

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 545

VT 000 029

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONS WHO WOULD BE CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADERSHIP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OCCUPATIONALLY ORIENTED PROGRAMS IN HIGH SCHOOLS.

BY: WENRICH, RALPH C. SHAFFER, EARL W.
MICHIGAN UNIV., ANN ARBOR, SCH. OF EDUCATION

REPORT NUMBER O6845-1-F

PUB DATE SEP 65

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$1.20 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PRINCIPALS, *OPINIONS, HIGH SCHOOLS, *FEDERAL AID, *STATE AID, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, ANN ARBOR

PRINCIPALS IN 106 LARGE HIGH SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN WERE INTERVIEWED TO DETERMINE HOW THEY WOULD USE AN ASSISTANT WHO WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING OCCUPATIONALLY ORIENTED PROGRAMS FOR EMPLOYMENT-BOUND YOUTH. DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND RELATIONSHIPS WHICH THE ASSISTANT MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO ASSUME OR DEVELOP WERE ALSO STUDIED. THE AREAS RANKED IN ORDER OF THE PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES WERE (1) PUPIL PERSONNEL, (2) SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, (3) INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM, (4) BUSINESS FUNCTIONS, AND (5) TEACHING PERSONNEL. THE TOP THREE OF 27 ACTIVITIES LISTED AND RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES FOR MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ASSISTANT WERE -- (1) LOCATING AND ORGANIZING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, (2) DETERMINING LOCAL OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION NEEDS, AND (3) OPERATING A STUDENT JOB-PLACEMENT PROGRAM. IT WAS CONCLUDED THAT MOST PRINCIPALS OF LARGE HIGH SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN WERE INTERESTED IN EXPANDING VOCATIONAL OR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS, AND THEY SAW THE NEED FOR AN ASSISTANT TO GIVE HELP AND LEADERSHIP. THE ASSISTANT SHOULD BE TRAINED IN BOTH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION, AND SHOULD WORK WITH THE PRINCIPAL, OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL, AND LOCAL CIVIC, BUSINESS, INDUSTRIAL, AND PROFESSIONAL GROUPS TO IMPROVE THE HIGH SCHOOL'S ABILITY TO PREPARE YOUNG PEOPLE FOR EMPLOYMENT. (FS)

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

High School Principals' Perceptions of the Roles and Responsibilities of Persons Who Would Be Charged with the Responsibility for Leadership in the Development of Occupationally Oriented Programs in High Schools

RALPH C. WENRICH

EARL W. SHAFFER

Sponsored by:

State Board of Control for Vocational Education
Lansing, Michigan

Administered through:

September 1965

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION • ANN ARBOR

ED011545

VT 00029

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
PERSONS WHO WOULD BE CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADERSHIP
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OCCUPATIONALLY ORIENTED PROGRAMS IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Ralph C. Wenrich
Earl W. Shaffer

ORA Project 06845

sponsored by:

STATE BOARD OF CONTROL FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
LANSING, MICHIGAN

administered through:

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION ANN ARBOR

September 1965

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

FOREWORD

In 1963, The University of Michigan did a survey of principals of major high schools in Michigan to determine what kinds of assistance they would consider most helpful in developing and/or operating more adequate programs and services for employment-bound youth. Over 98 percent of the principals responded, and three-fourths of them favored spending "some" or "most" earmarked vocational education funds to help them improve their programs for employment-bound youth.

Most of the principals felt that they did not have time to give leadership to the programs for employment-bound youth, and nearly three-fourths of them felt their programs could be improved if funds were made available to provide an extra assistant to give this leadership.

The study reported here is an attempt to determine how high school principals would use an assistant responsible for the development of occupationally oriented programs and services.

Although the project director takes full responsibility for the study, it should be recognized that he has had the assistance of many of his colleagues. Particular credit should be given to Earl Shaffer, Assistant in Research for the project, for assisting in the design of the study and for carrying through most of the details. The services of William C. Eckerman of the Survey Research Center, were extremely valuable in constructing the interview guide.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the 120 principals (of the 123 contacted) who agreed to participate in the study by granting an interview. I would also like to thank the 40 men in the University of Michigan's first Leadership Development Project for Vocational and Technical Education who conducted the interviews.

