foundation. The standards were published by the Council of Chief State School Officers, copyright @ 1996.

The Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) trains reviewers to conduct rigorous evaluations of educational leadership programs as part of the NCATE accreditation process. The ELCC determines which programs deserve “National Recognition” status (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2005). NCATE institutions are reviewed on a five-year cycle (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2009).

The following agenda depicting higher education faculty members’ responsibilities for improving the preparation of educational leaders in the nation’s K–12 schools were suggested by the Executive Board of the University Council for Educational Administration (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2005):

1. Vigorous recruitment strategies be mounted to attract a strong faculty with an effective mix of research and practitioner experience who have demonstrated success in teaching, clinical activities, and knowledge development.
2. Vigorous recruitment strategies be implemented in cooperation with district partners to attract bright and capable candidates, of diverse race, ethnicity, and sex.
3. Entrance standards to administrator preparation programs be dramatically raised to ensure candidates possess strong analytic ability, high administrative potential, and success in teaching.

4. Rigorous methods for screening potential leadership candidates implemented in cooperation with district partners.
5. Cap the number of leadership candidates admitted to the program each year, to ensure an effective professor-candidate ratio and a higher quality cohort of candidates.
6. Support research on leadership development and establish a current and relevant knowledge base on school improvement and student learning.
7. Establish a set of core courses for all students enrolled in College of Education Master's programs, focused on instructional and distributive leadership to be taken at the beginning of one's course of study. The core would be used to establish a common knowledge base among teacher and administrative leadership as well as to recruit and counsel candidates into or out of certain programs.
8. Develop leadership preparation curriculum to transmit a common core of knowledge and skills, aligned with the ISSLC standards and grounded in the problems of practice.
9. Provide specialty courses wherein candidates can focus their expertise for practice at elementary, middle and high school levels.
10. Establish a signature pedagogy that acknowledges administration as craft wisdom linking conceptual and abstract knowledge, reflective thinking, case and problem-based work, and action research to the context of practice.
11. Provide full-time, well-planned and supervised internships in collaboration with school districts that involve increasing responsibilities with problems of practice.
12. Develop effective ways to prepare a new generation of professors of educational leadership and to provide them with professional development.
13. Ensure that educational leadership programs are well resourced by providing adequate faculty lines, resources for internship supervision, and effective faculty professional development. (p. 1)

### *The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation*

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2008) is the regional body for the accreditation of higher education institutions in the following Southern states:

Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. This regional body creates and implements standards to ensure the quality of the higher education experience. Representatives of the institutions review the accreditation status of other member institutions and consider the admission of applicants to their ranks. The Commission on Colleges adheres to the



following fundamental characteristics of accreditation (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools):

- Participation in the accreditation process is voluntary and is an earned and renewable status.
- Member institutions develop, amend, and approve accreditation requirements.
- The process of accreditation is representative, responsive, and appropriate to the types of institutions accredited.
- Accreditation is a form of self-regulation.
- Accreditation requires institutional commitment and engagement.
- Accreditation is based upon a peer review process.
- Accreditation requires an institutional commitment to student learning and achievement.
- Accreditation acknowledges an institution's prerogative to articulate its mission within the recognized context of higher education and its responsibility to show that it is accomplishing its mission.
- Accreditation requires institutional commitment to the concept of quality enhancement through continuous assessment and improvement.
- Accreditation expects an institution to develop a balanced governing structure designed to promote institutional integrity, autonomy, and flexibility of operation.
- Accreditation expects an institution to ensure that its programs are complemented by support structures and resources that allow for the total growth and development of its students. (p. 3)

Faculty members should be familiar with the full scope of the 14 comprehensive regional accrediting standards and perform the duties that maintain their institutions' accreditation status in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

#### *National Demographics of Higher Education Faculty*

In 1965, the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration distributed a demographic survey among their members. A sampling study (Campbell & Newell) of educational leaders in the United States and Canada was conducted in 1973. In the late 1980s, another study found that there was a decrease in the number of full-time faculty supported by educational leadership programs (McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona). A 1994 study (McCarthy & Kuh) found a significant closure in the gender gap of

educational leadership faculty, but no significant progress in closing the racial gap. The most recent comprehensive study of educational leadership faculty found that 80% of educational administration faculty were male and 90% were white (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). A 2004 study (Pounder, Crow, & Bergeson) found that the latest hires in educational administration programs were females with earned Ph.D's (Bathon & Black, 2007). The researchers write, "While these studies have provided invaluable insights into the educational leadership professoriate, none focused specifically on obtaining full faculty population data for an individual state" (Bathon & Black, p. 4).

Black, Bathon, and Poindexter (2007) achieved such a study of the educational leadership faculty in the state of Indiana during the 2005-2006 academic year. The participants were educational leadership professors from 17 approved leadership preparation programs in Indiana. The results of the responses from the 164 faculty members surveyed include the following (Bathon & Black, 2007; Black, Bathon, & Poindexter):

- 79 people were adjunct.
- 80 people were listed as part-time.
- Nearly two-thirds are not full time when split time faculty (less than full- time in the program) are included.
- Full-time tenure track, the highest percentage (14 people) are associate professor level.
- Full-time, second highest percentage (12 people) are full professor level.
- Full-time, least common tenure-track (7 people) are assistant professor level.
- Only one in five faculty members are female.

- Only 1 in 15 of faculty members are faculty of color.

The researchers concluded that the Indiana educational leadership professoriate is made up of experienced, well educated, white, male, part-time professors (Bathon & Black, 2007).

Likewise, Martha McCarthy and Donald Hackman (2009) undertook a national comprehensive study of the educational leadership professoriate to update the last such study by McCarthy and Kuh in 1997. Online questionnaires were sent to 590 program heads and 2,381 educational administration faculty members. The program head questionnaire gathered information on unit size, and changes in units over time, degree programs, faculty composition, and other program characteristics.

The faculty questionnaire gathered information about K–12 educational leadership faculty such as: personal characteristics, professional activities, and attitudes about the educational leadership profession and preparation programs. The results are based on the responses of 217 program heads and 895 faculty members (McCarthy & Hackman, 2009).

The study found that there have been demographic changes in the characteristics of educational leadership faculty members. In 1994, white males represented 72% of the faculty members in higher education. In 2008, they represented only 49%. Among the demographic changes in university based principal educators were (McCarthy & Hackman, 2009):

- White males are no longer in the majority.
- Professorial ranks are nearly evenly distributed.
  - 27% professors.

- 29% associate professors.
- 28% assistant professors.
- Only 57% (fewer than three fifths) were tenured.
- Non-tenured faculty comprise a significant portion of positions at 16%.
- The mean age of the faculty is 56.
- Teaching was identified as the primary strength of 74%.
- Research was the primary strength of only 18% of the faculty.
- Only 8% identified service/outreach as their strength.

### *Demographics of Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education Faculty*

A 2002 national study found that faculty members throughout the United States were still largely white and largely male despite 30 years of affirmative action. This lack of change among the faculty demographics should be cause for concern. “Who teaches matters,” (Trower & Chait, 2002, p. 1). The most widespread explanation for the lack of diversity in higher education faculty was that there were an insufficient number of women and minorities in the professoriate. However, women and faculty of color confront barriers to academic appointments and tenured posts. Many qualified candidates choose not to attend graduate school; others withdraw midstream, and still others opt for alternative careers (Trower & Chait).

Although the term minority faculty is used to discuss the workplace experiences of non-white faculty, the research literature on minority faculty primarily focuses on the experiences of Latinos and African Americans. Women and minority faculty are underrepresented in higher education relative to their numbers in the United States population. They are burdened with heavy teaching and service responsibilities. This

limits access to time for engaging in research and publication opportunities. Women and minority faculty are expected to assume roles that allow their institutions to pursue diversity on campus. Ethnic minority female faculty members are expected to take on a *symbolic role* and serve students of color as role model and confidant. Unfortunately, these roles have no bearing on the faculty reward system, especially the awarding of tenure (Acquirre, 2000).

In 2003, the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that fewer than 12% of full professors in America were people of color: 6% Asian, 3% African American, 2% Hispanic, and .3% American Indian. The numbers were even more dismal for female faculty of color (Berger, 2007).

In the early 1970s, women represented 23% of full-time faculty. In 2002, women represented 36% of full-time faculty in the country. The percentage of African American faculty members remained stagnant (5% or lower). Nearly half of all black faculty members taught at historically black colleges. The percentage of Hispanic faculty was even lower, from 1.4% in 1975 to 2.8% in 1997. The percentage of women earning advanced degrees increased steadily for 30 years. Unfortunately, once women entered the academy, their status remained low (Trower & Chait, 2002).

#### *Ethnic Diversity, Gender, and Academic Rank*

Men still occupied the majority of senior rank positions. The higher up the academic ladder, the more pronounced the disparities between men and women. Minority men and women held lower academic ranks than white male faculty. At all ranks and all institutional types, female faculty members earned lower salaries than male faculty members. In 1997, minorities accounted for only 11% of the full time professors in the

United States. The highest percentages of black faculty members are employed with public comprehensive universities. Both men and women of all minority groups are less likely to be tenured than whites (Trower & Chait, 2002).

### *Ethnic Diversity, Gender, and Academic Tenure*

In 1934, the definitive statement on academic freedom and tenure was drafted. Few women, and no people of color participated in the deliberations, and the document was a product of the power elite of the era. The male model was universal when the tenure system was created, and those who had tenure decided who else could get it (Trower, 2008).

Tenure gives incumbents enormous protection and a significant amount of power. They can resist changes the university may desire. They can resist changes concerning diversity. Tenure was conferred by white males to white males. These tenured white males also designed the rules for white males. Tenure still ensures status and protection (Trower, 2008).

The trouble with tenure policies lies in their execution (Trower, 2008). Patrick Nestor and Paul Leary (2000) explored the job satisfaction of Extension faculty, agriculture education faculty, during the leadership of three different Extension directors. They reported two major factors related to granting tenure that had a negative impact on the faculty's job satisfaction: unclear expectations by the faculty and not all faculty were included in the tenure track status. A dual tenure status caused both tenure and non-tenure employees to question the validity of the tenure policy (Nestor & Leary).

If universities are to continue to be producers of knowledge, tenure reform must occur. Excellence in teaching and service should count more than they do for tenure and

promotion. Reforming tenure policies will allow the work of new scholars to be rewarded. Universities must restructure their tenure policies, so users of research can be valued as judges of research quality (Trower, 2008).

Trower (2008) offers some possible policy reforms based on her 12 years of experience with research, interviews, focus groups, and surveys. “Institutions should ensure that all junior faculty members are equally supported in their research efforts” (p. 2). Teaching and service loads need to be monitored for equity among women, people of color, and white men. Isolation is a key factor cited by women and faculty of color who opt out of the tenure process or who are unsuccessful in their bids for tenure. If the tenure process continues its present course, the academy will not attract the best and brightest women and men of all races and ethnicities (Trower).

#### *Adjunct/Part-time Faculty*

Cutbacks in public funding of higher education and pressures for institutions to become more cost-effective and accountable have led to a change in how academic work is done as well as in how it is funded. Employers are phasing out tenured faculty and staff positions and replacing them with full time temporary or part-time positions. The workers filling these contingent positions are perceived as *less than* the employees with full-time tenured or permanent positions. Contingent faculty members are often deprived of many fundamental resources that tenured and permanent employees have supplied to them such as: office space, access to secretarial help, and office supplies (National Education Association, 2007).

In a 2002 study that examined part-time university faculty satisfaction, Anthony and Valadez used data from the 1993 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF, 1993) to answer four research questions:

1. Do part-time faculty really wish they could be full-time and on tenure-track?
2. Are part-time non-tenure track faculty members universally dissatisfied?
3. Are their full-time tenure track counterparts more satisfied?
4. Might many part-time non-tenure track faculty actually choose this status because of its flexibility and professional emphasis on teaching? (p. 42)

The researchers concluded that part-time faculty would choose an academic career again to a greater extent than full time faculty. Part-time faculty members were less concerned about job security, tenure, pay, and benefits than were their full-time colleagues (Anthony & Valadez, 2002).

Many argue that educational leadership programs should always have deep connections to practice. Often adjunct professors provide students with insights into the everyday practice of the principalship. Studies show that skilled and relatively permanent adjuncts are highly valued by students. However, it is important that the students are capable of understanding and using theories to undergird decisions that educational leaders make everyday (Black, Bathon, & Poindexter, 2007).

Unfortunately, recent research indicates that the greater the use of part-time faculty the less apt students are to graduate (Jacoby, 2006). Also, as colleges and universities reduce the number of full-time faculty members, bureaucratic burdens increase for the few full-time faculty who remain (Evans, 2009). Critics charge that reliance on part-time and non-tenure-track faculty lowers institutional and educational quality because they do little student advising and research and do not participate in non-instructional activities, such as faculty governance (Eckle & King, 2004). “The American



Association of University Professors recommends that no more than 15 percent of total instruction in an institution and no more than 25 percent of total instruction within any department should be provided by non-tenure track faculty” (Russell, 2006, p. 3).

### *Aging Higher Education Faculty*

Senior faculty are defined as those who have achieved full professor rank and/or are 50 years of age or older. They are a critical group in faculty development. They recruit and mentor new faculty. Institutions depend on senior faculty for leadership and the maintenance of a cohesive culture and a positive climate. The growing concern over the major bulge in retirement has some institutions developing programs in an effort to delay the retirement plans of select senior faculty (Bland & Risbey, 2006).

In January 1994, many colleges and universities eliminated mandatory retirement for tenured faculty members. Some institutions became concerned with altering their retirement policies while others were concerned with the consequences of losing a large fraction of their faculty who were nearing retirement age. Loss of “human capital” may impact some institution’s educational and research programs. Doctoral institutions are the most concerned with the end of mandatory retirement. Sixty percent of these institutions have implemented retirement programs to address their concerns (Ehrenberg, 2000).

The average age of full time higher education faculty members in the United States in 2006 was 50 years old. There will be a major increase in retirement over the next decade. Filling vacated positions will allow institutions to have opportunities to accommodate different faculty interests and to address their institutional staffing needs (Russell, 2006). It is more critical than ever to prepare new faculty that will meet the changing demands in higher education (Austin, 2002). Emphasis must be placed on

building bridges among individuals with different experiences and perspectives (Antony & Taylor, 2001).

Data emerging from Harvard's Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education paints an interesting picture of faculty born between 1965 and 1980. Survey data indicate distinctions in the values and attitudes of younger aged faculty from their senior colleagues. These distinctions in younger faculty include (Jaschik, 2006):

- Strong interest in collaborative work.
- Skeptical of tradition.
- Seek flexibility in work hours and setting.
- Seek balances between work and family.
- Willing to relocate geographically for preferable working conditions.
- Less commitment to institutional loyalty.

### *Experience*

In response to state and national mandates, educational leadership programs have begun to emphasize field-based experiences for students enrolled in principal preparation programs. Some programs have implemented a full-time faculty clinical position. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEAA) (1987) suggested that clinical faculty could teach practice-oriented courses, develop mentoring programs, and supervise internships (Hackmann, 2007).

Faculty clinicians are experienced teachers and administrators. A study (Bredeson, 1996) at Stanford University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Utah noted that clinicians at each university enhanced faculty credibility because they brought significant administrative experience to their positions

(Hackmann, 2007). Ironically, in their study of educational leadership tenure-track professors, McCarthy and Kuh (1997) found that only 1/3 of them had experience as administrators. Data from a 2005 report by Levine indicated that only 6% of tenure—track faculty had prior principal experience and only 2% had experience as a superintendent (Hackmann, 2007).

### *Morale/Job Satisfaction*

The perceptions that faculty members have of their work-life have a direct impact on their job satisfaction. Work-life is described as the personal issues that influence job satisfaction and the intent to leave or remain in a position (Conrad & Rosser, 2006). Satisfaction plays a critical role in faculty members' perception of their professional and institutional work-life (Rosser, 2004). Barnes, Agago, and Coombs (1998) found that time commitment was not only an important factor in faculty members' desire to leave an institution, but it also contributed to their intention to leave the academy. Faculty release time from teaching and course load responsibilities to pursue research interests can be a contributing factor to the satisfaction and morale of faculty members (Plater, 1995; Schuldt & Totten, 2008). "Faculty members' advising, course loads, fringe benefits, job security, and salary are important issues to their overall satisfaction" (Rosser, 2004, p. 291).

Research on faculty work-life has included issues such as: faculty members' motivation, productivity, and behavior (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995), rewards and salary (Boyer, 1990; Hagedorn, 1996; Matier, 1990), gender and minority issues (Acquirre, 2000; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Turner & Myers, 2000), and retention and turnover (Barnes, Agago, and Coombs, 1998; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). There is limited

understanding of the impact the increase in public interest and demands on faculty productivity has had on faculty members' satisfaction with their institutions or their career (Rosser, 2004).

Clues about the value of different aspects of faculty work lie in their institutions' promotion and tenure policies. Most reviews of faculty performance rely heavily on quantitative measures of productivity (Fairweather, 2002). Many state legislatures are engaged in policy debates about the nature of faculty work. Legislatures are asked to mandate an increase in the time faculty spend on teaching, as well as legislate post-tenure review (Fairweather). Tenured professors perceive their work-life less positively than untenured professors. Although they have more experience with effective time management, they may perceive the tasks to seek funding and to serve on committees as tedious (Rosser, 2004).

Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) conducted a study on faculty members that included 10 campuses. The study revealed that the quality of faculty members' work-life affects their level of morale. Administrative support varies dramatically by college, department, discipline, and even by individual faculty members. Perceived inequities can be demoralizing to faculty members. Women and minority higher education faculty are less satisfied in the workplace than white male faculty. They perceive themselves as victims of salary inequities and a biased reward system (Acquirre, 2000; Jaschik, 2008).

White male faculty members perceive women and minority faculty as less competent and block their access to institutional resources and rewards that promote professional socialization (Acquirre, 2000; Jaschik, 2008). The ranks of faculty of color in higher education remain frustratingly small. Academia will not be able to keep up with

the global economy and America's educational needs if women and racial and ethnic minorities are not in the classroom (Turner, 2002).

The report, *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*, compared salaries between male and female faculty. The gender disparity has remained unchanged since the 1970s. "In 2005-2006, across all ranks and all institutions, the average salary for women faculty was 81 percent of the amount earned by men," reports Shilpa Banerji (2006, p. 1). Two reasons were offered for the salary disadvantage. Women are more likely to have positions at institutions that pay lower salaries. Women are also less likely to hold senior faculty rank. These significant differences between the average salaries of men and women will remain as long as women are limited to lecturer and instructor positions (Banerji).

Parveen Ali (2009) investigated the job satisfaction characteristics of higher education faculty of five different races at a national level. He writes, "Job satisfaction can be defined as the positive emotional feeling resulting from attaining what one wants or values from a job," (p. 289). A 2004 survey indicated that more of the Asian/Pacific Islander and white faculty were tenured than the other groups in the study, and there were more of white faculty with the rank of professor (Ali).

Salary, retirement, and job security have been shown to be important personal issues that may affect the satisfaction of faculty members in colleges and universities (Hagedorn, 1996; Schuldt & Totten, 2008). According to Alene Russell (2006), "Faculty salary growth has not kept pace with overall wage and salary growth, and salaries at public institutions have lost ground to privates" (p. 3).

Clare Comm and Dennis Mathaisel (2003) did a job satisfaction case study at a small private college. The study sought to improve academic quality by providing information regarding faculty workload, salary, and benefits. One major finding revealed that most of the faculty surveyed did not believe they were fairly compensated. The faculty surveyed also felt they were not getting institutional recognition for their contributions. As a result, half of the faculty participating in the study sought professional income outside the college. Their commitment to the university and academic quality were deemed at issue (Comm & Mathaisel).

Work-life conflict is defined as a conflict between work and family demands. Meeting the demands of both is difficult (Higgins, Duxbury, & Lyons, 2007). Employers who raise the importance of work-life policies send a signal throughout their organizations that work-life issues are important (Valcour & Batt, 2003). Work-life policies indicate whether leaders of an organization value family over work or value work over family (Thompson, Andreassi, & Prottas, 2003).

Organizations are searching for policies that can be used to reduce turnover (Horn & Kinicki, 2001). Organizations that want to lower their turnover rate should pay attention to fair implementation of their human resource management systems (Griffeth & Gaertner, 2001). Stressed workers are likely to quit if workload increases result from large duties, insufficient staffing, and additional work handed down by management (Thaden, 2007). High stress can lead to high employee turnover intentions (Kavanagh, 2005). Job stress is positively related to intent to leave current employment (Williams, 2003).

## CHAPTER THREE

### Methodology

#### *Introduction*

The overall purpose of the study was to describe higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and to examine their perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. Also the success of graduates, as measured by the ExCET or TExES, was studied in relation to a number of faculty characteristics, values, and perceptions using the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics?
2. What are the workloads?
3. What are the perceptions about faculty morale including: salary, workloads, program characteristics, institutional support, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and success rate of program graduates at their institutions as measured by the ExCET or TExES?
4. Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members, and tenure status?
5. Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and the program's national accreditation status?

6. Is there a significant difference in principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members and tenure status?
7. Is there a significant difference in the principal preparation program characteristics when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and each program's national accreditation status?
8. Is there a significant difference among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 when considering the following factors: faculty members' workload, the institutions' Carnegie Foundation classification, the institutions' principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status?

The research provided a description of the demographic characteristics and workload perceptions of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K–12 principals. The research also provided a description of the faculty members' perceptions about their principal preparation programs as measured by the certification passing rates of their program graduates.

### *Research Design*

This study was a nonexperimental exploratory design intended to collect information to determine the perceptions of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals about whether their workloads impact the quality of their principal preparation programs when considering age, gender, race/ethnicity, degrees earned by the faculty members, tenure status, and service to the university and



community. As a descriptive study, the research embodies a quantitative approach as the primary method of data analysis. Glatthorn (1998) states that this approach may be referred to as “qualitative primary, quantitative first” (p. 34).

### *Instruments*

Data for this study were derived from responses to the Demographic Characteristics and Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty in Texas Who Prepare K–12 Principals Survey. The survey instrument was a modification of a survey developed by the Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, as recommended by Newman, Klien, Weis, and Benz (1980). The researcher conducted a pilot of the modified survey. Eighteen higher education faculty members who prepare K–12 principals were asked to participate in field-testing the survey and to offer recommendations for improvement. Eleven of the faculty members in the pilot were employed with Tarleton State University and seven were graduates of Baylor University’s educational leadership program. Of the eighteen, 11 participants completed the pilot survey; two started it, but did not complete it. There was a response rate of 72%. Seven of the 11 who participated in the pilot offered feedback, suggestions, or comments. Adjustments were made, and the survey instrument was finalized.

Also, the researcher used data obtained from the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) (2008a) Website. Graduates of principal preparation programs must pass the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES), Test 068, to qualify for certification. The test is designed to measure knowledge and skills delineated in the Principal test framework, which is based on six Principal Standards set by the ISLLC. The examination is a multiple-choice test, designed to measure the requisite knowledge

and skills that a beginning Texas principal must possess. It includes individual items, stand-alone items, and items arranged in clusters. Some items are designed to test decision-making skills based on real-world situations faced by school principals and assistant principals in K-12 schools (Texas Education Agency, 2006).

Committees of Texas educators and interested citizens participated in each of nine stages of the test development process. A diverse group of Texas educators, principal educators, education service center staff, professional educator organization members, content experts, businessmen, and parents participated in developing the test. The steps in the process are described below (Texas Education Agency, 2006):

1. **Develop Standards.** A Standards Development Committee was convened to recommend what the beginning principal should know and be able to do.
2. **Review Standards.** The committee reviewed and revised its draft standards. The revised draft standards were placed into draft rules and were posted in the Texas Register for public review and comment. The Principal standards were proposed by the SBEC, sent to the State Board of Education for its 90-day review, and finally adopted by the SBEC in January 1999.
3. **Develop Framework.** A Principal Test Framework Committee reviewed and revised a draft test framework that is based on the standards. The framework outlines the specific competencies to be measured in the new TExES Principal test.
4. **Conduct Content Validation Survey.** A representative sample of Texas educators who are practicing principals or who prepare individuals to become principals were surveyed to determine the relative job importance of each competency outlined in the test framework for that content area.
5. **Develop and Review New Test Items.** The test contractor developed items designed to measure the competencies described in the Principal test framework. An Item Review Committee scrutinized the newly developed test items for appropriateness of content and difficulty, clarity, alignment with the competencies, and potential ethnic, gender, and regional bias.
6. **Conduct Pilot Test of New Test Items.** All of the newly developed test items that were deemed acceptable by the Item Review Committee were administered to an appropriate sample of Texas educators.
7. **Review Pilot Test Data and Conduct Preliminary Standard Setting.** A Pilot Test Results Review Committee reviewed all the statistical data gathered from the pilot test to ensure that the test items are valid and free from bias. The committee also provided individual item judgments regarding a preliminary passing standard for the test.

8. Administer New TExES Principal Test. The new TExES Principal test has been constructed to reflect the competencies in the test framework. The test was administered to candidates for certification beginning in fall 2000. An interim passing standard was equated to that of the previous ExCET Principal test to maintain an equal level of difficulty for both tests.
9. Set New Passing Standard. A Standard Setting Committee was convened in October 2001 and recommended a passing score for the new test. This recommendation was presented at the March 2002 SBEC Board Meeting when SBEC established the final passing standard for the new test. (pp. 1-2)

Test scores are reported on a scale of 100-300. A scaled score of 240 is required to pass and represents the minimum level of competency required to be a principal in Texas public schools (Texas Education Agency, 2006). The TExES Passing Rate percentages for the 45 institutions explored in this study are for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 (Appendix D).

### *Participants/Respondents*

The participants in the study were higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals in the 45 university-based principal preparation programs listed on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (2008) Website. A complete list of the universities can be found in Appendix B. One hundred twenty principal educators of 352 responded for a 33% rate of return.

### *Procedure for the Collection Data*

The researcher obtained a list of the universities in Texas that have state accredited principal preparation programs from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Web site in order to identify qualified participants for this study. This study used the TExES Passing Rate data for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006. Although Baylor University is listed among the 45 universities of interest to the study, its program was

discontinued in 2004. The passing rate data for Baylor will be reported for the 2005 school year only. Texas Wesleyan is listed among the 45 institutions invited to participate although it only has data for the year 2006.

The researcher created a database of educational administration faculty members' email addresses. The number of principal educators and their email addresses were obtained via universities' School/College of Education Web sites, via open records officers, or by telephone. Higher education faculty members who qualified for the study were emailed a letter requesting their participation in the study (Appendix C). A link to the survey was included in the letter, as well as reassurance of the confidentiality of each participant's responses. The complete survey is included in Appendix D.

### *Method of Data Analysis*

Data for this study were derived from responses to the Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty in Texas Who Prepare K–12 Principals. For Research Questions 1 and 2, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine response frequencies through the use of the mean and median. Answers to survey questions 2–24 provided demographic information about the participants for this study. Answers to survey questions 25–34 provided workload information about the participants in this study.

To answer Research Question 3, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics through a comparison of means to determine faculty morale including: salary, workloads, program characteristics, institutional support, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and success rate of program graduates. Answers to survey questions 35–42 provided information about the participants' perceptions of their institutional support and the

participants' perceptions of their principal preparation programs for this study. Two open-ended questions 41 and 42 solicited additional information regarding the participants' perceptions about their preparation programs. These questions inquired about the faculty members' perceptions of the strongest link and the weakest link in their programs.

For Research Question 4, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine if a significant difference existed in faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, and tenure. Answers to survey questions 2–24 provided demographic information to address this research question, and answers to survey questions 25–34 provided workload information to answer this research question.

For Research Question 5, data were also analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine if a significant difference existed in faculty workloads when considering Carnegie Foundation Classification and a program's national accreditation status. In addition to using the workload survey questions 25–34, the researcher identified each university's Carnegie Foundation Classification and its national accreditation status on the Carnegie Foundation Web site and the NCATE Web site respectively.

Likewise, to answer Research Question 6, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine if a significant difference existed in principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, and tenure. Answers to survey questions 2–24 provided demographic information to address this research question, and answers to survey questions 35–40 provided information about each principal preparation program to answer this research question.

Again, to answer Research Question 7, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine if a significant difference existed in principal preparation program characteristics when considering Carnegie Foundation Classification and a program's national accreditation status. Answers to survey questions 35–40 provided information about each principal preparation program; each university's Carnegie Foundation Classification and its national accreditation status were identified using the Carnegie Foundation Web site and the NCATE Web site.

Research Question 8 was answered using data obtained from the ExCET/TExES database that is maintained by the State Board of Education Certification (SBEC). To answer Research Question 8, only data from the universities whose faculty members participated in this study were used. The three universities that had passing rate data for only one year were excluded from this portion of the study as well. Each university's program graduates' mean score for the passing rate on the TExES for principals for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 was used. Also, the number of program graduates for each university reported in this study is a sum for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Findings and Analysis of Data

#### *Introduction*

How school leaders are prepared is an area of increased interest to state and national policy makers, funders, and researchers. Therefore, it is important to make the best use of the time and expertise of higher education faculty members in Texas who prepare K–12 principals. It is important to know about the demographic characteristics of these principal educators.

This study focused on higher education faculty members in Texas who prepare K–12 principals and examined their perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. Chapter Four presents the data and findings from this investigation. The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To describe the demographic characteristics of the faculty members.
2. To determine the workloads of the faculty members.
3. To examine the perceptions of the faculty members related to morale, including: salary, workloads, program characteristics, institutional support, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and success rate of program graduates at their institutions as measured by the ExCET or TExES.
4. To determine the differences that exist among faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, and tenure of faculty members.

5. To determine the differences that exist among faculty workloads when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and the national accreditation status of the program.
6. To determine the differences that exist among principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by faculty members, and tenure status.
7. To determine the differences that exist among principal preparation program characteristics when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and its programs national accreditation status.
8. To determine the differences that exist among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates when considering the following factors: faculty members' workload, each university's Carnegie Foundation classification, each institution's program's national accreditation status, and each institution's principal preparation program characteristics.

The Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty Survey (Appendix D) was distributed via email to 352 higher education principal educators in Texas, and 120 faculty members responded. Fifteen respondents did not meet the requirements necessary to participate in this study as stated in Chapter One under Basic Assumptions. There were 105 qualified faculty respondents included in the study. Findings are reported in this chapter for each of the eight research questions.



## *Analysis of Demographic Characteristics*

### *Research Question 1*

What are the demographic characteristics of higher education faculty members in Texas who prepare K–12 principals?

Responses to 29 survey questions were used to answer Research Question 1. These demographic questions were asked to provide information about the participants in this study, including their workload duties. Frequency distributions were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0) to analyze the number and percentage of the responses provided by the higher education faculty members in Texas who prepare K-12 principals who participated in this study.

Table 1 indicates that 105 qualified principal educators in Texas provided responses to answer the questions in the study. The primary tripartite activity for 85 of them (81%) was teaching. Administration was the primary activity for 12 principal educators (11.4%). Service was the primary activity for six of them (5.7%) while only two (1.9%) principal educators identified research as their primary activity.

According to Table 2, 91 (86.7%) of the principal educators work full time at their institutions while 12 (11.4%) are considered part time or adjunct faculty. Two of the faculty participants did not answer this question.

The data in Table 3 indicate that 66 of the principal educators who participated in the study were male (62.9%) and 39 were female (37.1%).

The ages of the faculty participants ranged from 24 to 61 years or older (Table 4). The ages of 5 of the participants were between 24 and 35 years (4.8%), 71 were between

36 and 60 years old (67.6%). Twenty-eight of the participants (26.7%) were ages 61 or over. One participant chose not to respond to the question about age.

Table 1

*Primary Activity*

Primary Activity	Frequency	Percentage
Administration	12	11.4
Teaching	85	81.0
Research	1	1.9
Service	6	5.7
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 2

*Full Time Faculty*

Full Time	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	91	86.7
No	12	11.4
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 3

*Faculty Gender*

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	66	62.9
Female	39	37.1
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 4

*Faculty Age*

Age	Frequency	Percentage
24-35	5	4.8
36-60	71	67.6
61+	28	26.7
Total	104	99.1
Missing	1	1.0
Total	105	100

The academic ranks of the faculty participants are displayed in Table 5. Of the qualified participants, there were 21 professors (20%), 29 associate professors (27.6%), 40 assistant professors (38.1%), 3 lecturers (2.9%), and 12 adjunct/part time instructors (11.4%).

Table 5  
*Academic Rank*

Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Professor	21	20.0
Associate Professor	29	27.6
Assistant Professor	40	38.1
Lecturer	3	2.9
Adjunct/Part-time	12	11.4
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

The data in Table 6 show that 12 participants were directors, coordinators, or administrators (11.4%). Ten of them were department chairs (9.5%), and 1 faculty participant was a dean (1.0%). Eighty-two chose not applicable in response to the question about administrative title (78.1%).

The data in Table 7 reflect that 81 of the faculty participants were white (77.1%), 11 were African American (10.5%), and 9 were Hispanic (8.6%). American Indian and Asian Americans totaled two each (1.9% each). These race/ethnic group percentages are similar to those in a national study about higher education faculty members (McCarthy & Hackmann, 2009).

Table 6

*Administrative Title*

Administrative Title	Frequency	Percentage
Director, coordinator, or Administrator of an Institute	12	11.4
Department Chair	10	9.5
Dean	1	1.0
Not Applicable	82	78.1
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 7

*Racial/Ethnic Group*

Racial/Ethnic Group	Frequency	Percentage
White/Caucasian	81	77.1
African American/Black	11	10.5
American Indian	2	1.9
Asian American	2	1.9
Hispanic	9	8.6
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 8, the primary interest of the majority of (80) of the principal educators was teaching (76.2%). Only 21(20%) of the faculty participants indicated that research was their primary interest. The primary interest of four participants was service (3.8%).

Table 8  
*Primary Interest*

Primary Interest	Frequency	Percentage
Research	21	20.0
Teaching	80	76.2
Service	4	3.8
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

The highest degree earned by the faculty participants is reported in Table 9. More participants identified the Ed.D as the highest degree earned than the PhD. The Ph.D. degree was the highest degree earned by 35 of the principal educators (33.3%). The Ed.D. degree was the highest degree earned by 68 of the faculty participants (64.8%). Two participants indicated Other Degree as their highest degree earned (1.9%).

Table 9

*Highest Degree Earned*

Highest Degree Earned	Frequency	Percentage
Ph.D.	35	33.3
Ed.D.	68	64.8
Other Degree	2	1.9
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

According to the data in Table 10, a little more than 11% of the principal educators earned their highest degree 29 or more years ago, while 37.1% earned degrees more recently (2001-2008). The largest group (51.4%) earned degrees between 1981-2000.

Table 10

*Year Highest Degree Earned*

Year Highest Degree Earned	Frequency	Percentage
Prior to 1950-1980	12	11.4
1981-2000	54	51.4
2001-2008	39	37.1
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 11 displays data about the faculty participants' experience as K-12 principals. Sixty-six, or 62.9%, of the participants had prior experience as a principal, while 39 principal educators (37.1%) had no experience as K-12 principals.

Table 11  
*K-12 Principal Experience*

K-12 Principal Experience	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	66	62.9
No	39	37.1
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 12 shows that over half (55.2%) of the faculty participants who prepare K-12 principals either have no principal experience or have fewer than five years experience as principals. Not applicable was selected by 40 (38.1%), 18 participants were principals between 0 and 4 years (17.1%), 27 were principals between 5 and 12 years (25.7%), 11 were principals 13 and 17 years, and eight participants were principals 18 years or more (7.6%).

Table 13 reports the number of years since the principal educators worked as K-12 principals. Twelve participants have been principals within the last four years, while 26 were principals between 5 and 12 years ago (24.8%). There were 10 faculty participants (9.5%), who were principals between 13–21 years ago, and 16 who were



principals 18 or more years ago (15.2%). Not applicable was selected by 41 participants (39%).

Table 14 records the number of years the faculty participants have been teaching in higher education. Data indicate that principal educators in this study had substantial higher education teaching experience, with almost two-thirds (63.8%) with 5 to 17 years of experience.

The data in Table 15 report that 43 faculty participants have been teaching at their current institutions for four years or less (41%), while 47 participants have been teaching at their current institutions between 5–12 years (44.8%). Only 14, or 13.8%, have taught at their current institution for 13 or more years. One person did not respond to the question.

Table 12

*Number of Years as K–12 Principal*

Number of Years	Frequency	Percentage
0-4	18	17.1
5-12	27	25.7
13-17	11	10.5
18+	8	7.96
Not Applicable	40	38.1
Total	104	99.0
Missing	1	1
Total	105	100

Table 13

*Years Since Being a K–12 Principal*

Years Since Being	Frequency	Percentage
0-4	12	11.4
5-12	26	24.8
13-17	10	9.5
18+	16	15.2
Not Applicable	41	39.0
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 14

*Number of Years Teaching in Higher Education*

Years in Higher Education	Frequency	Percentage
0-4	25	23.8
5-12	48	45.7
13-21	19	18.1
22+	12	11.0
Total	104	99.0
Missing	1	1.0
Total	105	100

Table 15

*Number of Years Teaching at Current Institution*

Years at Current Institution	Frequency	Percentage
0-4	43	41.0
5-12	47	44.8
13-21	10	9.5
22+	4	3.8
Total	104	99.0
Missing	1	1.0
Total	105	100

While the annual bases for faculty salaries varied, 63 (60%) reported in Table 16 that they worked on a 9/10 month basis. The next most frequent salary basis was 11/12 month (21%). One person did not respond to the question.

Table 16

*Annual Salary 2008-2009*

Salary	Frequency	Percentage
9/10 Months	63	60
11/12 Months	22	21
Other	19	18.1
Total	104	99.0
Missing	1	1.0
Total	105	100

The data in Table 17 report the annual salary for faculty participants for 2008-2009. The salary for the majority of faculty (54) is \$50,001–75,000 annually - the lowest salary of \$20,000 was reported by only 11, or 10.5% of faculty, while the highest salary of more than \$125,000 was reported by only 2.9%.

Table 17  
*Annual Faculty Salary 2008-2009*

Annual Salary	Frequency	Percentage
Under \$10,000-\$20,000	11	10.5
\$20,001-\$50,000	12	11.4
\$50,001-\$75,000	54	51.4
\$75,001-\$125,000	23	21.9
\$125,000-\$200,000	3	2.9
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 18 indicates the number and percentage of faculty participants and tenure status. There were 36 tenured faculty members (34.3%). There were 41 faculty participants who were non-tenured but on a tenured track (39%). There were 28 who were non-tenured and not on a tenured track (26%).

Table 18

*Tenure Status*

Tenure Status	Frequency	Percentage
Tenured	36	34.3
Non-Tenured on a Tenured Track	41	39.0
Non-Tenured Not on a Tenured Track	28	26.0
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 19 provides data related to length of tenure. Most of the 40 tenured faculty had held that status between 5-12 years. Only six persons have been tenured for more than 22 years.

Table 19

*Number of Years Tenured*

Years Tenured	Frequency	Percentage
0-4	12	11.4
5-12	15	14.3
13-21	7	6.7
22+	6	5.7
Not Applicable	65	61.9
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

## *Analysis of Faculty Members' Workloads*

### *Research Question 2*

What are the workloads of higher education faculty members who prepare K–12 principals?

Survey participants were asked to respond to a series of questions about their teaching, research, and service workloads for the previous semester (Spring 2009). The results of their responses are found in Tables 20–29.

The data in Table 20 show that three (2.9%) faculty members were not scheduled to teach while 37 (35%) were the largest number of faculty (42 or 40%) taught. Twenty-two faculty (20.5%) reported the heaviest teach load of 17-35 plus hours per week.

Table 20

#### *Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent Teaching – Spring 2009*

Number of Teaching Hours	Frequency	Percentage
None	3	2.9
1-8	37	35.2
9-16	42	40
17-34	10	9.5
35+	12	11.4
Total	104	99.0
Missing	1	1.0
Total	105	100

Table 21 indicates the actual number of hours per week faculty spent preparing to teach during the Spring 2009 semester. There were three (2.9%) faculty participants who did not spend time preparing to teach, 33 (31.4%) who spent 1-8 hours preparing to teach, 39 (37%) participants who spent 9-16 hours preparing to teach, 18 (17%) who spent 17-34 hours preparing to teach, and 12 (11.4%) who spent 35+ hours preparing to teach.

Table 21

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Preparing to Teach*

Number of Hours Preparing to Teach	Frequency	Percentage
None	3	2.9
1-8	33	31.4
9-16	39	37.1
17-34	18	17.1
35+	12	11.4
Total	105	100.0
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100.0

The data in Table 22 represent the number of hours each week that faculty participants spent advising and counseling students in the Spring 2009 semester. Nine (8.6%) indicated that they did not spend time advising and counseling students, while the majority, 72 (68.6%), spent 1-8 hours each week advising and counseling students. More than 20 (18%) participants who spent 9-16 hours advising and counseling students, three (2.9%) who spent 17-34 hours advising and counseling students, and two (1.9%) who spent 35+ hours advising and counseling students.

Table 22

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent Advising and Counseling Students*

Hours Advising/Counseling Students	Frequency	Percentage
None	9	8.6
1-8	72	68.7
9-16	19	18.1
17-34	3	2.9
35+	2	1.9
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 23 displays the number of hours per week participants spent on committee work or meetings Spring 2009. Thirteen or (12%) of the faculty participants did not spend time on committee work, while the majority, 58 (55%) spent 1-8 hours per week on committee work. Twenty-three (21.9%) participants spent 9-16 hours on committee work, seven (6.7%) spent 17-34 hours on committee work, and four (3.8%) spent 35+ hours on committee work. More than one-fourth, 28.6% spent up to 16 hours per week on committee work. Four faculty participants, or 3.8%, spent 35 hours or more per week.

As shown in Table 24, there were 41 (39%) faculty participants who did not spend time on administrative duties, while 37 (35%) spent 1-8 hours per week on administrative duties. Almost one-fourth of the faculty spent more than 9 hours per week on administrative duties, including eight (or 7.6%) whose administrative duties averaged 35 or more hours per week.