Ralph C. Wenrich
Project Director

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
PART	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Statement of the Problem	1
B. Objectives of the Study	1
C. Scope of the Study	1
D. Procedure	2
II. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	3
A. Five Areas of Responsibility for Proposed Assistants	3
1. Comparing the responses for the five areas of responsibility	3
2. Comparing the responses for specific activities listed under the major areas of responsibility	5
B. Further Comments by Principals Participating in the Study	10
C. Related Information	13
D. Conclusions	14
E. Recommendations	14
APPENDIX	17

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	The Five Major Areas Rated as Major Responsibility of the New Assistant (ranked according to average percentage of principals' responses)	4
II	The Five Major Areas Rated as Shared Responsibility of the New Assistant (ranked according to average percentage of principals' responses)	6
III	Pupil Personnel: Extent of the New Assistant's Responsibility, Opinions of Principals, by Percentage	6
IV	School-Community Relations: Extent of the New Assistant's Responsibility, Opinions of Principals, by Percentage	7
V	Instructional Program: Extent of the New Assistant's Responsibility, Opinions of Principals, by Percentage	8
VI	Business Functions: Extent of the New Assistant's Responsibility, Opinions of Principals, by Percentage	8
VII	Teaching Personnel: Extent of the New Assistant's Responsibility, Opinions of Principals, by Percentage	9
VIII	Ranking Order of All Items on the Questionnaire, by Percentage of Responses Under Major Responsibility	11

PART I. INTRODUCTION

A. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the spring of 1963, a study was made by Wenrich and Ollenburger¹ to determine what kinds of assistance principals of larger high schools in Michigan would consider most helpful in developing and/or operating special programs and services for employment-bound youth. Of the 120 principals included in the study, 109 accepted the responsibility for giving employment-bound youth salable skills; only 19 principals felt that their schools were doing all that could be done toward achieving this goal. A majority of the principals felt that they did not have time to give leadership to the programs, and nearly three-fourths of them felt their programs could be improved if funds were available for an assistant who would administer the occupational education program.

To prepare people for such leadership positions, we need to know more about the nature of these positions and the duties and responsibilities involved.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study were:

1. To determine what duties and responsibilities the principals would give to an assistant responsible for leading the development of occupationally oriented programs and services.
2. To determine the relationship the assistant has and/or should have with the principal, counselors, teachers, individuals in other community agencies and organizations, and in the world of work.
3. To determine if there is a pattern of duties, responsibilities, and relationships which the assistant might be expected to assume and develop.

C. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study included 106 of 123 Michigan high school principals of schools with a student population of 700 or more in grades 10-12, of 1000 or more in

¹Ralph C. Wenrich and Alvin Ollenburger. High School Principals' Perceptions of Assistance Needed in Order to Develop More Adequate Programs for Employment-Bound Youth. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, December 1963.

grades 9-12, and of 1,600 or more in grades 7-12. This was the same group of principals who were involved in the earlier study by Wenrich and Ollenburger.

D. PROCEDURE

A list was made of the types of duties and responsibilities related to occupational education with which high school principals needed assistance. This was done with the help of principals, professors of secondary school administration and curriculum, and twenty occupational educators from Michigan, who were members of the University of Michigan's first summer workshop of the Leadership Development Project for Vocational and Technical Education, held during the 1964 summer session.

An interviewer's questionnaire guide was constructed and pre-tested by giving it to a number of staff members and high school principals who were not included in the population to be interviewed. The questionnaire was then revised to eliminate ambiguities (See Appendix, p. 20).

As a voluntary assignment during their training internship, the twenty members of the Leadership Development Project Workshop and twenty members of the control group for the project were assigned certain high school principals to visit and interview, using the questionnaire guide.

Early in January, a letter was sent to each of the 123 principals whose schools qualified for the study, explaining the purposes of the study and requesting their participation in the interviews (see Appendix, p. 19).

Interviews were completed with 106 of the 123 principals. Only three principals declined the invitation to take part in the interview. Because of time limitations and changes in positions, the interviewers were unable to complete 14 interviews.

PART II. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

A. FIVE AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROPOSED ASSISTANTS

For this study the projected duties and responsibilities in which an assistant might be involved were divided into five major areas:

Instructional Program
School-Community Relations
Pupil Personnel
Teaching Personnel
Business Functions

Under each of the major areas were a number of specific areas of activity, designated by the letters a, b, c, etc. (see questionnaire, Appendix, p. 21).

The principals were asked to indicate to what extent they felt the proposed assistant should be involved in and have responsibility for the activities listed under each of the five areas.

The choices for responding to each item were that the new assistant principal would:

1. Have primary responsibility for the area, subject only to the veto power of the principal
2. Share responsibility for the area with the principal
3. Act only as an advisor to the principal in this area
4. Not be involved at all in this area

To save space, the responses have been shortened, in the rest of this study, to PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY, SHARED RESPONSIBILITY, ADVISORY ONLY, NO RESPONSIBILITY.

1. Comparing the Responses for the Five Areas of Responsibility

The activities under Pupil Personnel received the highest average number of votes per item (64 percent) as an area of PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY for the assistant. School-Community Relations ranked second, with an average of 60 percent of the responses under PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY. Instructional Program ranked third, with an average of 47 percent, and Business Functions ranked fourth with an average of 43 percent. The fifth ranked area was Teaching Personnel, with 16 percent (see Table I).