Table 23

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Committee Work/Meetings*

Hours on Committee Work/Meetings	Frequency	Percentage
None	13	12.4
1-8	58	55.2
23	21.9	18.1
17-34	7	6.7
35+	4	3.8
Total	105	100
Missing	0	0
Total	105	100

Table 24

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Administrative Duties*

Hours on Administrative Duties	Frequency	Percentage
None	41	39.0
1-8	37	35.2
9-16	10	9.5
17-34	8	7.6
35+	8	7.6
Total	104	99
Missing	1	1
Total	105	100

Data related to the number of hours per week spent on research and scholarly activities are shown in Table 25. It may be important to note that 22 or 21% of faculty spent no time on research and writing. The largest number, 46 or 43.8%, spent between 1 and 8 hours per week on research and writing. At the high end, six (5.7%) spent 35 or more hours per week in this activity.

Table 25

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Research and Scholarly Writing*

Hours on Research/Scholarly Writing	Frequency	Percentage
None	22	21.0
1-8	46	43.8
9-16	18	17.1
17-34	11	10.5
35+	6	5.7
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 26 documents the number of hours per week that faculty participants spent on other creative products/performance during the 2009 Spring Semester. Almost half 46 (43.8%) of the faculty participants did not spend time on other creative products and performances. However, slightly more 49 (46.7%) spent 1-8 hours on other creative products and performances. Only eight faculty participants reported spending between nine or more hours per week in these activities, and only two (1.9%) faculty who did not respond to this question.

Table 26

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Other Creative Products/Performances*

Hours on Other Creative Products/Performances	Frequency	Percentage
None	46	43.8
1-8	49	46.7
9-16	6	5.7
17-34	1	1.0
35+	1	1.0
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 27 shows data about hours per week faculty participants spent on community and public services activities during the 2009 Spring Semester. More than 75% of the faculty reported some community and/or public service hours, with the majority, 60%, spending 1–8 hours per week.

As shown in Table 28, a majority of the faculty participants 55 (52%) did not spend time on outside consulting and freelance work in school districts. However, 33 (31%) spent 1-8 hours on outside consulting and freelance work, and eight (7.6%) faculty devoted 9-16 hours per week on outside consulting and freelance work, two (1.9%) who spent 17-34 hours on outside consulting and freelance work during the Spring 2009 Semester. Only four (3.8%) spent 17 hours or more per week on the activity. There were 5 (4.8%) participants who did not respond to this question.

Table 27

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent On Community/Public Service*

Hours on Other Community/Public Service	Frequency	Percentage
None	25	23.8
1-8	63	60.0
9-16	11	10.5
17-34	3	2.9
35+	1	1.0
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 28

*Actual Number of Hours Per Week Spent On Outside Consulting/Freelance Work in School Districts*

Hours Working in School Districts	Frequency	Percentage
None	55	52.4
1-8	33	31.4
9-16	8	7.6
17-34	2	1.9
35+	2	1.9
Total	100	95.2
Missing	5	4.8
Total	105	100

According to the data in Table 29, during the Spring 2009 Semester, there were 53 (50.5%) faculty participants who did not spend time on supervising field experiences and internships in K-12 schools, 33 (31%) who spent 1-8 hours on supervising field experiences and internships, nine (8.6%) participants who spent 9-16 hours on supervising field experiences and internships, 5 (4.8%) who spent 17-34 hours on supervising field experiences and internships, and 5 (4.8%) who spent 35+ hours on supervising field experiences and internships.

Table 29

*Number of Hours Supervising Field Experiences/Internships in K-12 Schools*

Hours Supervising Field Experiences	Frequency	Percentage
None	53	50.5
1-8	33	31.4
9-16	9	8.6
17-34	5	4.8
35+	0	0.0
Total	100	95.2
Missing	5	4.8
Total	105	100

## *Analysis of Faculty Members' Perceptions*

### *Research Question 3*

What are the faculty participants' perceptions about salary, workload stress, program characteristics, institutional support, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and success rate of program graduates at their institutions as measured by the ExCET or TExES?

The responses to 25 survey questions were used to answer Research Question 3. Frequency distributions were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0) to analyze the responses of the number and percentage of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and their perceptions about faculty morale. Steps were taken to measure selected factors in the survey.

Faculty participants used a 5-point rating scale to respond to survey questions regarding job satisfaction in the last two years. The first rating scale was divided into three broad categories: (1) satisfied, (2) not satisfied, and (3) not applicable. In addition, the participants also used a 5-point rating scale to respond to survey questions regarding the degree of stress posed by selected factors in the survey. This rating scale was also divided into three broad categories: (1) extensive, (2) somewhat, and (3) not at all. Participants provided responses to survey questions about their principal preparation program characteristics. A third rating scale asked participants to (1) agree or (2) disagree with select statements about characteristics of their programs.

The majority of the faculty participants indicated that they are satisfied with their salary and benefits. Table 30 shows that 103 faculty respondents shared their perceptions about their satisfaction with their salaries and benefits. Eighty-three (or 79%) were

satisfied while only 17 (16%) were not satisfied. Three (2.9%) faculty participants chose the Not Applicable response.

Table 30  
*Job Satisfaction*

Salary/Fringe Benefit	Frequency	Percentage
Satisfied	83	79.0
Not Satisfied	17	16.2
Not Applicable	3	2.9
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

The survey inquired about faculty members' perceptions related to stress experienced in the last two years by selected workload duties. Tables 31-39 record the degree of stress posed by the following nine workload duties: teaching load, committee work, faculty meetings, colleagues, students, research and publishing demands, institutional red tape, keeping up with technology, and the review/promotion process. Faculty participants indicated that workload duties associated with students were the least stressful, while workload duties associated with institutional red tape were the most stressful.

As shown in Table 31, 103 faculty participants shared their perceptions about the stress experienced by their teaching loads. Of the numbers, 13 (12%) indicated that their teaching load had been an extensive source of stress. There were 32 (30.5%) participants

who indicated that their teaching load had somewhat been a source of stress. The majority 58 (55%) indicated that their teaching load had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. Two (1.9%) faculty members did not respond to the question.

Table 31

*Teaching Load as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Teaching Load	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	13	12.4
Somewhat	32	30.5
Not At All	58	55.2
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

One hundred three faculty participants shared their perceptions about the stress experienced by their committee work (Table 32). There were 14 (13%) participants who indicated that their committee work had been an extensive source of stress on them, and 45 (42.9%) participants indicated that their committee work had been somewhat a source of stress. There were 44 (41.9%) who said that their committee work had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were two (1.9%) participants who did not respond to the question.

As shown in Table 33, 103 faculty participants shared their perceptions about the stress experienced by their institutions' faculty meetings. Faculty meetings were a source of stress for 52% of the participants. There were 18 (17%) participants who indicated that



faculty meetings had been an extensive source of stress. There were 37 (35%) participants who indicated that faculty meetings had somewhat been a source of stress. There were 48 (45.7%) who said that faculty meetings had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were two (1.9%) participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 32

*Committee Work as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Committee Work	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	14	13.3
Somewhat	45	42.9
Not At All	44	41.9
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 33

*Faculty Meetings as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Faculty Meetings	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	18	17.1
Somewhat	37	35.2
Not At All	48	45.7
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 34 shows the responses of 103 participants who shared their perceptions about the stress posed by their colleagues. A majority of 19 (18%) faculty respondents indicated that their colleagues were a source of stress for them during the last two years, while 38 (36%) that their colleagues had been somewhat a source of stress. There were 46 (43.8%) who said that their colleagues had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were two (1.9%) participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 34

*Colleagues as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Colleagues	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	19	18.1
Somewhat	38	36.2
Not At All	46	43.8
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

One hundred three faculty participants shared their perceptions about the stress posed by their students (Table 35). Only 5, or (4.8%) indicated that their students had been an extensive source of stress for them, while 34 (32%) participants indicated that their students had somewhat been a source of stress. The clearly majority of faculty 64 (61%) said that their students had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were two (1.9%) participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 35

*Students as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Student	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	5	4.8
Somewhat	34	32.4
Not At All	58	55
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 36 indicates that 103 faculty participants shared their perceptions about their stress caused by their institutions' research and publishing demands. There were 20 (19%) participants who indicated that research and publishing demands had been an extensive source of stress during the last two years, and 51 (48.6%) indicated that research and publishing demands had been somewhat a source of stress. There were 58 (55%) who said that research and publishing demands had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were two (1.9%) participants who did not respond to the question.

The data in Table 37 record the faculty participants' responses to the stress experienced by "red tape" within their institutions. There were 25 (23.8%) participants who indicated that institutional "red tape" had been an extensive source of stress, and 43 (41%) participants indicated that institutional "red tape" had somewhat been a source of stress. Thirty-five (33%) said that institutional "red tape" had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. Only two (1.9%) participants did not respond to the question.

Table 36

*Research/Publishing Demands as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Research/Publishing Demands	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	20	19.0
Somewhat	32	30.5
Not At All	51	48.6
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Table 37

*Institutional “Red Tape” as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Institutional “Red Tape”	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	25	23.8
Somewhat	43	41.0
Not At All	35	33.3
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 38, 101 faculty participants shared their perceptions about the stress of keeping up with technology. More than one-half 58% of the faculty respondents indicated that keeping up with technology had been a source of stress during the last two years, with 20% indicating that the stress had been extensive. There were 40 (38%) who

said that keeping up with technology had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were four (3.8%) participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 38

*Keeping Up With Technology as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Keeping Up With Technology	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	20	19.0
Somewhat	41	39.0
Not At All	40	38.1
Total	101	96.2
Missing	4	3.8
Total	105	100

Table 39 shows the results of the survey inquiry about the review and promotion process as a source of stress. Eighteen (17%) faculty participants indicated that the review and promotion process had been an extensive source of stress during the last two year, and another 29 (27.6%) participants indicated that the review and promotion process had somewhat been a source of stress. There were 56 (53%) who said that the review and promotion process had not been a source of stress at all in the last two years. There were two (1.9%) participants who did not respond to the question.

Faculty participants were asked to agree or disagree with statements describing their principal preparation program characteristics. The results of their responses are recorded in Tables 40–55.

Table 39

*Review/Promotion Process as Source of Stress During the Last Two Years*

Review/Promotion Process	Frequency	Percentage
Extensive	18	17.0
Somewhat	29	27.6
Not At All	56	53.3
Total	103	98.1
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 40, there were 99 faculty participants who shared their perceptions about whether or not field-based experiences are important characteristics of their programs. There were 93 (88.6%) faculty participants who agreed that field-based experiences are important characteristics of their principal preparation programs and six (5.7%) who did not agree. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Table 40

*Perceptions About Field-based Experiences for Students*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	93	88.6
Disagree	6	5.7
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 41, there were 103 faculty participants who shared their perceptions about whether or not their principal preparation programs should hire more women. There were 60 (57.1%) faculty participants who agreed that more women should be hired and 43 (40.9%) did not agree. There were two (1.9%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Table 41

*Perceptions About the Need to Hire More Women*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	60	57.1
Disagree	43	40.9
Total	103	98.0
Missing	2	1.9
Total	105	100

Ninety-nine faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not their program enrolled quality students (Table 42). There were 95 (90.5%) faculty participants who agreed that their principal preparation programs enrolled quality students, and only four (3.8%) did not agree. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Table 43 shows the responses of 99 faculty participants who shared their perceptions about whether or not their program has a reputation for academic quality. There were 95 (90.5%) faculty participants who agreed that their principal preparation

programs have a reputation for academic quality, and only four (3.8%) who did not agree. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Table 42

*Perceptions About the Quality of Students Enrolled in the Program*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	95	90.5
Disagree	4	3.8
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

Table 43

*Perceptions About the Programs' Reputation for Academic Quality*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	95	90.5
Disagree	4	3.8
Total	66	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 44, 99 faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not their full time faculty members were committed to the welfare of their programs. There were 54 (51%) faculty participants who agreed that full time faculty members in their principal preparation programs were committed to the welfare of their



programs and 45 (42.9%) did not agree. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Table 44

*Perceptions About the Commitment of Full Time Faculty Members to the Welfare of the Program*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	54	51.4
Disagree	45	42.9
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 45, 100 faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not area school districts and practicing administrators were committed to the welfare of their programs. There were 88 (83.8%) faculty participants who agreed that school districts/practicing administrators are committed to the welfare of their principal preparation programs, and 12 (11%) who do not agree. There were 5 (4.8%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Ninety-nine faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not their students' internships and field experiences were adequately supervised. As shown in Table 46, there were 96 (91%) faculty participants who agreed that their students' internships and other field-based experiences were adequately supervised, and only three (2.9%) who did not agree. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 45

*Perceptions About the Commitment of School District(s) and Practicing Administrators to the Welfare of the Program*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	88	83.8
Disagree	12	11.4
Total	100	95.2
Missing	5	4.8
Total	105	100

Table 46

*Perceptions About the Adequate Supervision of Internships and Other Field-based Experiences*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	96	91.4
Disagree	3	2.9
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

Table 47 shows that 99 faculty participants indicated whether or not their institutions have reduced teaching loads to allow faculty members to work with local schools or school districts. There were 87 (82.9%) faculty participants who agreed that their institutions have reduced teaching loads to allow faculty members to work with

local schools or school districts and 12 (11%) disagreed. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 47

*Perceptions About Reduced Teaching Loads to Work With Local School(s) or District(s)*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	87	82.9
Disagree	12	11.4
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 48, 99 faculty participants responded to their survey question. Eighty-nine (84.8%) faculty participants indicated that their institutions provide reduced teaching loads to allow faculty members to work on research and publications, 10 (9.5%) disagreed with the statement indicating that institutions do not provide reduction in teaching load for scholarship activities. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

As shown in Table 49, 101 faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not their programs were valued by their universities' leadership. There were 87 (82.9%) faculty participants who agreed with the statement, "My University's leadership values the program." There were 14 (13%) faculty participants who did not agree. There were four (3.8%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 48

*Perceptions About Reduced Teaching Loads for Research and Publications*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	89	84.8
Disagree	10	9.5
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

Table 49

*Perceptions About Whether the University's Leadership Values the Program*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	87	82.9
Disagree	14	13.3
Total	101	96.2
Missing	4	3.8
Total	105	100

As shown in Table 50, 100 faculty members shared their perceptions about whether or not full time faculty members in their programs were treated fairly. There were 79 (75%) faculty participants who agreed that full time faculty members were treated fairly in their principal preparation programs, and 21 (20%) who did not agree. There were 5 (4.8%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 50

*Perceptions About the Fair Treatment of Full Time Faculty*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	79	75.2
Disagree	21	20.0
Total	100	95.2
Missing	5	4.8
Total	105	100

Table 51 also reports perceptions of institution support as related to the need for more faculty members. One hundred faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not more full time faculty members in their programs should be hired. There were 84 (80%) faculty participants who agreed that their institutions should hire more full time faculty members for the principal preparation program. Sixteen (15%) did not agree, and there were 5 (4.8%) who did not respond to the question.

Table 51

*Perceptions About the Need for More Full Time Faculty*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	84	80.0
Disagree	16	15.0
Total	100	95.2
Missing	5	4.8
Total	105	100

There were 100 faculty participants who shared their perceptions about whether or not more adjunct/part time faculty members in their programs should be hired (Table 52). There were 77 (73%) faculty participants who agreed that their institutions should hire more adjunct/part time faculty members and 23 (21.9%) who did not. There were five (4.8%) who did not answer the question.

Table 52

*Perceptions About the Need for More Adjunct/Part-time Faculty*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	77	73.3
Disagree	23	21.9
Total	100	95.2
Missing	5	4.8
Total	105	100

Table 53 shows the responses of 101 faculty participants who shared their perceptions about whether or not adjunct/part time faculty members in their programs were treated fairly. There were 94 (89.5%) faculty participants who agree that adjunct/part time faculty members in their programs were treated fairly and seven (6.7%) who did not agree. There were four (3.8%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

There were 102 faculty participants who shared their perceptions about whether or not adjunct/part time faculty members were committed to the welfare of their programs. There were 82 (78%) faculty participants who agreed that adjunct/part time

faculty members were committed to the welfare of their programs and 20 (19%) who did not agree. There were three (2.9%) faculty participants who did not answer the question.

Table 53

*Perceptions About the Fair Treatment of Adjunct/Part-time Faculty Members*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	94	89.5
Disagree	7	6.7
Total	101	96.2
Missing	4	3.8
Total	105	100

Table 54

*Perceptions About Commitment of Adjunct/Part-time Faculty to the Welfare of the Program*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	82	78.1
Disagree	20	19.0
Total	102	97.1
Missing	3	2.9
Total	105	100

Ninety-nine faculty participants shared their perceptions about whether or not the ExCET/TEExES is a good measure of success for a potential K-12 principal (Table 55). There were 91 (86.7%) faculty participants who agreed that the ExCET/TEExES is a good

measure of success for a potential K-12 principal and eight (7.6%) who did not agree. There were six (5.7%) faculty participants who did not respond to the question.

Table 55

*Perceptions About the ExCET/TEsES as a Good Measure of Success*

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	91	86.7
Disagree	8	7.6
Total	99	94.3
Missing	6	5.7
Total	105	100

*Analysis of Differences Among Workloads and Demographic Characteristics*

*Research Question 4*

Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members, and tenure status?

The responses to 25 survey questions were used to answer Research Question 4. Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistics using cross tabulations were used to identify if significant differences existed among the following variables: (1) workload and age, (2) workload and gender, (3) workload and race/ethnicity, (4) workload and highest degree earned, (5) and workload and tenure. Within the context of the study, if the cross-tabulations generated an  $\alpha$  value less than .05, the results were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). If the significance level fell between .05 and .10, the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery).



The research data indicated that differences do not exist among faculty workloads when considering the factors of age and race/ethnicity. On the contrary, Tables 56–74 indicate differences among faculty workloads when considering gender, highest degree earned by faculty members, and tenure status.

As shown in Table 56, study participants responding to the question about the number of hours spent performing administrative duties weekly during Spring 2009, totaled 104: 39 females and 65 males. The data indicate that marginally significant differences exist among administrative duties when gender was considered. Findings indicated that female faculty participants performed more administrative duties than male faculty participants.

Only 10 (25%) female participants perform no administrative duties in comparison to 31 (46%) of the male participants. The female participants performing 1–16 hours of administrative duties weekly totaled 58%, while male participants only totaled 35% for the same number of hours. Both female and male participants performing 17–35+ hours of administrative duties a week totaled 15%.

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of hours spent on research and scholarly writing totaled 95. The Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) was the highest degree earned by 66 of the respondents, and the Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.) was the highest for 29 respondents. Statistically significant differences exist among the number of hours spent on research and scholarly writings when the highest degree earned was considered. Faculty participants whose highest degree earned is a Ph.D. spent more time on research and scholarly writing than faculty participants whose highest degree earned is an Ed.D. All faculty participants responding

to this question, whose highest degree earned is a Ph.D., spent time on research and scholarly writing, while 14 (20%) of the 66 participants, whose highest degree earned is an Ed.D., did not spend time on research or scholarly writing.

Table 56  
*Administrative Duty Workload by Gender*

Hours	Female		Male	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	10	25	31	46
1-8	18	46	19	28
9-16	5	12	5	.07
17-35+	6	15	10	15
Total	39	100	65	98
Missing	0	0	1	.01
Total	39	100	66	99
Chi Square		a Value	df	Significance
Pearson		5.635	3	0.1308

The data in Table 57 show that there were 34 (50%) faculty participants with an Ed.D. and 12 (34%) with a Ph.D. who spent 1-8 hours on research or scholarly writings. Twenty-five percent of the participants with an Ed.D. spent 9-35+ hours on research or scholarly writings as opposed to 47% of the participants with Ph.D.'s. There were two (2%) participants with Ed.D.'s and six (17%) participants with Ph.D.'s who did not respond the question about hours spent on research and scholarly writing. There were two

faculty participants who did not identify whether their highest degree earned was an Ed.D. or a Ph.D, so they are not included in Table 57.

Table 57

*Research/Scholarly Writing by Highest Degree Earned*

Hours	Ed.D.		Ph.D	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	14	20	0	0
1-8	34	50	12	34
9-16	10	14	8	22
17-35+	8	11	9	25
Total	66	97	29	82
Missing	2	.02	6	17
Total	68	100	35	100
Chi Square		a Value	df	Significance
Pearson		36.897	6	.0001

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of refereed articles totaled 102. The Ed.D. was the highest degree earned by 67 of the respondents, and the Ph.D was the highest degree earned by 35 of the respondents. The data in Table 58 suggest that statistically significant differences exist among the participants' number of refereed articles when their highest degree earned was considered. Forty-one percent of the faculty participants, whose highest degree earned is an Ed.D., have not published any refereed articles. On the contrary, only seven (2%) of

the faculty participants whose highest degree earned is a Ph.D, have not published any refereed articles.

The data in Table 58 show that 10 (14%) faculty participants with an Ed.D. and 13 (37%) with a Ph.D. have published 1-4 refereed articles. There were 17 (25%) respondents with an Ed.D. and two (5%) with a Ph.D. who have published 5-10 refereed articles. There were 12 (17%) respondents with an Ed.D. and 13 (37%) with a Ph.D. who have published 11-51+ refereed articles.

One (1%) respondent with an Ed.D. did not answer the question about the number of refereed articles published. There were two survey participants who did not identify whether their highest degree earned was an Ed.D. or a Ph.D, so they are not included in Table 58.

Table 58  
*Number of Refereed Articles by Highest Degree Earned*

Hours	Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	28	41	7	2
1-4	10	14	13	37
5-10	17	25	2	5
11-51+	12	17	13	37
Total	67	98	35	100
Missing	1	1	0	0
Total	68	100	35	100
Chi Square	a Value		df	Significance
Pearson	16.454		3	.0009

Ninety-four participants responded to workload questions about cumulative publications. The Ed.D. was the highest degree earned by 59 of the faculty participants, and the Ph.D. was the highest degree earned by 35 of the faculty participants. Data indicate that statistically significant differences exist among publication workloads when considering the faculty participants' highest degree earned. Faculty participants whose highest degree earned was a Ph.D. totaled 87% for 1–20 publications while only 64% of the faculty participants whose highest degree earned was an Ed.D. had 1–20 publications. More of the faculty participants with Ph.D.'s have publications than those with Ed.D.'s. Nine of the faculty participants with Ph.D.'s had 11 – 20 cumulative publications, while none of the faculty participants with Ed.D.'s had more than 10 cumulative publications.

The data in Table 59 shows that 15 (22%) of the 59 faculty participants, whose highest degree earned is an Ed.D., have not published. There were four (5%) faculty participants, of the 35, whose highest degree earned, is a Ph.D., who have not published. There were 34 (50%) faculty participants with an Ed.D. and 13 (37%) with a Ph.D. who have 1-4 publications.

There were 10 (14%) faculty participants with an Ed.D. and nine (25%) with a Ph.D. who have 5-10 publications. None of the faculty participants with an Ed.D. and nine (25%) with a Ph.D. have 11-20+ publications. There were nine (13%) faculty participants with Ed.D.'s who have not published.

All of the 35 (100%) faculty participants with Ph.D.'s have published. There were two faculty participants who did not identify whether their highest degree earned was an Ed.D. or a Ph.D., so they are not included in Table 59.

Table 59

*Cumulative Publications by Highest Degree Earned*

Hours	Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	15	22	4	11
1-4	34	50	13	37
5-10	10	14	9	25
11-20+	0	0	9	25
Total	59	86	35	100
Missing	9	13	0	0
Total	68	100	35	100
Chi Square		a Value	df	Significance
Pearson		19.979	3	.0002

The study participants responding to workload questions about scheduled teaching hours for Spring 2009 totaled 103. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 35. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 41, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 60 indicate that statistically significant differences exist between scheduled teaching hours when participant's tenure status was considered. Half of the faculty participants with tenure taught 9–16 hours per week. Only 31% of the non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants and 39% of the faculty participants not on tenure track taught 9–16 hours per week.

Table 60

*Scheduled Teaching Hours by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	0	0	2	4	0	0
1-8	8	22	17	41	12	42
9-16	18	50	13	31	11	39
17-35+	9	25	9	21	4	14
Total	35	97	41	100	27	96
Missing	1	2	0	0	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	10.453		6		.01068	

All of the faculty participants with tenure and all of those who do not have tenure and are not on a tenure track had scheduled teaching hours Spring 2009. There were two (4%) faculty participants who did not have tenure, but are on a tenure track, who did not have scheduled teaching hours. There were eight (22%) faculty participants with tenure, 17 (41%) non-tenure/on tenure track, and 12 (42%) non-tenure not on tenure track who had 1–8 scheduled teaching hours. There were 18 (50%) faculty participants with tenure, 13 (31%) non-tenure/on tenure track, and 11 (39%) non-tenure not on tenure track who had 9–16 scheduled teaching hours. There were nine (25%) faculty participants with tenure, nine (21%) non-tenure/on tenure track, and four (14%) non-tenure not on tenure

track, who had 17–35+ scheduled teaching hours. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, 0 (0%) non-tenure/on tenure track, and one (3%) non-tenure not on tenure track who did not respond to the question about scheduled teaching hours.

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of hours spent weekly on committee work totaled 105. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 36. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 41, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 28. The data in Table 61 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among hours spent on committee work when the participants' tenure status was considered. Forty-two percent of the faculty participants without tenure and not on a tenure track did not spend time on committee work. Also, 19% of the faculty participants with tenure spent 17–35+ hours on committee work, while only 4% non-tenure but on a tenure track faculty participants spent the same number of hours on committee work.

There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure and 12 (42%) faculty participants who do not have tenure and are not on a tenure track, who do not spend time on committee work. All of the faculty participants who do not have tenure but are on a tenure track spend time on committee work. There were 20 (55%) faculty participants with tenure, 25 (60%) non-tenure/on tenure track faculty participants, and 13 (46%) non-tenure not on tenure track faculty participants, who spent 1-8 hours on committee work. Forty-one percent of the respondents with tenure, 38% non-tenure/on tenure track respondents, and 10% non-tenure not on tenure track respondents spent 9-35 hours on committee work.



Table 61

*Hours Committee Work by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	1	2	0	0	12	42
1-8	20	55	25	60	13	46
9-16	8	22	14	34	1	3
17-35+	7	19	2	4	2	7
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	40.791		6		.0001	

The study participants responding to workload questions about hours spent on performing administrative duties totaled 104. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 35. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 41, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 28. The data in Table 62 indicate that marginally significant differences exist among hours spent on administrative duties when the participants' tenure status was considered. Faculty participants without tenure on tenure track spent more hours performing administrative duties than the faculty participants with tenure and those not on tenure track. Thirty (73%) faculty participants on tenure track, 23

(63%) faculty participants with tenure, and 10 (26%) faculty participants not on tenure track spent 1–35+ hours on administrative duties.

Table 62

*Administrative Duty by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	12	33	11	26	18	64
1-8	9	25	21	51	7	25
9-16	6	16	4	9	0	0
17-35+	8	22	5	12	3	10
Total	35	97	41	100	28	100
Missing	1	2	0	0	0	0
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	17.626		6		0.0072	

There were 12 (33%) faculty participants with tenure, 11 (26%) who do not have tenure but are on a tenure track, and 18 (64%) of the faculty participants who do not have tenure and are not on a tenure track who do not spend time on administrative duties.

There were nine (25%) faculty participants with tenure, 21 (51%) non-tenure/on tenure track, and seven (25%) non-tenured not on tenure track who spent 1-8 hours on administrative duties. There were 14 (38%) faculty participants with tenure, nine (21%)

non-tenure/on tenure track, and three (10%) of the non-tenure not on tenure track faculty participants who spent 9-35+ hours on administrative duties. There was one survey participant who did not respond to the question about the number of hours spent on administrative duties. This participant could not be included in Table 62. There was one (2%) missing response from a participant with tenure about the question on the number of hours spent on administrative duties.

Table 63 shows study participants responding to workload questions about the number of research and scholarly writing totaled 103. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 35. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 41, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 63 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of research and scholarly writing when the participants' tenure status was considered. Fifty-seven percent of the faculty participants who are not tenured and not on a tenured track did not spend time on research and scholarly writing, while only 5% of the faculty participants with tenure and 9% of the faculty participants without tenure on tenure track did not spend time on research and scholarly writing.

Two (5%) of the faculty participants with tenure, four (9%) of the faculty participants who do not have tenure but are on a tenure track, and 16 (57%) of the faculty participants who do not have tenure but are not on a tenure track do not spend time on research and scholarly writing. There were 16 (45%) faculty participants with tenure, 20 (48%) faculty participants whose status are non-tenure/on tenure track, and 10 (35%) non-tenure not on tenure track who spend 1-8 hours on research and scholarly writing. There were 10 (28%) faculty participants with tenure, seven (17%) non-tenure/on tenure

track, and one (3%) faculty participant whose status is non-tenure not on tenure track faculty participants who spend 9-16 hours on research and scholarly writing. There were seven (20%) faculty participants with tenure and 10 (24%) faculty participants whose status are non-tenure/on tenure track, who spend 17-35+ hours on research and scholarly writing. There were faculty participants who are non-tenure not on tenure track who spend 17-35+ hours on research and scholarly writing. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure and one (3%) faculty participant non-tenure/ and not on tenure track who did not respond to the survey question about the number of hours spent on research and scholarly writing.

Table 63

*Workload (Research and Scholarly Writing) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	2	5	4	9	16	57
1-8	16	45	20	48	10	35
9-16	10	28	7	17	1	3
17-35+	7	20	10	24	0	0
Total	35	97	41	100	27	96
Missing	1	2	0	0	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	36.928		6		.0001	

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of on campus Doctoral Courses totaled 9. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 3. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 3, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 3. The data in Table 64 indicate that marginal differences exist among the number of on campus doctoral courses participants taught when each participant's tenure status was considered. There were so few participants who responded to this question that the validity of the data in Table 64 is questionable. Also, this data has no generalization value.

Table 64

*Workload (Number of On Campus Doctoral Courses) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	1	2	1	2	1	3
1 Course	1	2	1	2	1	3
2-4 Courses	1	2	1	2	1	3
Total	3	8	3	7	1	3
Missing	33	91	38	92	25	89
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	0.0		4		1.0	

There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who do not teach any On Campus Doctoral Courses. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who taught one On Campus Doctoral Course. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who teach 2-4 On Campus Doctoral Courses. There were 33 (91%) faculty participants with tenure, 38 (92%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 25 (89%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer the survey question about the number of On Campus Doctoral Courses they teach.

Twenty-five study participants responded to workload questions about the number of refereed articles. Eighteen of the faculty participants were tenured and seven were non-tenured. The data in Table 65 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of refereed articles when the participants' tenure status was considered. Half of the faculty participants with tenure published 11 – 51+ refereed articles, while only 17% of the participants without tenure but on a tenure track have published as many. None of the faculty participants without tenure and not on a tenure track had published more than 10 refereed articles.

Table 65

*Workload (Number of Refereed Articles) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	4	11	12	29	19	67
1-4	4	11	13	31	8	28
5-10	10	27	8	19	1	3
11-51+	18	50	7	17	0	0
Total	36	100	40	97	28	100
Missing	0	0	1	2	0	0
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	41.956		6		.0001	

There were four (11%) faculty participants with tenure, 12 (29%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 19 (67%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not published any refereed articles. There were four (11%) faculty participants with tenure, 13 (31%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and eight (19%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 1-4 refereed articles. There were 10 (27%) faculty participants with tenure, eight (19%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 5-10 refereed articles. There were 18 (50%) faculty participants with tenure, seven (17%)

faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 11-51+ refereed articles. There was one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track whose response to this question was missing.

As shown in Table 66, study participants responding to workload questions about the number of Off Campus Master level courses taught totaled 69. Thirty-six of the faculty participants were tenured and 11 were not on the tenure track, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 22. The data in Table 66 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of off campus Master level courses taught when the participants' tenure status was considered. More faculty participants who do not have tenure and are not on tenure track taught Master level Off Campus courses in comparison to faculty participants with tenure and those without tenure but on a tenure track. However, those faculty participants with tenure and those without tenure but on a tenure track taught 2–4 Master level Off Campus courses, while those without tenure and not on a tenure track only taught one course.

There were 26 (72%) faculty participants with tenure, 30 (73%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 13 (46%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who do not teach any Off Campus Master level Courses. There were five (13%) faculty participants with tenure, four (9%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and nine (32%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who teach one Off Campus Master level course. There were five (13%) faculty participants with tenure, seven (17%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track



who teach 2-4 Off Campus Master level courses. There were six (21%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer the question about the number of Off Campus Master level courses taught.

Table 66

*Workload (Number of Off Campus MA/MS Courses) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	26	72	30	73	13	46
1 Course	5	13	4	9	9	32
2-4 Courses	5	13	7	17	0	0
Total	36	100	41	100	22	78
Missing	0	0	0	0	6	21
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	12.264		4		0.155	

Table 67 indicates that 69 study participants responded to workload questions about the number of non-refereed articles published. Faculty participants with tenure totaled 34. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 39, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 26. The data in Table 67 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of non-refereed articles published when the participants' tenure status was considered. Eighty-two percent of the

faculty participants with tenure published 1–51+ non-refereed articles, while only 50% of the faculty participants without tenure but on a tenure track and only 28% of the faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track published the same number of non-refereed articles.

Table 67

*Workload (Number of Non-refereed Articles) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	4	11	18	43	18	64
1-10	23	63	19	46	7	25
11-51+	7	19	2	4	1	3
Total	34	94	39	95	26	92
Missing	2	5	2	4	2	7
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	34.082		6		.0001	

As shown in Table 67, there were four (11%) faculty participants with tenure, 18 (43%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 18 (64%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not published any non-refereed articles. There were 23 (63%) faculty participants with tenure, 19 (46%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and seven (25%) faculty participants

without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 1-10 non-refereed articles. There were seven (19%) faculty participants with tenure, two (4%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 11-51+ non-refereed articles. There were two (5%) faculty participants with tenure, two (4%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and two (7%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who did not respond to the question about the number of published non-refereed articles.

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of published chapters in edited volumes totaled 99. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 34. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 39, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 26. The data in Table 68 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of published chapters in edited volumes when the participants' tenure status was considered.

Eighty-two percent of the faculty participants without tenure and not on a tenure track have not written a chapter in an edited volume, as opposed to 33% of faculty participants with tenure and 51% of the faculty participants without tenure but on a tenure track. Also, 30% of the faculty participants with tenure have written chapters in 5-51+ edited volumes in comparison to 6% of the faculty participants without tenure but on a tenure track and 0% of the faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track.

.

Table 68

*Workload (Chapter in Edited Volume) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	12	33	21	51	23	82
1-4	11	30	13	31	1	3
5-10	7	19	1	2	0	0
11-51+	4	11	2	4	0	0
Total	34	94	39	95	26	92
Missing	2	5	2	4	2	7
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	27.433		6		.0001	

There were 12 (33%) faculty participants with tenure, 21 (51%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 23 (82%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not published a chapter in edited volume. There were 11 (30%) faculty participants with tenure, 13 (31%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published a chapter in 1-4 edited volumes. There were seven (19%) faculty participants with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and 0 faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published a chapter in 5-10 edited volumes. There were four (11%) faculty participants

with tenure, two (4%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published a chapter in 11-51+ edited volumes. There were two (5%) faculty participants with tenure, two (4%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and two (7%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who did not respond to this question.

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of cumulative publications totaled 104. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 36. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 41, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 69 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of cumulative publications when the participants' tenure status was considered. Only 2% of the faculty participants with tenure have not published, while 17% of the faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track have not published. The data shows that 42% of the faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track have not published. Those with tenure who have 5–20 publications totaled 71% in comparison to 24% of the faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track with the same number of publications. There were no faculty participants with tenure and not on tenure track with more than four publications.

As displayed in Table 69, there was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, seven (17%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 12 (42%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have no publications. There were nine (25%) faculty participants with tenure, 24 (58%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 15 (53%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have 1-4 publications. There were 14 (38%) faculty participants with tenure,

five (12%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have 5-10 publications. There were 12 (33%) faculty participants with tenure, 5 (12%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 0 faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have 11-20+ publications. There was one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who did not respond to this question.

Table 69

*Workload (Cumulative Publications) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	1	2	7	17	12	42
1-4	9	25	24	58	15	53
5-10	14	38	5	12	0	0
11-20	12	33	5	12	0	0
Total	36	100	41	100	27	96
Missing	0	0	0	0	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	44.802		6		.0001	

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of published professional writings totaled 102. The faculty participants with tenure totaled

35. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 40, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 70 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of published professional writings when the participants' tenure status was considered. More faculty participants with tenure (88%) have published 1–51+ professional writings in comparison to 67% faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track and 24% faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track.

There were three (8%) faculty participants with tenure, 12 (29%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 20 (71%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not published any professional writings. There were 20 (55%) faculty participants with tenure, 17 (41%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 5 (17%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 1-4 professional writings. There were nine (25%) faculty participants with tenure, six (14%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and two (7%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 5-10 professional writings. There were three (8%) faculty participants with tenure, five (12%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have published 11-51+ professional writings. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer this question.

Table 70

*Workload (Number of Published Professional Writings) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	3	8	12	29	20	71
1-4	20	55	17	41	5	17
5-10	9	25	6	14	2	7
11-51+	3	8	5	12	0	0
Total	35	97	40	97	27	96
Missing	1	2	1	2	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	68.342		9		.0001	

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of state presentations totaled 102. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 35. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 40, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 71 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of state presentations when the participants' tenure status was considered. Sixty-seven (67%) of the faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track have not made any state presentations, while faculty participants with tenure totaled 13% and those without tenure but on tenure track totaled 34%. Faculty participants with tenure have made between 5–51+ state presentations in comparison to



16% of faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track and 3% faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track.

Table 71

*Workload (Number of State Presentations) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	5	13	14	34	19	67
1-4	21	58	19	46	7	25
5-10	7	19	6	14	1	3
11-51+	3	8	1	2	0	0
Total	35	97	40	97	27	96
Missing	1	2	1	2	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	22.995		6		.0008	

There were 5 (13%) faculty participants with tenure, 14 (34%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 19 (67%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not made any state presentations. There were 21 (58%) faculty participants with tenure, 19 (46%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and seven (25%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have made 1-4 state presentations.

There were seven (19%) faculty participants with tenure, six (14%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who have made 5-10 state presentations. There were three (8%) faculty participants with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have made 11-51+ state presentations. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, one (2%) faculty participant without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer this question.

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of national presentations totaled 102. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 36. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 39, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 72 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of national presentations when the participants' tenure status was considered. Eighty-two percent of the faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track have not made a national presentation. All but 5% of the faculty participants with tenure have made a national presentation. Faculty participants with tenure who have made 1–51+ national presentations totaled 91%. Faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track totaled 69% and those without tenure and not on tenure track totaled 14% for the same number of national presentations.

Table 72

*Workload (Number of National Presentations) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	2	5	10	24	23	82
1-4	19	52	12	29	4	14
5-10	13	36	8	19	0	0
11-51+	2	5	9	21	0	0
Total	36	100	39	95	27	96
Missing	0	0	2	4	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	55.667		6		.0001	

There were two (5%) faculty participants with tenure, 10 (24%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 23 (82%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not made any national presentations. There were 19 (52%) faculty participants with tenure, 12 (29%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and four (14%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have made 1-4 national presentations. There were 13 (36%) faculty participants with tenure, eight (19%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have made 5-10 national presentations. There were two (5%) faculty participants with tenure, nine

(21%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have made 11-51+ national presentations. There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, two (4%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer this question.

The study participants responding to workload questions about the number of cumulative publications in the last two years totaled 104. The faculty participants with tenure totaled 36. Non-tenure on tenure track faculty participants totaled 41, and non-tenure faculty participants not on tenure track totaled 27. The data in Table 73 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of cumulative publications in the last two years when the participants' tenure status was considered. Fifty-seven percent of the faculty participants without tenure and not on a tenure track have never published, while 12% without tenure but on tenure track have never published, and just 2% of the faculty participants with tenure have never published. In contrast, 58% of the faculty participants with tenure have 5–51+ cumulative publications. There were 43% of the faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track and only 7% of the faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who had the same number of cumulative publications.

There was one (2%) faculty participant with tenure, five (12%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 16 (57%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have not had any publications in the last two years. There were 14 (38%) faculty participants with tenure, 18 (43%) faculty participants

without tenure but on tenure track, and nine (32%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have had 1-4 publications in the last two years.

There were 18 (50%) faculty participants with tenure, 14 (34%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and two (7%) faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have had 5-10 publications in last two years. There were three (8%) faculty participants with tenure, four (9%) faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track, and zero faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track who have had 11-51+ publications in the last two years. There was one (3%) faculty participant without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer this question.

Table 73

*Workload (Cumulative Publications in the Last Two Years) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	1	2	5	12	16	57
1-4	14	38	18	43	9	32
5-10	18	50	14	34	2	7
11-51+	3	8	4	9	0	0
Total	36	100	41	100	27	96
Missing	0	0	0	0	1	3
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	37.418		6		.0001	

The faculty participants responding to workload questions about the number of participants who developed a new course in the last two years totaled 90. The participants with tenure totaled 35. Non-tenure on tenure track participants totaled 40, and non-tenure participants not on tenure track totaled 15. The data in Table 74 indicate that marginally significant differences exist among the number of participants who developed a new course in the last two years when the participants' tenure status was considered. Faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track developed more courses (73%) than respondents with tenure (66%) and faculty participants without tenure and not on tenure track (53%). Also, all of the participants, who are without tenure and not on tenure track who responded to this question, have developed a new course.

Table 74

*Workload (Developed a New Course) by Tenure Status*

Responses	Tenure		Non-tenure/Tenure Track		Non-tenure Not on Tenure Track	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	24	66	30	73	15	53
No	11	30	10	24	0	0
Total	35	97	40	97	15	53
Missing	1	2	1	2	13	46
Total	36	100	41	100	28	100
Chi Square	a Value		df		Significance	
Pearson	5.909		2		0.0521	

There were 24 (66%) participants with tenure who developed a new course in the last two years and 11 (30%) who had not. There were 30 (73%) non-tenure but on tenure track participants who developed a new course in the last two years and 10 (24%) who had not. All 15 (53%) of the non-tenure and not on tenure track participants developed a new course in the last two years. There was one (2%) participant with tenure, one (2%) participants without tenure but on tenure track, and 13 (46%) r participants without tenure and not on tenure track who did not answer this question.

### *Analysis of Differences in Workloads and Institutional Characteristics*

#### *Research Question 5*

Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering the institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and principal preparation program's national accreditation status?

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of published research and scholarly writing totaled 101. The data in Table 75 indicate that marginally significant differences exist among the number of published research and scholarly writing when the Carnegie Classification of the participant's institution was considered. The greatest percentage of faculty participants who have 1–16 research and scholarly writings (94%) work in Master's Large universities, while participants who work in universities classified as Doctoral Research totaled 65%, those in Research University High totaled 84%, those in Research University Very High totaled 75%, those in Master's Medium totaled 78%, and those in Master's Small universities totaled 60% for the same number of research and scholarly writings.

The participants from the classification, Doctoral Research University totaled 12. There were four (33%) who have not published any research and scholarly writings. There were five (41%) who have published 1-8 research and scholarly writings. There were two (16%) who have published 9-16 research and scholarly writings. There was one (8%) participant who has published 17-35+ research and scholarly writings.

The faculty participants from the classification, Research University High totaled 14. There were two (14%) who have not published any research and scholarly writings. There were four (28%) who have published 1-8 research and scholarly writings. There were three (21%) who have published 9-16 research and scholarly writings. There were five (35%) participants who have published 17-35+ research and scholarly writings.

There were four faculty participants from the classification, Research University Very High. There was one participant (25%) who has published 9-16 research and scholarly writings. There were two (50%) participants who have published 17-35+ research and scholarly writings. There was one (25%) participant from the classification Research University Very High who did not answer this question.

The participants from the classification, Master's Large University totaled 36. There were two (5%) who have not published any research and scholarly writings. There were 18 (50%) who have published 1-8 research and scholarly writings. There were eight (22%) who have published 9-16 research and scholarly writings. There were eight (22%) participants who have published 17-35+ research and scholarly writings.

Faculty participants from the classification, Master's Medium University totaled 29. There were six (20%) who have not published any research and scholarly writings.



Table 75

*Workload (Research and Scholarly Writing) by Carnegie Classification*

Responses	DRU		RUH		RUVH	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	4	33	2	14	0	0
1-8	5	41	4	28	0	0
9-16	2	16	3	21	1	25
17-35+	1	8	5	35	2	50
Total	12	100	14	100	3	100
Missing	0	0	0	0	1	25
Total	12	100	14	100	4	100

  

Responses	ML		MM		MS	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	2	5	6	20	4	40
1-8	18	50	15	51	4	40
9-16	8	22	3	10	1	10
17-35+	8	22	5	17	1	10
Total	31	86	29	100	10	100
Missing	5	13	0	0	0	0
Total	36	100	29	100	10	100

  

Chi Square	a Value	df	Significance
Pearson	20.019	15	0.1712

There were 15 (51%) who have published 1-8 research and scholarly writings. There were three (10%) who have published 9-16 research and scholarly writings. There were five (17%) faculty participants who have published 17-35+ research and scholarly writings.

The number of faculty participants from the classification, Master's Small University totaled 10. There were four (40%) who have not published any research and scholarly writings. There were four (40%) who have published 1-8 research and scholarly writings. There was one (10%) participant who has published 9-16 research and scholarly writings. There was one (10%) participant who has published 17-35+ research and scholarly writings.

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of published professional writing totaled 33. The data in Table 76 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of published professional writing when the Carnegie Classification of the participant's institution was considered. The highest percentage (88%) of participants with 1-51+ published writings work in Master's Large universities. Faculty participants who work in Doctoral Research Universities had the second lowest percentage (41%), while those who work in Master's Medium universities had the lowest percentage (37%) of faculty participants with 1-51+ published writings. The faculty participants from the classification, Doctoral Research University totaled 12. There were six (50%) who have not published any professional writings. There were four (33%) who have published 1-10 professional writings. There was one (8%) faculty participant who has published 11-51+ professional writings. There was one (8%) participant who did not answer this question.

Table 76

*Workload (Number of Published Professional Writing) by Carnegie Classification*

Variable	DRU		RUH		RUVH	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	6	50	3	21	0	0
1-10	4	33	9	64	3	75
11-51+	1	8	1	7	0	0
Total	11	9	13	92	3	75
Missing	1	8	1	7	1	25
Total	12	100	14	100	4	100

  

Variable	ML		MM		MS	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	3	8	18	62	4	40
1-10	28	77	10	34	4	40
11-51+	4	11	1	3	1	10
Total	35	97	29	100	9	90
Missing	1	2	0	0	1	10
Total	36	100	29	100	10	100

  

Chi Square	a Value	df	Significance
Pearson	26.193	10	0.0035

The faculty participants from the classification, Research University High totaled 14. There were three (21%) who have not published any professional writings. There were nine (64%) who have published 1-10 professional writings. There was one (7%)

participant who has published 11-51+ professional writings. There was one (7%) participant who did not answer this question.

There were four participants from the classification, Research University Very High who have published professional writings. There were three (75%) who have published 1-10 professional writings. There was one (25%) participant who did not answer this question.

There were 36 participants from the classification, Master's Large University. There were three (8%) who have not published any professional writings. There were 28 (77%) who have published 1-10 professional writings. There were four (11%) participants who have published 11-51+ professional writings. There was one (2%) participant who did not answer this question.

There were 29 participants from the classification, Master's Medium University. There were 18 (62%) who have not published any professional writings. There were 10 (34%) who have published 1-10 professional writings. There was one (3%) participant who has published 11-51+ professional writings. There was one (3%) participant who did not answer the question.

There were 10 participants from the classification, Master's Small University. There were four (40%) who have not published any professional writings. There were four (40%) who have published 1-10 professional writings. There was one (10%) participant who has published 11-51+ professional writings. There was one (10%) participant who did not answer the question.

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of scheduled teaching hours totaled 104. There are 16 study participants whose principal

preparation programs have national accreditation status. The number of participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status totaled 89. The data in Table 77 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of scheduled teaching hours when the national accreditation status of the participant's principal preparation program was considered. More faculty participants (64%) whose programs did not have national accreditation status taught 9–35+ hours, while only 36% of the faculty participants whose programs did have national accreditation status taught the same number of hours.

Table 77

*Workload (Scheduled Teaching Hours) by National Accreditation Status*

Hours	National Status (Yes)		National Status (No)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	2	12	1	1
1-8	8	50	29	32
9-16	3	18	39	43
17-35+	3	18	19	21
Total	16	100	88	98
Missing	0	0	1	1
Total	16	100	89	100
Chi Square	a Value		df	Significance
Pearson	9.409		3	0.0243

There were two (12%) participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status and one (1%) participant whose program does not, who do

not have any scheduled teaching hours. There were eight (50%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who have 1-8 scheduled teaching hours and 29 (32%) whose programs do not. There were three (18%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who have 9-16 scheduled teaching hours and 39 (43%) participants whose programs do not. There were three (18%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who have 17-35+ scheduled teaching hours and 19 (21%) whose programs do not. There was one (1%) participant whose program does not have national accreditation status who did not answer this question.

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of hours spent on advising and counseling totaled 105. The number of participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status totaled 16. The number of participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status totaled 89. The data in Table 78 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of hours spent on advising and counseling when the national accreditation status of the participant's principal preparation program was considered. Twenty-six percent of the faculty participants whose programs did not have national accreditation status spent 9–35+ hours on advising and counseling, while 75% of the faculty participants whose programs have national accreditation status spent only eight hours or less on this duty.

There were four (25%) respondents whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status and five (5%) participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status, who do not spend time advising and counseling students. There were 12 (75%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who spend 1-8 hours advising and counseling students and 60 (67%) whose programs do not.

There were no participants whose programs have national accreditation status who spend 9-16 hours advising and counseling students, and 19 (21%) participants whose programs do not. There were no participants whose programs have national accreditation status who spend 17-35+ hours advising and counseling students, and 5 (5%) whose programs do not.

Table 78

*Workload (Hours Advising and Counseling) by National Accreditation Status*

Hours	National Status (Yes)		National Status (No)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	4	25	5	5
1-8	12	75	60	67
9-16	0	0	19	21
17-35+	0	0	5	5
Total	16	100	89	100
Missing	0	0	0	0
Total	16	100	89	100
Chi Square	a Value		df	Significance
Pearson	10.372		3	0.157

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of hours spent on committee work and meetings totaled 96 (91%). The number of participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status totaled 16 (100%). The number of participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status totaled 80 (89%). The data in Table 79 indicate that statistically

significant differences exist among the number of hours spent on committee work and meetings when the national accreditation status of the participant's principal preparation program was considered. Sixty-seven percent of the faculty participants whose programs have national accreditation status spent 1–35+ hours on committee work and meetings, while faculty participants whose programs did not have national accreditation status totaled 80%.

Table 79

*Workload (Hours Committee Work and Meetings) by National Accreditation Status*

Hours	National Status (Yes)		National Status (No)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	5	31	8	8
1-8	6	37	52	58
9-16	3	18	20	22
17-35+	2	12	0	0
Total	16	100	80	89
Missing	0	0	9	10
Total	16	100	89	100
Chi Square		a Value	df	Significance
Pearson		16.33	3	.0010

There were five (31%) participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status and eight (8%) participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status, who do not spend time on committee work and meetings. There were six (37%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who



spend 1-8 hours on committee work and meetings and 52 (58%) whose programs do not. There were three (18%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who spend 9-16 hours on committee work and meetings, and 20 (22%) participants whose programs do not. There were two (12%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who spend 17-35+ hours on committee work and meetings, and none whose programs do not. There were nine (10%) participants who did not answer this question.

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of hours spent on consulting totaled 90. The number of participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status totaled 16. The number of participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status totaled 74. The data in Table 80 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of hours spent on consulting when the national accreditation status of the participant's principal preparation program was considered. Thirty-seven percent of faculty participants whose programs have national accreditation status spent 1–35+ hours consulting, while faculty participants whose programs did not have national accreditation status totaled 32%.

There were 10 (62%) participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status and 45 (50%) participants whose programs do not, who do not spend time consulting. There were four (25%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who spend 1-8 hours consulting and 29 (32%) whose programs do not. There were two (12%) participants whose programs have national

accreditation status who spend 9-35+ hours consulting, and zero participants whose programs do not. There were 15 (16%) participants who did not answer this question.

Table 80

*Workload (Consulting Hours) by National Accreditation Status*

Hours	National Status (Yes)		National Status (No)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	10	62	45	50
1-8	4	25	29	32
9-35+	2	12	0	0
Total	16	100	74	83
Missing	0	0	15	16
Total	16	100	89	100
Chi Square	a Value		df	Significance
Pearson	9.979		2	.0068

The study participants responding to the workload question about the number of on campus Master level courses taught totaled 105. The number of participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status totaled 16. The number of participants whose programs do not have national accreditation status totaled 89. The data in Table 81 indicate that statistically significant differences exist among the number of on campus Master level courses taught when the national accreditation status of the participant's principal preparation program was considered. Six percent of the faculty participants whose programs had national accreditation status taught two to four on

campus Master Level courses, while 46% of the faculty participants whose programs did not have national accreditation status taught the same number of courses.

Table 81

*Workload (Number of On Campus MA/MS Courses) by National Accreditation Status*

Variable	National Status (Yes)		National Status (No)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	10	62	24	26
1 Course	5	31	23	25
2 Courses	1	6	22	24
3-4 Courses	0	0	20	22
Total	16	100	89	100
Missing	0	0	0	0
Total	16	100	89	100
Chi Square	a Value		df	Significance
Pearson	11.144		3	0.110

There were 10 (62%) participants whose principal preparation programs have national accreditation status and 24 (26%) participants whose programs do not, who taught no Master level courses. There were five (31%) participants whose programs have national accreditation status who taught one Master level course and 23 (25%) whose programs do not. There was one (6%) participants whose program has national accreditation status who taught two Master level courses, and 22 (24%) participants whose programs do not. There were no participants whose programs have national

accreditation status who taught three-four Master level courses, and 20 (22%) whose programs do not.

*Analysis of Differences in Principal Preparation Program Characteristics and Demographic Characteristics*

*Research Question 6*

Is there a significant difference in perception about principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by faculty members, and tenure status?

The responses to 17 survey items were used to answer Research Question 6. Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistics using cross tabulations were used to identify if a significant relationship existed between the following variables: (1) principal preparation program characteristics and age, (2) principal preparation program characteristics and gender, (3) principal preparation program characteristics and race/ethnicity, (4) principal preparation program characteristics and highest degree earned, and (5) principal preparation program characteristics and tenure. Within the context of the study, if the cross-tabulations generated an  $\alpha$  value less than .05, the results were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). If the significance level fell between .05 and .10, the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery).

Survey question 38 (Appendix D) asked faculty participants whether or not 17 statements described their principal preparation programs to determine if differences in faculty participants' perceptions existed when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by faculty members, and tenure status. The data results indicated that differences did not exist among the perceptions of the faculty participants regarding

their principal preparation program characteristics when considering factors such as: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned, and tenure of faculty members.

In addition to exploring whether or not differences existed among faculty participants' perceptions regarding their principal preparation program characteristics, the researcher solicited responses to two open-ended questions about the participants' programs. Survey question 40 asked faculty participants to describe their program's strongest characteristic, and question 41 asked them to describe their program's weakest link (Appendix D).

Two main categories emerged from the responses about the programs' strengths: comments about faculty members and comments about program designs. Faculty participants identified the following characteristics as their programs' strongest characteristics:

- The strengths of our faculty are very diverse and this is good for students.
- Experienced practitioners as faculty
- Committed faculty
- Working one-on-one with students in order to meet individual needs
- Student centered
- Students are not numbers to us at all. We get to know our students.
- Candidates learning from each other
- NCATE credentialed program
- Excellent balance between theory and practice
- Aligned with the new role of the principal
- Field-based experiences

Three main categories emerged from the responses about the programs' weaknesses: comments about faculty members, comments about the students, and comments about program designs. Faculty participants identified the following characteristics as their programs' weakest characteristics:

- Our faculty has little or no actual experience in the field and often do not make connection between research and practice effectively.
- Finding researchers with principal experience for faculty positions
- The quality of a few professors
- More full time faculty is needed to increase an emphasis on research.
- Lack of quality students
- The people we let into the program.
- Acceptance of unqualified candidates leads to lower TExES scores
- Quality of students admitted to the program
- Not a cohort model
- Not aligned to standards
- District partnerships
- Too much emphasis on ExCET

*Analysis of Differences in Principal Preparation Program Characteristics and Institutional Characteristics*

*Research Question 7*

Is there a significant difference in perceptions about principal preparation program characteristics when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and program's national accreditation status?

The responses to eight survey items were used to answer Research Question 7. Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistics using cross tabulations were used to identify if significant differences existed between (1) the principal preparation program characteristics and Carnegie classification of institutions and (2) the principal preparation program characteristics and national accreditation status of each principal preparation program. Within the context of the study, if the cross-tabulations generated an  $\alpha$  value less than .05, the results were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). If the significance level fell between .05 and .10, the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery).

Survey question 39 (Appendix E) asked faculty participants to agree or disagree with eight statements about their principal preparation programs to determine if differences in faculty participants' perceptions exist when considering their institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and national accreditation. Participants were asked if students who complete their principal preparation programs know how to perform selected duties expected of successful principals.

The data results in Table 82 indicate differences do not exist among perceptions about principal preparation program characteristics when considering each program's national accreditation status. Statistically significant differences, however, do exist between two principal preparation program characteristics (*Students know how to conduct research* and *Students know how to provide opportunities for K–12 faculty members to continuously learn*) when considering Carnegie Classification.

The study participants responding to the question about whether or not students in their program know how to conduct research totaled 98 (93%). The faculty participants

who work in universities classified as a Doctoral Research University totaled 11 (91%). The faculty participants who work in universities classified as a Research University High totaled 12 (100%). There were two (50%) faculty participants who work in universities classified as Research University Very High. The faculty participants who work in universities classified as a Master's Large University totaled 35 (97%). Faculty participants who work in universities classified as a Master's Medium University totaled 28 (96%), and the number of faculty participants who work in universities classified as a Master's Small University totaled 10 (100%). The data indicate that significant differences exist between the principal preparation program characteristic, *Students in the program know how to conduct research*, when the program's Carnegie Classification was considered.

The faculty participants who work in universities classified as a Doctoral Research University who agreed with the statement that their students know how to conduct research totaled 10 (11%), and one (14%) faculty participant did not agree. All 12 (13.2%) of the faculty participants from the classification, Research University High agreed that their students know how to conduct research. There was one (1.1%) faculty participant from the classification, Research University Very High who agreed with the statement that their students know how to conduct research. There was one (14%) faculty participant from the classification, Research University Very High did not agree. The 35 (38.5%) faculty participants from the classification, Master's Large University all agreed with the statement that their students know how to conduct research. Faculty participants from the classification, Master's Medium University that agreed with the statement that their students know how to conduct research totaled 24 (26.4%) while the number who



Table 82

*Principal Preparation Program Characteristics (Students Know How To Conduct Research) by Carnegie Classification*

Classification	Agree		Disagree		Total		Missing		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Research Univ. Very High	1	1.1	1	14	2	2.0	2	28	4	100
Research Univ. High	12	13.2	0	0	12	12.1	2	28	14	100
Doctoral Research Univ.	10	11	1	14	11	11.1	1	14	12	100
Master's Large	35	38.5	0	0	35	35.4	1	14	36	100
Master's Medium	24	26.4	4	57	28	28.3	1	14	29	100
Master's Small	9	9.9	1	14	10	10.1	0	0	10	100
Total	91	91.91	7	99	98	100	7	98	105	100
Chi Square	Value				df		Significant			
Pearson	21.75				6		.001			

did not agree totaled four (57%). The number of faculty participants from the classification, Master's Small University who agreed with the statement that their students know how to conduct research totaled nine (9.9%). Only one (14%) did not agree.

The study participants responding to the question about whether or not students in their program know how to provide opportunities for continuous learning totaled 98 (93%).

The faculty participants from the classification, Doctoral Research University totaled 11 (91%). The faculty participants from the classification, Research University High totaled

12 (85%). The faculty participants from the classification, Research University Very

High totaled two (50%). The faculty participants from the classification, Master's Large

University totaled 35 (97%). Faculty participants from the classification, Master's

Medium University totaled 28 (96%), and the number of faculty participants from the

classification, Master's Small University totaled 10 (100%). The data in Table 83 indicate

that statistically significant differences exist among the principal preparation program

characteristic, (*Students in the program know how to provide opportunities for*

*continuous learning*), when the program's Carnegie Classification was considered.

The 35 (36.8%) faculty participants from the classification, Master's Large

University all agreed that their students know how to provide opportunities for

continuous learning. The faculty participants from the classification, Doctoral Research

University who agreed with the statement that their students know how to provide

opportunities for continuous learning totaled nine (9.5%), but two (50%) did not agree.

Table 83

*Principal Preparation Program Characteristics (Students Know How To Provide Opportunities For Continuous Learning) by Carnegie Classification*

Classification	Agree		Disagree		Total		Missing		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Research Univ. Very High	1	1.1	1	25	2	2.0	2	28	4	100
Research Univ. High	12	12.6	0	0	12	12.1	2	28	14	100
Doctoral Research Univ.	9	9.5	2	50	11	11.1	1	14	12	100
Master's Large	35	36.8	0	0	35	35.4	1	14	36	100
Master's Medium	27	28.4	1	25	28	28.3	1	14	29	100
Master's Small	10	10.5	0	0	10	10.1	0	0	10	100
Total	94	95	4	4	98	99	7	98	105	100
Chi Square	Value				df		Significant			
Pearson	19.028				6		.004			

The 12 (12.6%) faculty participants from the classification, Research University High all agreed with the statement that their students know how to provide opportunities for continuous learning. There was one (1.1%) faculty participant from the classification, Research University Very High who agreed and one (25%) who did not agree with the statement that their students know how to provide opportunities for continuous learning. The number of faculty participants in this classification was too low to generalize the results. Faculty participants from the classification, Master's Medium University that agreed with the statement that their students know how to provide opportunities for continuous learning totaled 27 (28.4%). There was only one (25%) faculty participant who did not agree. The 10 (10.5%) faculty participants from the classification, Master's Small University all agreed with the statement that their students know how to provide opportunities for continuous learning.

#### *Analysis of Differences in Workloads, Institutions, and Certification Passing Rates*

##### *Research Question 8*

Is there a significant difference among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 when considering the following factors: faculty workload, Carnegie Foundation classification, principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status?

The responses to 25 survey questions were used to answer Research Question 8. Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistics using cross tabulations were used to identify if a significant relationship existed between the following variables: (1) the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates and faculty workloads (2) the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates and Carnegie Foundation

classification, (3) the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates and principal preparation program, and (4) the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates and each program's national accreditation status. Within the context of the study, if the cross-tabulations generated an *a* value less than .05, the results were considered statistically significant (George & Mallery, 2005). If the significance level fell between .05 and .10, the results were considered marginally significant (George & Mallery).

The three year means of program graduates' certification passing rates on the ExCET/TExES exam, (Appendix A) were used to determine if a significant difference existed among program graduates' passing rates when considering the following factors: faculty workload, Carnegie Foundation classification, principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status. Only the data from the universities whose faculty members participated in this study were used to examine this question. The three universities that had passing rate data for only one year were excluded from this portion of the study as well. Each university's program graduates' mean score for the passing rate on the TExES for principals for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 was used.

The data results indicated that differences do not exist among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 when considering the following factors: faculty workload, Carnegie Foundation classification, principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Discussion and Recommendations

#### *Introduction*

This chapter consists of five sections: (1) an introduction, (2) a discussion of the findings, (3) recommendations for future research, (4) recommendations for universities, and (5) final comments. The introduction explains the intent, rationale, and the problem of the study. This section also includes a brief description of the respondents participating in the study. The literature review guides the discussion of the findings. The recommendations for universities and for future research are based on the findings in the study. The last section provides the researcher's final comments regarding the study.

The purpose of this study was to describe higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and to examine their perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. The success of principal preparation program graduates in Texas, as measured by the ExCET/TEExES, was also examined. This report draws conclusions from survey responses of 105 principal educators in 36 higher education institutions in Texas and success rate of program graduates at their institutions as measured by the ExCET or TEExES.

Data from a survey submitted in the fall of 2009 to qualified participants were analyzed to address the problem of the study. In addition, data from the ExCET/TEExES passing rate means for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 of each participant's program graduates were used as a measure of program success. The research sought answers to the following research questions.

## *Discussion of the Findings*

### *Discussion of Demographic Characteristics of Principal Educators in Texas*

*Research question 1.* What are the demographic characteristics of higher education faculty members in Texas who prepare K–12 principals?

There were 352 principal educators in the state of Texas at 45 state accredited universities who qualified to participate in this study. The researcher invited all who qualified to participate by responding to questions in the survey titled, Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty Who Prepare K–12 Principals in Texas. One hundred twenty faculty members responded to the electronic survey. The survey responses of 105 of them met the requirements necessary to be included as a participant in this study.

A national comprehensive study found that 49% of the educational leadership professoriate were white males (McCarthy & Hackman, 2008). Fifty-seven percent of the faculty members were tenured. The mean age of the faculty was 56 years old. Teaching was the primary activity of 74% of them, while research was the primary activity of 18%. Eight percent of the faculty members identified service as their primary activity (McCarthy & Hackman).

The data in this study, Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty in Texas Who Prepare K–12 Principals, indicated that the majority of the participants were white (77%). In another national study of higher education faculty, 3% were African American and 2% were Hispanic (Berger, 2007). However, this demographic study indicated that 10.5% of the faculty participants were

African American and 8.6% were Hispanic. Texas has a higher percentage of racial/ethnic minority principal educators than reflected in Berger's national study of higher education faculty members.

Faculty workload is the amount of time spent on teaching, research, and service. Many full time faculty members work about 55 hours a week (American Association of University Professors, 2008). The American Association of University Professors identified a list of duties performed by full time professors such as: creating a new course, advising students, and giving scholarly presentations. Likewise, Eastern Kentucky University (2009) posted a job description for a vacant, full time faculty member who would be expected to teach courses on campus, off campus, and online; provide service to local school districts; and be a productive scholar among many other duties. These job descriptions are very similar to the workload duties of principal educators in Texas.

In this study, faculty participants reported a range of the actual number of hours they spent engaged in teaching, research, and service activities during the Spring 2009 semester. Twelve of the faculty participants indicated they spent over 35 hours teaching. Six indicated they spent over 35 hours engaged in research and scholarly writing, and two indicated they spent over 35 hours advising and counseling students. In the last two years, sixty-five percent of the faculty participants developed a new course. Also, in the last two years, sixty-three of them gave state level presentations, and 66% gave national level presentations.

Senior faculty members are defined as those who have achieved full professor rank and/or are 50 years of age or older. Most (86.7%) participants in this study were full



time faculty members. In 2006, the average age of full time higher education faculty members in the United States was 50 years old. These senior faculty members recruit and mentor new faculty. They provide leadership in their institutions, maintain the culture, and maintain a positive climate (Bland & Risbey, 2006).

This study did not collect data that would determine the average age of faculty participants. Data for this study did, however, indicate that 67% of the respondents ranged in age from 36 – 60.

Research indicates that most senior faculty members are also white males. They control institutional rewards and benefits that were designed by white males for white males (Trower, 2008). Male faculty participants in this study totaled 62.9%, while the females totaled 37.1%. Most institutions list diversity as an institutional value in their mission statements, yet, based on the findings in this study, ethnic and gender diversity is not reflected among principal educators in Texas. Although the percentage of minority principal educators in Texas is higher than the national percentage of minority higher education faculty (Berger, 2007), 10.5% African American and 8.6% Hispanic is still a small representation of ethnic diversity reflected by the population of Texas.

Schools of education need to recruit and develop diverse faculty members and bring their gender and racial cultures into the 21st century. As aging faculty members retire, institutions have an opportunity to fill vacated positions with individuals with different experiences and perspectives.

The primary interest of 80 (72.2%) of the participants was teaching. Research was the primary interest of 21 (20%) participants, and only four (3.8%) participants chose service as their primary interest. The large gap in the percentage between teaching and

research as the primary interest of faculty members in this study could possibly be due to the low number of faculty participants from institutions that focus heavily on research. Therefore, these results may not be representative of principal educators in Texas whose primary interest is research. Although teaching was the primary interest of the majority of faculty participants, engaging in research is necessary in order for them to remain current and effective as teachers. It is also necessary for faculty members to engage in service activities for their university and community (Menges, 2000).

Nearly twice as many of the participants have earned an Ed.D. (64.8%) than those who have earned a Ph.D. (33.3%). Graduates of Ed.D. programs are usually scholarly practitioners, as opposed to researchers. They are leaders in the field of education who raise standards within the public school system through professional leadership. It is critical for Ed.D. graduates to participate in professional organizations and to influence legislation and policy within public schools. The majority of the faculty participants in this study have an excellent opportunity to influence legislation and policy within public schools in Texas.

In this study faculty participants with Ph.D.'s spent more hours on research and scholarly writing than those participants with Ed.D.'s. Those with Ph.D.'s also published more refereed articles and had more cumulative publications such as: books, manuals, monographs, and chapters in edited volumes than faculty participants with Ed.D.'s.

A growing concern about principal preparation programs is that some full time faculty lack expertise in the areas they teach (Levine, 2005). Principal educators are responsible for creating a bridge between theory and practice. Faculty participants who have no experience as K–12 principals can provide academic knowledge, but may be less

able to provide their students with lessons based on experiences for navigating the complexities of the principalship. Principal educators with experience as K – 12 principals enhance faculty credibility among students and practicing administrators. Experienced principals have a clearer understanding of what their students need to know in order to be successful in school leadership positions.

Thirty-seven percent of the faculty participants in this study had no experience as K–12 principals. It is important to note that survey questions in this study did not inquire about whether or not faculty participants without experience as K – 12 principals were teaching courses where experience was an essential skill set.

Thirty-six (34.3%) of the participants had tenure status, 41 (39%) were non-tenured but on tenure track, and 28 (26%) did not have tenure and were not on a tenure track. Tenure status secures and protects faculty members' academic freedom in teaching, research, and service. Academic freedom is a fundamental characteristic of higher education. It preserves the right to free inquiry and expression. However, some employers are phasing out tenured faculty and staff positions (National Education Association, 2007). Findings in this study do not indicate this practice as a growing trend in Texas. Participants pursuing tenure outnumber those participants who already have tenure, and only 26% of the participants were without tenure and not on tenure track.

In this study, tenured faculty members taught more hours per week. Half of the faculty participants with tenure taught 9–16 hours per week, while 31% of faculty participants without tenure on tenure track and 39% not on tenure track taught the same number. Tenured faculty participants also spent more hours on committee activities and spent more hours on research and scholarly writing than other faculty participants without

tenure. They published more non-refereed articles and more chapters in edited volumes than those without tenure. Tenured faculty participants also had more state level and national level presentations.

### *Discussion of Faculty Members' Workloads*

*Research question 2.* What are the workloads of higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K–12 principals?

The data from this study agree with the research about how faculty members spend their time (Brazeau, 2003; Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007). Participants in this study spent more time teaching and preparing to teach than time on advising and counseling students, or time on committee work and meetings, or time on research and scholarly writing. These principal educators teach more Master level courses than Bachelor courses or Doctoral courses in all three categories: on campus, off campus, and online. Principal preparation courses are, for the most part, Master level courses.

More than half of the faculty participants have published refereed articles, non-refereed articles, books, manuals, or monographs. More than half of the participants have made presentations at state conferences, and more than half have made presentations at national conferences. Principal educators are expected to actively engage in scholarly activities that lead to the advancement of knowledge. It is important for higher education faculty members to find answers to controversial questions and to share those answers in an arena that adds to the knowledge of education. Publications and state and national presentations are appropriate forums for sharing that knowledge (Menges, 2000).

Lastly, more than half of the participants have developed a new course in the last two years. It is important for principal educators to revise and improve their principal preparation programs. They are responsible for structuring their courses, advising their students, and providing their students with field based experiences. The value of field-based experiences increases if principal educators have restructured them to address current issues in K–12 schools.

Findings in this demographic study support existing research (Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007). Higher education faculty members spend the least amount of workload time on service activities. Current methods of evaluating and rewarding faculty effectiveness still cause faculty to separate their service efforts from their research and teaching efforts (Brazeau, 2003). A large majority of faculty participants indicated that they spent no more than 8 hours a week on service activities in the Spring 2009 semester. Higher education faculty members are responsible for sharing their academic knowledge outside of academe. They provide services ranging from advising local schools, community organizations, and their institutions' research and teaching faculties.

#### *Discussion of Faculty Members' Perceptions*

*Research question 3. What are the faculty members' perceptions about salary, workloads, program characteristics, use of adjunct and part-time faculty, and the success rate of their program graduates as measured by the ExCET or TExES?*

Comm and Mathisel (2003) found that when faculty members believe that they are not fairly compensated or recognized for their contributions, then their commitment to their university may be deemed at issue. Faculty participants in this study had positive

perceptions about their salaries, workloads, principal preparation programs, use of adjunct/part time faculty, and the success rate of their program graduates. The salary of the largest percentage of participants ranged between \$50,000 and \$75,000. Seventy-nine percent of the faculty participants indicated that they were satisfied with their salary and fringe benefits.

A similar percentage of faculty participants agreed that full time faculty members, as well as part time faculty members in their programs, were treated fairly. When asked about 10 targeted sources of stress, the participants' responses indicated the following in order from the largest percentage to the smallest percentage: 1) institutional "red tape" (64.8%), 2) keeping up with information technology (58%), 3) committee work (56.2%), 4) colleagues (54.3%), 5) faculty meetings (52.3%), 6) research or publishing demands (49.5%), 7) publishing demands (49.5%), 8) review/promotion process (44.6%), 9) teaching load (42.9%), and 10) students (37.2%).

Although it is not clear what behaviors or activities faculty participants considered to be institutional "red tape," it is clear that "red tape" was a source of stress for over half of them. Principal educators face a variety of challenges including increased demands on their time. It is possible that institutional "red tape" robs them of time that could be spent on teaching or preparing to teach, on research, and on service.

Also, keeping up with informational technology was the second greatest source of stress identified by faculty participants. K – 12 classroom teachers are expected to integrate technology and classroom instruction. Principal educators are responsible for preparing principals as technology leaders in K – 12 schools. It is possible that aging

faculty members in this study are challenged by the rapid pace of technological advancement.

The study participants were asked to provide responses to statements describing their principal preparation programs. According to Lauder (2000), seven components can indicate the success or failure of principals' effects on student achievement. In this study, faculty participants perceived that each of Lauder's components were present in their principal preparation programs. The responses were 80% or higher for the presence of each of the components in their program. The components are identified as follows: 1) entrance requirements, 2) use of the cohort model, 3) use of clear performance standards, 4) a partnership with one or more school districts, 5) adequate preparation of principals for their roles as technology leaders, 6) adequate emphasis on reflective practice, and 7) continuous review with input from current practitioners.

Faculty participants were only asked to indicate whether or not these seven characteristics were present in their programs. They were not asked to indicate to what degree these characteristics were present. Neither were they asked to comment on whether or not these characteristics had an effective impact on their program's success.

The faculty participants perceived that school districts and practicing administrators are more committed to the welfare of their principal preparation programs than the full time faculty members are. A little more than half of the faculty participants indicated that the full time faculty members were committed to the welfare of their preparation programs, while 83.8% indicated that school district(s) and practicing administrators were committed. There were only 12 faculty participants in this study who were not full time faculty. Even if they were all included among those indicating that full

time faculty members were not committed to their preparation programs, this would still leave 36% of the full time faculty participants, perceiving that full time faculty members are not as committed to the welfare of their principal preparation programs as are school district(s) and administrators.

A large percentage of full time faculty members doubt that other full time faculty members are committed to the welfare of their preparation programs. Faculty participants were allowed to interpret individual meanings for behaviors constituting commitment to their programs' welfare. Some could have interpreted it to mean concern for colleagues and balanced workloads. Others could have interpreted it to mean concern for individual student's success. Still others could have interpreted commitment to the welfare of the program to mean program success as measured by the TExES.

Participants shared additional perceptions about their programs. A majority of the participants felt that their principal preparation programs enrolled quality students (90.5%). Many (90.5%) believed that their program had a reputation for academic quality, and that the ExCET/TExES was a good measure of success for a potential K–12 principal (86.7%). They agreed in large numbers that their graduates performed well on the ExCET/TExES.

Interestingly, 19 faculty participants in this study taught in universities with certification passing rates below 75%. It would appear that these faculty participants are either satisfied with the low passing rates of their program completers or unaware of their passing rate. NCATE standards set an acceptable passing rate as 80% or above (NCATE, 2009). In my opinion, although the 19 faculty participants did not teach in NCATE



accredited institutions, they should not be satisfied with the passing rate of their graduates since the percentage is below the acceptable standard established by NCATE.

Educational leadership programs must have high standards. Weak programs should be strengthened or closed (Levine, 2005). An important standard for measuring program effectiveness in Texas is the state certification exam, the ExCET/TEGES. Most principal educators in this study believed the ExCET/TEGES ~~exam~~ <sup>is</sup> was a good measure of program strength and potential for the success of K–12 principals. The three-year passing rate mean of over half (57%) of the principal preparation programs in this study was 80% or above, the percentage NCATE established as an acceptable passing rate for graduates on state standardized certification exams. The passing rate data indicate that a number of high quality programs exist in Texas.

#### *Discussion of Differences in Faculty Workloads and Demographics*

*Research question 4.* Is there a significant difference in faculty workloads when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members, and tenure status?

In this study, no significant differences were found in faculty workloads when age and race/ethnicity were considered. However, significant differences existed in workloads when faculty members' gender, highest degree earned, and tenure status were considered.

Higher education administrators coordinate a wide variety of student services. There is a global focus for more female involvement in educational administration. According to Trower, (2008) gender was not a factor in considering administrative

effectiveness. Women received appointments based on their experiences. The findings in this study, however, indicated that female principal educators performed more administrative duties than male principal educators. It is possible that female participants' perceptions about traditional gender roles caused them to be careful of their colleagues' concerns. From a female perspective and based on experience, one might assume that females were afraid to reject tasks or assignments doled out to them. Females may have overcompensated in their administrative duties to ensure a level of respect from others.

A higher percentage of faculty participants with Ph.D.'s spent more time on research and scholarly writing than faculty participants with Ed.D.'s. Likewise, faculty participants with Ph.D.'s published more refereed articles and produced more cumulative publications than respondents with Ed.D.s. The relationship between faculty participants with Ph.D.s and number of publications makes sense, given that the doctor of philosophy degree represents a process for higher education faculty members to engage in scholarly discourse, research, and publishing.

Although both degrees are significant, the mission of Ed.D. programs may differ from that of Ph.D. programs. Ed.D. programs tend to prepare individuals as practitioners for their professional field of work while Ph.D. programs may have a greater emphasis on preparing scholars in their field of study. Good teaching and active scholarship support one another, regardless of the degree one holds.

Faculty participants with tenure and those on tenure track had a higher percentage of scheduled teaching hours than faculty participants who were not on tenure track. Also, faculty participants on tenure track had a higher percentage of hours spent on committee work and on administrative duty than those without tenure on tenure track and those not

on tenure track. The results were identical for the number of state and national presentations; faculty members with tenure had significantly more presentations than those without tenure.

It is common for tenured faculty to spend less time on research duties than those without tenure but on tenure track. Research is usually a requirement for achieving tenure status. In this study, however, the number of hours faculty participants without tenure but on tenure track spent on research activities and the number of hours those with tenure spent on research activities were nearly equal. Tenured principal educators in Texas apparently do not relent on research activities even though scholarly activities may no longer be necessary for achieving job security. Given the job security that tenure status assures, tenured faculty participants choose to spend their time teaching, performing committee work and administrative duties, and on making state and national presentations in order to contribute to the knowledge of education.

#### *Discussion of Differences in Faculty Workloads and Institutional Characteristics*

*Research question 5.* Is there a significant difference in perceptions about faculty workloads when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and the program's national accreditation status?

The data in this study indicated that significant differences in faculty workloads existed when each institution's national accreditation status was considered and when each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification was considered. Although good teaching is the primary responsibility of higher education faculty members, they also need to be fine scholars engaged in research (National Policy Board for Educational

Administration, 2005). Participants from Master's Large universities produced a higher percentage of research and scholarly writings. Participants from Doctoral Research universities and Master's Small universities produced the second lowest and lowest percentage of research and scholarly writings, respectively. However, this study included so few faculty participants from Doctoral Research universities that this data cannot be generalized.

Higher education faculty members' productivity is usually measured by the number of publications in refereed journals and books and by the number of citations of their work. Publication productivity differs across the types of institutions. Academic publications are valued more at doctoral-granting institutions. In this study, however, faculty in Master's Large universities reported more publications than those in doctoral-granting institutions. Again, these results did not adequately represent principal educators from Research Universities Very High because there were too few faculty participants in this study.

Lastly, participants from universities with national accreditation status (NCATE) had a lower percentage of scheduled teaching hours than those participants in universities without national accreditation. The same is true for the number of hours spent advising and counseling students. Higher education faculty members from institutions with national accreditation status are responsible for capping the number of candidates admitted into their programs to ensure an effective professor-student ratio and a higher quality of cohort candidates (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2005).

The workload standards set for NCATE institutions are designed to assure program success. Faculty workloads for teaching on campus and online should not exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching and 9 hours for graduate teaching per semester or the equivalent, according to NCATE. Supervision of field-based experiences should not exceed 18 students for each full time equivalent faculty member per semester. NCATE standards require that most faculty members engage in scholarly work based on the missions of their institutions. Also, NCATE standards require that participants collaborate with K – 12 schools, that most faculty are actively involved in professional associations, and that most faculty provide services at local, state, national, or international levels. The external review process is rigorous and requires faculty members' ongoing due diligence.

NCATE teaching, research, and service standards ensure these accredited universities of greater program success. One measure of program success is passing rates on the ExCET/TEGES. NCATE accredited institutions in Texas had higher passing rates during 2004 – 2006 than non-accredited institutions.

#### *Discussion of Differences in Program Characteristics and Faculty Demographics*

*Research question 6.* Is there a significant difference in the perceptions about principal preparation program characteristics when considering: age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest degree earned by the faculty members, and tenure status?

Results from this study found that there were no significant differences in principal preparation program characteristics and faculty members' demographic characteristics. This is contrary to research in demographic characteristics such as gender,

race/ethnic minority, and age. Throughout 12 years of experience with research, interviews, focus groups, and surveys, Trower (2008) determined that there was a need to reform teaching and service loads for equity among women, people of color, and white men. Also, the values and attitudes of younger faculty members differ from those of their senior colleagues.

According to Jaschik (2006), younger faculty members seek flexibility in work hours and setting, and they are less committed to institutional loyalty. In this study, 61 (58.1%) of the faculty participants have been at their current institutions for 5–22+ years. It does not appear that their institutional loyalty is in jeopardy. It is likely that both tenured faculty and faculty without tenure but on tenure track account for the high percentage of faculty participants committed to their institutions. Tenure allows principal educators to remain within academia.

#### *Discussion of Differences in Program Characteristics and Institutional Characteristics*

*Research question 7.* Is there a significant difference in the perceptions about principal preparation program characteristics when considering each institution's Carnegie Foundation classification and each program's national accreditation status?

Participants from universities classified as Master's Large had the highest percentages of responses indicating that their "students know how to conduct research." According to Creighton (2001), decisions to improve student achievement must be based on data and careful data analysis. Research helps enlightened educators do a better job with their students (Slavin, 2004). Aspiring principals need to know how to apply research findings to practice. The lowest percentage of responses was from universities

classified as Research Universities Very High. However, there were too few respondents from this classification to be able to generalize these results.

Participants from Master's Small universities unanimously agreed that students in their principal preparation programs know how to "provide opportunities for continuous improvement." All participants from Master's Large universities who responded to the question agreed that students in their principal preparation program know how to provide opportunities for continuous improvement. Current research on leadership and on student achievement provides opportunities for continuous improvement. Principals who graduate from principal preparation programs that seek continuous review with input from current practitioners have a greater affect on student achievement (Lauder, 2000).

Responses from faculty participants to two open-ended questions revealed their perceptions about their principal preparation program's strongest and weakest characteristics. Seventy faculty participants responded to the question about their program's strongest characteristic. Sixty-five responded to the question about their program's weakest characteristic.

Fifteen faculty participants indicated that faculty members were their program's strongest characteristic. Faculty members were described as diverse, experienced practitioners, committed to the welfare of their programs as well as committed to their students. Phrases such as, "faculty get to know their students, implement student-centered programs, and work to meet the individual needs of their students," were used to describe faculty behaviors. These behaviors could be proof of their commitment to the success of students enrolled in their programs who lack desired academic qualities.

Faculty participants who indicated faculty members as their program's weakest characteristic described them as lacking quality, lacking experience as K – 12 principals, and lacking in research skills. It is difficult to believe that principal educators so described were effective instructors in their principal preparation programs. These characteristics are indeed weak. Also, five faculty participants identified, "lack of quality students," as the weakest characteristic in their principal preparation programs. Weak principal educators will not provide the academic support weak students need to be successful K – 12 principals.

Field-based experiences were identified as the strongest characteristic of several programs, as well as the weakest characteristic in other programs. Whether field-based experiences are considered the strongest characteristic or the weakest characteristic, it is a vital characteristic in a principal preparation program. The quality and effectiveness of a program's field-based experiences contribute to a program's success or failure.

#### *Discussion of Differences in Passing Rate Data and Faculty Workload, Institutional Characteristics and Principal Preparation Program Characteristics*

*Research question 8.* Is there a significant difference among the three- year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 when considering the following factors: faculty members' workload, the institutions' Carnegie Foundation classification status, the institutions' principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status?

Data indicated that differences did not exist among the three year means of the certification passing rates of program graduates in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 when the following factors were considered: faculty workload, Carnegie Foundation



classification, principal preparation program characteristics, and each program's national accreditation status.

However, it is important to note that 91% of the faculty participants indicated that their principal preparation programs provided adequate supervision for internships and other field-based experiences. Eighty-two percent of the participants indicated that they have reduced teaching loads to work with local school districts. Eighty-four percent agreed that they have reduced teaching loads for research and publications. Still, 19 of the faculty participants work in the eight schools with certification passing rates below 75%. Perhaps, these institutions should take a look at the quality of their internships.

Also, worth noting, is the success rate of universities that are nationally accredited. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) established high quality teacher, specialist, and administrator preparation. Graduates who prepare at NCATE-accredited colleges outperform graduates who prepare at unaccredited colleges (Darling-Hammond, 2009). In this study, the university whose graduates had the highest passing percentage rate was an NCATE accredited university. Only five nationally unaccredited universities had passing rates higher than 87%, the lowest passing rate among the NCATE accredited universities. Overall, the passing percentage rate of graduates from NCATE accredited universities were higher than the rates of graduates who prepared at nationally unaccredited universities.

In this study, the mean passing rate on the ExCET/TEExES exam for five out of the six Texas universities with NCATE accreditation range from 87%–95% passing (Appendix A):

Baylor University	NA
Sam Houston University	87%
Stephen F. Austin University	89%
Texas A & M University	92%
Trinity University	95%
University of North Texas	88%

Characteristics of NCATE accredited universities include the following (NCATE, 2009):

- Strong faculty with a mix of research and practitioner experience,
- District partnership to attract a diversity of capable candidates,
- Raised entrance standards,
- Rigorous methods for screening potential leaders,
- Capped number of candidates admitted,
- Support for current leadership research,
- Established set of core courses,
- Curriculum that transmits common core of knowledge and skills,
- Specialty courses,
- Signature pedagogy,
- Full time, supervised internships,
- Effective principal preparation methods, and
- Good resources

### *Recommendations for Further Research*

1. Replicate this study to obtain a greater percentage of participation, so the demographic data will more closely reflect the demographics of principal educators in Texas.
2. A qualitative study about the perceptions of racial/ethnic minority principal educators and female principal educators is recommended.
3. A case study to describe and compare the workloads and values of principal educators from universities with higher passing rates on the ExCET/TEExES to the workloads and values of those with lower passing rates is warranted.
4. A study may attempt to determine to what degree Lauder's (2000) seven program components are present in principal preparation programs and their impact on the programs' success.

### *Recommendations for Universities*

1. Provide faculty members who prepare K–12 principals with reduced teaching loads to work with local school(s) or school districts.
2. Provide faculty members reduced teaching loads for research and publications. Institutions with reduced teaching expectations attract good teachers who are also scholars.
3. Increase racial and gender diversity among higher education faculty members who prepare K–12 principals.
4. Institutions with certification passing rates below 75% should evaluate and improve the quality of their internship programs.

5. Institutions of higher education should consider a tiered faculty. One faculty tier should be those with strong, and preferably recent, principal experience, as a clinical faculty. They would be primarily responsible for teaching courses such as supervising field-based experiences, where a skill set related to practice is required. Other faculty might focus on theory, research, and other important areas of study for principal preparation.
6. Institutions of higher education should have strong cooperative relationships with school districts and practicing administrators to ensure that principal preparation programs provide a variety of meaningful and properly supervised field-based activities.

Principals are expected to lead the charge in improving struggling schools.

Principal preparation programs must provide candidates with opportunities to observe and practice the skills they need to accomplish those tasks. The quality of training for principals cannot be left to chance. It is the responsibility of higher education faculty members, who develop and design the principal preparation programs in Texas, to reform their programs to meet the complex needs of K–12 principals. It is also their responsibility to conduct the research that can be used to improve student achievement.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### TExES Passing Rate for 45 Accredited Principal Preparation Programs in Texas

Institution	2003-04 % Passers	2004-05 % Passers	2005-06 % Passers	3 Year Means
Abilene College	82	90	68	80
Angelo State University	84	100	86	90
Baylor University	0	0	0	NA
Concordia University	0	100	73	NA
*Dallas Baptist University	73	85	88	82
*Houston Baptist University	83	75	83	80
*Lamar University	82	90	84	85
Lubbock Christian University	89	96.8	96	93
Midwestern State University	95	78.6	87	86
*Our Lady of the Lake University	63	85.7	66	71
Prairie View A & M University	74	72.6	69	71
Sam Houston State University	91	84.5	87	87
*St. Mary's University	83	100	75	86
Stephen F. Austin State University	85	89.8	94	89
Sul Ross State University - Alpine	68	90.9	75	77
Sul Ross State University - Rio Grande	41	85	58	61
Tarleton State University	80	90.5	84	84
Texas A & M University	88	94.7	95	92
Texas A & M International University	60	48	65	57
Texas A & M University - Commerce	78	83.7	78	79
Texas A & M University - Corpus Christi	73	83.7	66	74

Institution	2003-04 % Passers	2004-05 % Passers	2005-06 % Passers	3 Year Means
Texas A & M University - Kingsville	65	63	69	65
Texas A & M University - Texarkana	82	73	87	80
Texas Christian University	87	92	58	79
Texas Southern University	34	46.9	42	40
Texas State University - San Marcos	93	93	82	89
Texas Tech University	75	89	71	78
Texas Wesleyan	0	0	70	NA
Texas Woman's University	76	71.4	74	73
*Trinity University	100	94	92	95
*University of Houston	85	87	80	80
University of Houston - Victoria	82	83.6	76	80
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	100	63.6	88	83
University of North Texas	86	91	87	88
University of St. Thomas	90	87.5	81	86
University of Texas - Arlington	87	85	84	85
University of Texas - Austin	92	84.6	92	89
University of Texas - Brownsville	55	65.9	61	60
University of Texas - El Paso	78	73	71	74
University of Texas - Pan American	66	73.8	60	66
*University of Texas - Permian Basin	63	73.8	84	73
University of Texas - San Antonio	87	92	76	85
University of Texas - Tyler	92	95.7	87	91
Wayland Baptist University	84	100	84	89
*West Texas A & M University	76	96	85	85

*Note:* \* No faculty participants

## APPENDIX B

### University Carnegie Foundation Classification for 45 Accredited Principal Preparation Programs in Texas

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>Former Classification</u>
Abilene Christian University	Master's Medium	Masters I
Angelo State University	Master's Medium	Masters I
Baylor University	Research University/High	DRE
*Dallas Baptist University	Master's Larger	Masters I
*Houston Baptist University	Master's Medium	Masters I
*Lamar University	Master's Larger	Masters I
Lubbock Christian University	Master's Smaller	Masters II
Midwestern State University	Master's Medium	Masters I
*Our Lady of the Lake University	Master's Larger	Masters I
Prairie View A & M University	Master's Larger	Masters I
Sam Houston State University	Doctoral Research University	DRE
*St. Mary's University	Master's Larger	Masters I
Stephen F. Austin State University	Master's Larger	Masters I
Sul Ross State University – Alpine	Master's Larger	Masters I
Sul Ross State University – Rio Grande	Master's Smaller	Masters II
Tarleton State University	Master's Larger	Masters I
Texas A & M University	Research University	DRI/Very High



<u>Institution</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>Former Classification</u>
Texas A & M International - University	Master's Medium	Masters I
Texas A & M University - Commerce	Doctoral Research University	DRE
Texas A & M University - Corpus Christi	Master's Larger	Masters I
Texas A & M University - Kingsville	Doctoral Research University	DRE
Texas A & M University - Texarkana	Master's Medium	Masters I
Texas Christian University	Doctoral Research University	DRE
Texas Southern University	Master's Medium	Masters I
Texas State University - San Marcos	Master's Larger	Masters I
Texas Tech University	Research University/High	DRE
Texas Wesleyan University	Master's Medium	Masters I
Texas Woman's University	Doctoral Research University	DRE
*Trinity University	Master's Medium	Masters I
*University of Houston	Research University/High	DRE
University of Houston – Victoria	Master's Larger	Masters I
University of Mary Hardin - Baylor	Master's Smaller	Masters II
University of North Texas	Research University/High	DRE
University of St. Thomas	Master's Larger	Masters I

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>Former Classification</u>
University of Texas – Arlington	Research University/High	DRE
University of Texas – Austin	Research University/Very High	DRI
University of Texas - Brownsville	Master's Medium	Masters I
University of Texas - El Paso	Research University/High	DRE
University of Texas - Pan American	Master's Larger	Masters I
*University of Texas - Permian Basin	Master's Medium	Masters I
University of Texas - San Antonio	Master's Larger	Masters I
University of Texas - Tyler	Master's Larger	Masters I
Wayland Baptist University	Master's Medium	Masters I
*West Texas A & M University	Master's Larger	Masters I
<i>Note: *No faculty participants in this study</i>		

## APPENDIX C

### Letter Emailed to Participants

4100 North 20<sup>th</sup> Street  
Waco, Texas 76708  
254-754-5187

September 24, 2009

Dear Principal Educator:

My name is Francene Haliburton, and I am a doctoral candidate at Baylor University. My dissertation is entitled Demographic Characteristics and Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty Who Prepare K-12 Principals in Texas. I am requesting your assistance with this study. I am asking that you take no more than 15 minutes of your valuable time to complete the survey.

Empirical research about K-12 principals continues to increase because principals have been identified as a key component for determining the success of K-12 schools. However, little empirical research exists about the higher education faculty who prepare the principals. My dissertation will examine the perceptions of higher education faculty and their values related to workloads and other issues.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. An Informed Consent Form is included at the beginning of the survey instrument. Questions regarding this research that are not addressed in detail on the Consent Form may be directed to my advisor, Dr. James L. Williamson, at 254-710-3050.

Please follow the link below and take the survey by October 9, 2009. Comments and concerns are welcomed and may be sent to fhaliburton@wacoisd.org. If you are not a principal educator (a higher education faculty member who prepares K-12 principals), please take a minute and notify me at the same email address and bypass participating in the questionnaire. Thank you in advance for your time, assistance, and consideration.

<http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB229P7GQEZYN>

Respectfully requested,

Francene Haliburton  
Doctoral Candidate  
Scholars of Practice  
Department of Educational Administration  
Baylor University

## APPENDIX D

### Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education

#### Faculty Survey Informed Consent Form

I have agreed to participate in the research project titled: *Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty in Texas Who Prepare K-12 Principals*, conducted by Francene Haliburton, a doctoral candidate in the Scholars of Practice program at Baylor University. I have been informed that the purpose of this study is to describe higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and to examine their perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. Also the success of graduates, as measured by the ExCET or TExES, will be studied in relation to a number of faculty characteristics, values, and perceptions. I understand that if I agree to participate in this study, I will be asked questions about my background and my perceptions about teaching, research, and service (workload allocations) in regards to K-12 principalship programs. I will be asked these questions in the *Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty Survey* that will be administered electronically through Zoomerang. It is estimated that the survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes. I am aware that my participation is voluntary and that my refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I would otherwise be entitled. I further understand that my participation may be withdrawn at anytime without penalty or loss of benefits to which I would otherwise be entitled and that if I have additional questions concerning this research, I may contact Francene Haliburton at 4100 North 20th Street, Waco, Texas 76708 or email her at fhaliburton@wacoisd.org. In addition, I understand that questions may be directed to Dr. James L. Williamson, Ms. Haliburton's Faculty Advisor, at 254-710-3050. As you may be aware, electronic communication may be subject to interception, legally by your employer or illegally by another party, while the information is in transit. Therefore, it is possible that your information might be seen by another party and I cannot control whether that happens. Although none of the information requested is of a personal nature, if you are concerned about your data security, I suggest that you print this e-mail, fill out the answers by hand, remove information from headers, etc. that identifies you as the respondent and mail the completed survey to the following address: Francene Haliburton at 4100 North 20th Street, Waco, Texas 76708. I understand that the intended benefits of this study include empirically describing higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and examining their perceptions about tripartite (teaching, research, and service) workload allocations.

I have been informed that the foreseeable risk of participating in this study may be that I experience some discomfort in being candid with the researcher. I further understand that I may choose not to answer any question on the *Demographic Characteristics and Workload Perceptions of Higher Education Faculty Survey*. Additionally, I understand that all information gathered during this study is confidential and that my confidentiality will be protected by limitations of who has access to data, by data stored in locked cabinets, by locked computer files, etc.

\_\_\_\_ I understand that inquiries regarding my rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to my participation as a subject can be directed to Baylor's University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research. The chairman is Dr. Matthew Stanford, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, P. O. Box 97334, Waco, Texas 76798, phone number 254-710-2236. I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I may have as a result of my participation, and I acknowledge that I can print a copy of this consent form electronically.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: This is a survey to describe higher education faculty in Texas who prepare K-12 principals and to examine their perceptions and values related to workloads and other issues. Your time is greatly appreciated. BE FRANK as your responses are completely anonymous. No one will ever know the answers that you give, so please be honest. If you are unsure how to answer a question, just choose the best answer for you. There are no right or wrong answers. Please try to answer all of the questions asked.

*Part A - Instructions: Respond to each item by selecting the appropriate response or by filling in the blank. Please mark the number of choices indicated. When in doubt, pick the best answer(s).*

**2** Please select your institution from the drop box below: \_\_\_\_\_

**3** What is your primary activity in your current position at this institution? (Mark one)

- ☐ Administration
- ☐ Teaching
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Service
- ☐ Other, please specify

**4** Are you considered a full-time employee at your institution? (Mark one) ☐ Yes ☐ No

**5** What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

**6** Your age: (Mark one)

- ☐ 24 or less
- ☐ 25-30
- ☐ 31-35
- ☐ 36-45
- ☐ 46-60
- ☐ 61+

**7** What is your present academic rank?

- ☐ Professor
- ☐ Associate Professor
- ☐ Assistant Professor
- ☐ Instructor
- ☐ Lecturer
- ☐ Adjunct/Part-time
- ☐ Other, please specify

**8** What is your administrative title?

- ☐ Director, coordinator, or administrator of an institute or specially funded program
- ☐ Department Chair
- ☐ Dean
- ☐ Associate or Assistant Dean
- ☐ Vice-President, Provost, Vice-Chancellor
- ☐ President, Chancellor
- ☐ Not Applicable
- ☐ Other, please specify

**9** Racial/Ethnic Group: (Mark all that apply)

- ☐ White/Caucasian
- ☐ African American/Black
- ☐ American Indian
- ☐ Asian American
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ Other, please specify

**10** Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or research or service?

- ☐ Very heavily in research
- ☐ In all, but leaning toward research
- ☐ In all, but leaning toward teaching
- ☐ Very heavily in teaching
- ☐ Very heavily in service
- ☐ In all, but leaning toward service

**11** On the following list, please mark one in each column:

- | Highest Degree Earned                                       | Degree Currently Working On                                 |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)      | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Master's (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Master's (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LL.B., J.D.                        | <input type="checkbox"/> LL.B., J.D.                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ed.D.                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Ed.D.                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D.                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D.                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Degree                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Degree                       |

**12** In the blank below, please provide the major of the highest degree earned. \_\_\_\_\_

**13** In the blank below, please provide the major of the degree you are currently working on. \_\_\_\_\_

**(Please skip if you are not currently working on a degree).**

**14** In which year did you receive your highest degree earned?

- ☐ prior to 1950
- ☐ 1950 - 1960
- ☐ 1961 - 1970
- ☐ 1971 - 1980
- ☐ 1981 - 1990
- ☐ 1991 - 2000
- ☐ 2001 – 2008

**15** Have you ever been a K-12 principal? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**16** If the answer to #15 is yes, how many years were you a K-12 principal?

- ☐ 0 - 4 years
- ☐ 5 - 12 years
- ☐ 13 - 17 years
- ☐ 18 - 23 years
- ☐ 24 years or longer
- ☐ Not Applicable

**17** How long has it been since you were a K-12 principal?

- ☐ 0 - 4 years
- ☐ 5 - 12 years
- ☐ 13 - 17 years
- ☐ 18 - 23 years
- ☐ 24 years or longer
- ☐ Not Applicable

**18** How many years have you been teaching in higher education?

- ☐ 0 - 4 years
- ☐ 5 - 8 years
- ☐ 9 - 12 years
- ☐ 13 - 16 years
- ☐ 17 - 21 years
- ☐ 22+ years

**19** How many years have you been teaching at your current institution?

- ☐ 0 - 4 years
- ☐ 5- 8 years
- ☐ 9 - 12 years
- ☐ 13 - 16 years
- ☐ 17 - 21 years
- ☐ 22+ years

**20** Please state what your salary is based on:

- ☐ 9/10 months
- ☐ 11/12 months
- ☐ Other, please specify

**21** Please mark the dollar value of your base institutional salary, rounded to the nearest\$1,000.

- ☐ under \$10,000
- ☐ \$10,001 - \$15,000
- ☐ \$15,001 - \$20,000
- ☐ \$20,001 - \$35,000
- ☐ \$35,001 - \$50,000
- ☐ \$50,001 - \$75,000
- ☐ \$75,001 - \$125,000
- ☐ \$125,001 - \$200,000
- ☐ \$200,001+

**22** What is your tenure status?

- ☐ Tenured
- ☐ Non-Tenured on a Tenured Track
- ☐ Non-Tenured and Not on a Tenured Track
- ☐ Not Applicable

**23** If tenured, how many years have you had tenure?

- ☐ 0 - 4 years
- ☐ 5 - 8 years
- ☐ 9 - 12 years
- ☐ 13 - 16 years
- ☐ 17 - 21 years
- ☐ 22+ years
- ☐ Not Applicable



*Part B - Instructions: Please answer questions 24 through 30 as they apply to the full term most recently completed at this institution.*

**24** During the present term, how many hours per week on the average do you actually spend on each of the following activities?

1

Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credited hours)

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Advising and counseling of students

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Committee work and meetings

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Administrative Duties

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Research and scholarly writing

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Other creative products/performances

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Community or public service

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Outside consulting/freelance work in school districts

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

Supervising field experiences/internships in K-12 schools

\_\_\_ None \_\_\_ 1 – 4 \_\_\_ 5 – 8 \_\_\_ 9 – 12 \_\_\_ 13 – 16 \_\_\_ 17 – 20 \_\_\_ 21 – 34 \_\_\_ 35 – 44 \_\_\_ 45+

**25** How many of the following courses are you teaching **on-campus** this term? (Mark one for each activity)

BA or BS undergraduate credit courses

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

Masters level graduate courses related to principal preparation

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

Doctoral level graduate courses related to principal preparation or other administrative preparation

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

Other graduate level courses

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

**26** If you marked "Other graduate level courses" in question #25, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

**27** How many of the following courses are you teaching **off-campus** this term? (Mark one for each activity)

BA or BS undergraduate credit courses

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

Masters level graduate courses related to principal preparation

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

Doctoral level graduate courses related to principal preparation or other administrative preparation

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

Other graduate level courses

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 5+ \_\_\_ None

**28** If you marked "Other graduate level courses" in question #27, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

**29** How many of the following courses are you teaching in an **online format** this term? (Mark one for each activity)

BA or BS undergraduate credit courses

\_\_\_1\_\_\_2\_\_\_3\_\_\_4\_\_\_5+\_\_\_None

Master level graduate courses related to principal preparation

\_\_\_1\_\_\_2\_\_\_3\_\_\_4\_\_\_5+\_\_\_None

Doctoral level graduate courses related to principal preparation or other administrative preparation

\_\_\_1\_\_\_2\_\_\_3\_\_\_4\_\_\_5+\_\_\_None

Other graduate level courses

\_\_\_1\_\_\_2\_\_\_3\_\_\_4\_\_\_5+\_\_\_None

**30** If you marked "Other graduate level courses" in question #29, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_

**31** How many of the following have you published? (Mark only one response for each option)

Articles in refereed academic or professional journals

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

Articles in non-refereed academic or professional journals

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

Chapters in edited volumes

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

Books, manuals, or monographs

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

**32** In the last two years:

How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication?

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

How many of your professional papers or presentations have you given at state level conferences?

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

How many of your professional papers or presentations have you given at national level conferences?

\_\_\_None\_\_\_1-2\_\_\_3-4\_\_\_5-10\_\_\_11-20\_\_\_21-50\_\_\_51+

**33** During the Last Two Years Have You:

Developed a new course? \_\_\_Yes\_\_\_No

Considered leaving academe for another job? \_\_\_Yes\_\_\_No

Taught courses at more than one institution during the same term? \_\_\_Yes\_\_\_No

Served as a paid consultant? \_\_\_Yes\_\_\_No

Requested/sought a promotion? \_\_\_Yes\_\_\_No

**34** How important were each of the following in your decision to work at this college or university?  
(Mark one for each item)

Institutional emphasis on teaching

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Institutional emphasis on research

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Quality of students

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Prestige of institution

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Prestige of principal preparation program

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Salary and benefits

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Research facilities

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Academic rank offered

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Colleagues

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Geographic location

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Job opportunities for spouse

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

Other personal/family considerations

☐ Very Important ☐ Somewhat Important ☐ Not Important ☐ A Deterrent

**35** Below are some statements about your K-12 Principalship Program. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following:

Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

The department should hire more faculty of color.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Faculty of color are treated fairly in the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Women faculty are treated fairly in the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

This program should hire more women faculty.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

My research is valued by faculty in my department.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

My teaching is valued by faculty in my department.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Classes are too large for meaningful discussions.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Full-time faculty are committed to the welfare of the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Adjunct/Part-time faculty are committed to the welfare of the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

School district(s) and practicing administrators are committed to the welfare of the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

My university's leadership values the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Full-time faculty are treated fairly in the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Adjunct/Part-time faculty are treated fairly in the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

More full-time faculty should be hired.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

More adjunct/part-time faculty should be hired.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

There are too many adjunct/part-time faculty in our program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Field-based experiences are important characteristics of the program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Faculty have reduced teaching loads to work with local school(s) or school district(s).

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Student internships and other field based experiences are adequately supervised by faculty in our program.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Faculty have reduced teaching loads for research and publications.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Students are required to conduct research.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Our principal preparation program enrolls quality students.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

Our principal preparation program has a reputation for academic quality.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

The ExCET/TEsES is a good measure of success for a potential K-12 principal.

☐ Agree Strongly ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Somewhat ☐ Disagree Strongly

**36** Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of stress for you during the last two years: (Mark one for each item)

Review/promotion process	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Committee work	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Faculty meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Colleagues	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Students	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Research or publishing demands	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All

Institutional procedures/"red tape"	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Teaching load	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All
Keeping up with information technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Extensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat	<input type="checkbox"/> Not At All

**37** How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? (Mark one for each item)

Salary and fringe benefits

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Opportunity for scholarly pursuits

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Teaching load

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Quality of students accepted into the program

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Class size

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Technology support

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Office/lab space

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Autonomy and independence

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Professional relationships with other faculty

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Social relationships with other faculty

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Competency of colleagues

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Job security

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Relationships with administration

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Institution's review/promotion process

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Quality of committee work

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Quantity of committee meetings/activities

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Quality of faculty meetings

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Quantity of faculty meetings

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Research demands

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Publishing demands

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Navigating institutional procedures

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

Overall job satisfaction

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Marginally Satisfied ☐ Not Satisfied ☐ Not Applicable

**38** Indicate how well each of the following describes your K-12 program at your college or university: (Mark one for each item)

It is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The faculty are typically at odds with campus administrators.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Faculty here respect each other.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Most students are treated like "numbers in a book".

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Faculty are rewarded for teaching more than research and publications.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Faculty are rewarded for research more than teaching and publications.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Faculty are rewarded for publications more than teaching and research.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Too many unqualified candidates are accepted.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program uses the cohort model.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program uses clear performance based standards.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program includes a partnership with one or more school district(s) to provide a meaningful field-based experience.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program adequately prepares principals for their roles as technology leaders.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program adequately prepares principals for their roles as instructional leaders.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program adequately emphasizes reflective practice.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

The program seeks continuous program review with input from current practitioners.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

Graduates perform well on the ExCET/TEXES.

☐ Very Descriptive ☐ Somewhat Descriptive ☐ Not Descriptive

**39** Students who complete your institution's principal program know how to...

Develop a vision

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Conduct research

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Collect, analyze, and use data for school improvement

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Align staff development with student learning needs

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Provide opportunities for K-12 faculty members to continuously learn

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Apply best practices to student learning as instructional leaders

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Enhance student performance on statewide assessments

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Work effectively with parents and community groups

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

**40** According to your perception, describe your principal preparation program's strongest characteristic.

**41** According to your perception, describe your principal preparation program's weakest characteristic.

## REFERENCES

- Acquirre, A. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Adams, C. et al. (1995). *Report of the faculty workload task force*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- American Association of University Professors. (2008). What do faculty do? Washington, DC: Retrieved October 6, 2009 from [www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/facultydolist.htm](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/facultydolist.htm)
- Anthony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 41-56.
- Antony, J. S., & Taylor, E. (2001). Graduate student socialization and its implications for the recruitment of African American education faculty. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Faculty work in schools of education: Rethinking roles and rewards for the twenty-first century* (pp. 189-209). Albany, NY: Columbia State University of New York Press.
- Austin, A. E. (2002, January/February). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Banerji, S. (2006). *Diverse issues in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Barnes, B., Gooden, D., & Preziosi, R. (2004). An examination of the learning styles of online MBA students and their preferred course delivery methods. *New Horizons in Adult Education*, 18(2). Retrieved May 6, 2009, from <http://www.huizenga.nova.edu/about/ResearchReports/HS07-11-04LearningStylesofOnlineMBASStudents.pdf>
- Barnes, L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 457-469.
- Bartlett, J. (2003). *An analyses of computer and information sciences faculty workloads in higher education*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.
- Bathon, J., & Black, W. (2007). *Preparing tomorrow's principals: Faculty in Indiana building-level administrator preparation programs*. Paper presented at the University Council of Educational Administrators Conference, Alexandria, Virginia.



- Berger, A. (2007). *Great minds don't think alike*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Black, W. R., Bathon, J. M., & Poindexter, B. (2007). *Looking in the mirror to inform practice: A study of administrative licensure and masters degree programs in the state of Indiana*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Department of Education.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectations, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Bland, C. J., & Risbey, K. R. (2006). *Understanding senior faculty needs*. Washington, DC: Stylus Publishing.
- Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil Nimus*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Border, K. (2004). *University-based principal preparation programs in Texas: Perceptions of program completers and supervisors in the Texas Lighthouse Project*. Doctoral Dissertation, Baylor University.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brazeau, G. (2003 ). Revisiting faculty service roles: Is “faculty service” a victim of the middle child syndrome? *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 67(3), Article 85.
- Bredeson, P. (1996). *The principalship*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, F. (2005). African Americans and school leadership: An introduction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(4), 585-590.
- Browne-Ferringo, T., & Muth, R. (2004). Leadership mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 468-494.
- Campbell, R., & Newell, L. (1973). A study of professors of educational administration: A summary. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 9(3), 3-27.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009). *Basic classification description*. Retrieved March 14, 2009, <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications> retrieved March 14, 2009
- Clark, T. (1993). Attitudes of higher education faculty toward distance education: A national survey. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 7(2), 19-33.

- Comm, C., & Mathaisel, D. (2003). A case study of the implications of faculty workload and compensation for improving academic quality. *International Journal of Education Management*, 17(5), 200-210.
- Conrad, D., & Pedro, J. (2009). Perspectives on online teaching and learning: A report of two novice online educators. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 1-17.
- Conrad, T., & Rosser, V. (2006, April). *Examining the satisfaction of educational leaders and their intent to pursue career advancement in public school administration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, San Francisco.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2008). *State policy framework to develop highly qualified educational administrators*. Retrieved from [www.ccsso.org/publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=365](http://www.ccsso.org/publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=365)
- Creighton, T. (2001, May/June). Data analysis and the principalship. *Principal Leadership*, 1(9), 52-57.
- Creighton, T., & Jones, G. (2001, August). *Selection or self-selection? How rigorous are selection criteria I education administration programs?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Daresh, J. (2002). U.S. school administrator development: Issues and a plan for improvement. In *Proceedings of International Conference on School Leader Preparation, Licensure/Certification, Selection, Evaluation, and Professional Development*, edited by Wen-liuh Lin. Taipei, Taiwan: National Taipei Teachers College.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). The effect of NCATE. Washington, DC: Retrieved September 1, 2009, from [www.ncate.org](http://www.ncate.org)
- Davis, J., & Jazzar, M. (2005, May/June). The seven habits of effective principal preparation programs. *Principal*, 84(5), 18-21.
- DeMuse, K. P. (1987). The relationship between research productivity and perceptions of doctoral program quality. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18, 81-83.
- Denton, M., & Zeytinoglu, U. (1993). Perceived participation in decision-making in a university setting: the impact of gender. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 46(2), 320-331.
- Drake, D., & McCord, R. (2004). A professional shift: The transition from superintendent to professor. *The AASA Professor*, 26(3), 8-14.

- Duncan, H. (2005). Online education for practicing professionals: A case study. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(4), 874-896.
- Eastern Kentucky University. (2009). *The department of educational leadership and policy studies: Application*. Retrieved October 6, 2009, from [www.ncpeaprofessors.org](http://www.ncpeaprofessors.org)
- Eckel, P., & King, J. (2004). *An overview of higher education in the United States: Diversity, access, and the role of the marketplace*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Educational Research Service, National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leadership we need*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2000). The survey of changes in faculty retirement policies. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved June 12, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/retirement/2000retirement-survey.htm?PF=1>
- Enger, K. (2003). *Analysis of articles published in eight selected higher education journals on selected variables to reveal scholarly development of the discipline*. University of North Dakota.
- Evans, D. (2009). *Redefining faculty roles*. Washington, DC: The Chronicle of Higher Education.
- Fairweather, J. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 26-48.
- Farkas, S. et al. (2001, November). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Foley, S. (2006). *Teaching, scholarship, and institutional service: A progressive interpretation of faculty work in higher education*. Oxford, OH: Miami University.
- Glatthorn, A. A. (1998). *Writing a winning dissertation: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Goodney, T. (2007). *Assessing knowledge, understanding, skills, and traits: A discrepancy analysis of those who prepare and hire secondary principals in Ohio*. Oxford, OH: Miami University.
- Gordon, S. P. (2004). *Professional development for school improvement: Empowering learning communities*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Griffeth, R. W., & Gaertner, S. (2001). A role for equity theory in the turnover process: An empirical test. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(5), 1017-1037.
- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 233- 256.
- Gutierrez, J.J. (2000). Instructor student interaction. *USDLA Journal*, 14(3). Retrieved June 16, 2009, from <http://www.usdPa.org/html/journal/MAROO.Issue/Instructorstudent.htm>
- Hackmann, D. (2007). Roles and responsibilities of clinical faculty in selected educational leadership programs. *Planning and Changing*, 38(1), 17-34.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 569-598.
- Harris, S., & Crocker, C. (2008). *Emerging gender issues between mentors and protégés in a principal preparation program*. Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration's School Leadership Review. Retrieved August 23, 2009, from <http://cnx.org/content/ml4497/latest/>
- Hemsley-Brown, J., & Sharp, C. (2003). The use of research to improve professional practice: A systematic review of the literature. *Oxford Review of Education*, 29(4), 449-471.
- Hera, N., & King, R. (1999). Students' frustrations with a Web-based distance education course. *First Monday*, 4(12). Retrieved June 16, 2009, from <http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issues 4-12/hara>
- Higgins, D. C., Duxbury, D. L., & Lyons, S. (2007). Reducing work-life conflict: What works? What doesn't? Executive Summary.
- Holt, K. (2005). *A comparison of faculty time requirements in online and traditional course formats: Health science and non-health science courses*. Touro University International.
- Horn, P. W., & Kinicki, A. J. (2001). Toward a greater understanding about how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 975-987.
- Jackson, B., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Jacoby, F. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1081-1103.

- Jaschik, S. (2006). The gen x professor. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved August 27, 2009, from <http://insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2006/04/05/genx>
- Jaschik, S. (2008). Racial gaps in faculty job satisfaction. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved August 23, 2009 from [www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/12/05/coache](http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/12/05/coache)
- Jefferies, P., & Seden, R. (2006). Using asynchronous computer conferencing to support learning and teaching in a campus-based higher education context: Beyond e-moderating. In J. O'Donoghue (Ed.), *Technology supported learning and teaching: A staff perspective*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Jensen, C. (2006). The employment of site administrators who obtained administrative certification by examination. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 23, 4E. Retrieved September 2, 2009, from <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Jensen,%20C%20het%20The%20Employability%20of%20Site%20Administrators%20Who%20Obtained%20Administrative%20Certification%20By%20Examination.pdf>
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2000). Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 34-59.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness:" Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315-342.
- Kavanagh, J. (2005). *Stress and performance: A review of the literature and its applicability to the military*. Technical Report.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Transforming principal preparation*. ERIC Digest 165. Retrieved September 14, 2008 from <http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest165.html>
- Lauder, A. (2000). The new look in principal programs. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 23-28.
- Lazarus, B. (2003). Teaching courses online: How much time does it take? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning, Networks*, 7(3), 47-54.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders: The education schools project*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Levine, A. (2007). *Educating researchers*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton.
- Mancing, H. (1991). Teaching, research, service: The concept of faculty workload. *ADFL Bulletin*, 22(3), 44 -50.
- Mansour, B. E. (2006). Challenges and solutions in offering distance education programs: A case study of an HRD program. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from [http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Nov\\_06/article03.htm](http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Nov_06/article03.htm)

- Marston, R. (2002). Addressing the university's tripartite mission through an early childhood movement program. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (JOPERD)*, 73(5), 35-41.
- Matier, M. W. (1990). *Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses*. *Research in Higher Education*, 31, 39-60
- McCarthy, M. Kuh, G. Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
- McCarthy, M., & Hackmann, D. (2009). *Demographic trends in the educational leadership professoriate, 1972–2008*. Austin: University Council for Educational Administration.
- McCarthy, M., & Kuh, G. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate*. Columbus, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.
- McCormick, A., Pike, G., Kuh, G., & Chen, P. (2009). Comparing the utility of the 2000 and 2005 Carnegie classification systems in research on students' college experiences and outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 144-167
- Meyer, K. (1998). Faculty workload studies: Perspectives, needs, and future directions. ERIC Digest (ED418654)
- Middaugh, M. (2001). *Understanding faculty productivity: Standards and benchmarks for colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Milstein, M. M., Bobroff, B. M., & Restine, L. N. (1991). *Internship programs in educational administration: A guide to preparing educational leaders*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Modern Language Association of America. (2009). *Standing still: The associate professor survey. Report of the committee on the status of women in the profession*. Web publication. Retrieved August 27, 2009, from [http://www.mla.org/pdf/cswp\\_final042909.pdf](http://www.mla.org/pdf/cswp_final042909.pdf)
- Morse, K. (2003) Does one size fit all? Exploring asynchronous learning in a multicultural environment. *JALN*, 7(1). Retrieved August 28, 2009, from [www.sloan-c.org/publications/jaln/v7nl/pdf/v7nl\\_morse.pdf](http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/jaln/v7nl/pdf/v7nl_morse.pdf)
- Mupinga, D., & Maughan, G. (2008). *Web-based instruction and community college faculty workload*. Washington DC: College Teaching 56(1)
- Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2004). *Research on preparation programs in educational leadership: An analysis*. Monograph prepared for the University Council for Educational Administration: University of Missouri-Columbia.

- Muth, R. (2002). Scholar practitioner goals, practices, and outcomes: What students and faculty need to know and be able to do. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 1(1), 67-87
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Digest of education statistics. Chapter 3: Postsecondary education. Table 253: Bachelor's master's and doctor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions by sex of students and field of study: 2002-2003*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- National Commission for the Advancement of Education Leadership Preparation. (2002). *Ensuring the university's capacity to prepare Learning-focused leadership*. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from <http://www.ncaelp.org/PressRelease.htm>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2009). *Why NCATE?*. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from [www.ncate.org](http://www.ncate.org)
- National Education Association. (2007). *The NEA and contingent academic workers in higher education: NBI 2004-60 action plan*. NEA Advisory Committee on Membership 2007. Retrieved September 2, 2009, from [http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE\\_NCNE\\_NEAcontingentplan.pdf](http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE_NCNE_NEAcontingentplan.pdf)
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2005). *Improving the preparation of educational leaders: An agenda for reform*. Retrieved October 9, 2009, from [www.npbea.org](http://www.npbea.org)
- Nestor, P., & Leary, P. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non-tenure track status of extension faculty and job satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, 38(4), 8-13
- Norton, J. (2002). Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Olson, D. (2002). The triumph of hope over experience in the search for "what works:" A response to Slavin. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 22-24.
- Plater, W.M. (1995). Future work: Faculty time in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Change*, 27(3), 22-33.
- Porter, S., & Umbach, P. (2001 ). Analyzing faculty workload data using Multi-level modeling. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(2), 171-176.
- Redish, T., & Chan, T. (2007). Technology leadership: Aspiring administrators' perceptions of their leadership preparation program. *Electronic Journal for the Integration of Technology in Education*, 6, 123-139.
- Remler, K. R., & Perma, E. (2009). *Why do institutions of higher education reward research while selling education?* Boston: National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Restauri, S. L., King, F.L., & Nelson, J. G. (2001). *Assessment of students' ratings for two methodologies of teaching via distance learning: An evaluative approach based on accreditation*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 460148)
- Rice, M. L., & Miller, M. T. (2001). Faculty involvement in planning for the use and integration of instructional and administrative technologies. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 33(3), 328-336.
- Rosser, V. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285-309.
- Russell, A. (2006). Faculty trends and issues. *American Association of State Colleges and Universities*, 3(4), 1. Retrieved October 4, 2009, from <http://www.aascu.org/media/pm/pdf/v3n4.pdf>
- Russo, A. (2004, March/April). *Preparing the highly qualified principal*. Harvard Education Letter: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved October 4, 2009, from <http://www.hepg.org/hel/article/262>
- Scanks, E. (2005). *A study of Texas principals' perceptions of barriers to research utilization*. Doctoral Dissertation, Baylor University, Waco, TX.
- Schnaubelt, T., & Statham, A. (2007). *Faculty perceptions of service as a mode of scholarship*. Kenosha, WI: University of Wisconsin-Parkside.
- Schuldt, B., & Totten, J. (2008). An exploratory study: Business faculty and the faculty stress index. *Allied Academies International Conference*, 13(2).
- Slavin, R. (2004). Education research can and must address "what works" questions. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1) 25-27.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2008). *The commission on colleges*. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Retrieved October 4, 2009, from <http://www.sacscoc.org>
- State Board for Educator Certification. (2008a). *Texas examinations of educator standards: Preparation manual: 068 principal*. Austin: Retrieved December 11, 2008, from [http://www.texas.ets.org/assests/pdf/test\\_descriptions/te\\_facmanappendixc\\_fld068\\_r.pdf](http://www.texas.ets.org/assests/pdf/test_descriptions/te_facmanappendixc_fld068_r.pdf)
- State Board for Educator Certification. (2008b). *The interactive reports: ASEP*. Austin: Retrieved December 11, 2008, from <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/reports/default.asp>
- Texas Education Agency. (2006). *Texas examinations of educator standards: Preparation manual: 068 principal*. Austin: Educational Testing Service.



- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2008). *Program inventory*. Austin: Retrieved March 23, 2008, from <http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/InteractiveTools/ProgramInventory/DegInv.cfm>
- Thaden, E. (2007). Understanding attrition & predicting employment durations of former staff in a public sector social service organization. *Community Research and Action*.
- Thompson, C. A., Andreassi, J., & Prottas, D. (2003). Work-family culture and climate.
- Thurmond, V., & Wambach, K. (2004). *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*. Retrieved 5/13/09 from the World Wide Web: [http://itdl.org/journal/Jan\\_04/article02.htm](http://itdl.org/journal/Jan_04/article02.htm)
- Tomei, L. A. (2006). The impact of online teaching on faculty load: Computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14(3), 531-541.
- Trower, C. (2008). *Amending higher education's constitution*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved August 24, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsrrs/academe/2008/so/Fea/trow.html?PF=1>
- Trower, C., & Chait, R. (2002). *Faculty diversity: Too little for too long*. Cambridge: Harvard Magazine.
- Tubbs, E. (2008). Program coordinators disposition toward educational leadership best practices: Practicum experience in Georgia. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 1(4), Kennesaw State University, U.S.A.
- Turner, C. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *Schools and staffing in the United States: Selected data for public and private schools, 1993-94*. (NCES 95-191). Washington DC: United States Department of Education, NCES.
- Valcour, P. M., & Batt, R. (2003). Work-life integration: Challenges and organization responses. *Faculty Publications-Human Resource Studies*, 310-331
- Valentine, A. (2001, March). *Goals 2000 principal leadership development project* (final report). Columbia, MO: Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, State Action for Education Leadership Project.

- Van Patten, J. (1994). *The politics of assessment of the professoriate*. Paper presented at the Southeastern Philosophy of Education Society
- West, R. F., & Rhoton, C. (1994). School district administrators' perceptions of education research and barriers to research utilization. *ERS Spectrum*, 12, 23-30.
- Williams, A. (2003). *Huntington West Virginia: Job stress, job satisfaction, and intent to leave employment among maternal-child health nurses*. Huntington, VA: Marshall University.
- Williamson, R., & Hudson, M. (2001). *The good, the bad, the ugly: Internships in principal preparation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Wonacott, M. (2001). *Implications of distance education for CTE* [microform]. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Center on Education and Training Employment, College of Education, the Ohio State University.
- Yerkes, D. M., & Guaglianone, C. L. (1998). Where have all the high school administrators gone? *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 28(2), 10-14.