TABLE I

THE FIVE MAJOR AREAS RATED AS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE NEW ASSISTANT (RANKED ACCORDING TO
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSE)

Area by Rank	Area by Title	Average Percentage
<u>Area One</u>	Pupil Personnel	64
<u>Area Two</u>	School-Community Relations	60
<u>Area Three</u>	Instructional Program	47
<u>Area Four</u>	Business Functions	43
<u>Area Five</u>	Teaching Personnel	16

When the major areas of responsibility are ranked according to the average percentage of responses per item indicated as a SHARED RESPONSIBILITY, Instructional Program and Teaching Personnel both received an average of 41 percent, Business Functions was third with 33 percent, School-Community Relations was fourth with 32 percent, and Pupil Personnel was fifth with 19 percent (see Table II).

2. Comparing the Responses for Specific Activities Listed Under the Major Areas of Responsibility

More than 50 percent of the principals felt that each activity under Pupil Personnel was a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY of the new assistant. First and second in this group were operation of a student job-placement program and establishment of a student job-placement program, with 75 and 74 percent of the votes, respectively (see Table III).

Under School-Community Relations, at least 50 percent of the principals felt each activity to be a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY of the new assistant. Determining local occupational needs through recognized methods such as surveys ranked first, with 76 percent. Establishing and/or working with lay advisory committees and developing relations with community agencies and professional organizations ranked second, with 70 percent (see Table IV).

Only one activity under Instructional Program, initiating curriculum innovation, was viewed by at least 50 percent of the principals to be a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY of the new assistant. Although Instructional Program ranks third in terms of the principals' perceptions of PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY, 3 of the 5 activities listed under that area were seen by at least 50 percent of the principals as a SHARED RESPONSIBILITY for the new assistant (see Table V).

No single activity listed under Business Functions received a 50 percent vote under any of the four possible response categories. Item c, purchasing supplies and equipment, was felt by 49 percent of the principals to be a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY, while 48 percent saw activity a, budget planning, as a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY of the new assistant (see Table VI).

None of the activities having to do with Teaching Personnel was felt to be a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY of the new assistant. Fifty-nine percent of the principals rated orienting new teachers as a SHARED RESPONSIBILITY. A noticeable majority, 71 percent, felt that the new assistant would not be involved in determining salaries for teachers (see Table VII). In space provided for further comment, many principals pointed out that salary was not within the realm of building administrative staff.

In the areas of Instructional Program and Teaching Personnel, most of the activities were felt to be more a SHARED RESPONSIBILITY than a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY of the new assistant. However, none of the principals classified any of the activities under Instructional Program as NO RESPONSIBILITY (see Table V).

TABLE II

THE FIVE MAJOR AREAS RATED AS SHARED RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE NEW ASSISTANT (RANKED ACCORDING TO AVERAGE
PERCENTAGE OF PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES)

Area by Rank	Area by Title	Average Percentage
<u>Area One</u>	Instructional Program	41
<u>Area One</u>	Teaching Personnel	41
<u>Area Three</u>	Business Functions	33
<u>Area Four</u>	School-Community Relations	32
<u>Area Five</u>	Pupil Personnel	19

TABLE III

PUPIL PERSONNEL: EXTENT OF THE NEW ASSISTANT'S
RESPONSIBILITY, OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS, BY
PERCENTAGE

Answer	Activities Under Pupil Personnel [*]				
	a	b	c	d	e
Major Responsibility	50	55	74	75	65
Shared Responsibility	28	21	16	10	22
Advisory Only	16	14	4	7	10
No Responsibility	5	8	2	6	3
No Response	1	2	3	2	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

- *a. Offering vocational guidance services to students
b. Selecting students for occupational training
c. Establishing a student job-placement program
d. Operating a student job-placement program
e. Conducting follow-up studies of students after graduation from or dropping out of high school

TABLE IV

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS: EXTENT OF THE
NEW ASSISTANT'S RESPONSIBILITY, OPINIONS
OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENTAGE

Answer	Activities Under School-Community Relations [*]					
	a	b	c	d	e	f
Major Responsibility	64	70	76	70	34	50
Shared Responsibility	27	22	19	23	62	41
Advisory Only	7	8	4	7	4	9
No Responsibility	1	0	1	0	0	0
No Response	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

*a. Involving local business and industry in the problems and programs of the school

b. Establishing and/or working with lay advisory committees

c. Determining local occupational education needs through recognized methods, such as community surveys

d. Developing relations with such community agencies as M.E.S.C., Chambers of Commerce, law enforcement agencies, representatives of labor and management, and other professional organizations

e. Interpreting the school's occupational education program to parents and patrons of the school

f. Interpreting, for the school and the community, legislation affecting occupational education

TABLE V

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM: EXTENT OF THE NEW
ASSISTANT'S RESPONSIBILITY, OPINIONS
OF PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENTAGE

Answer	Activities Under Instructional Program*				
	a	b	c	d	e
Major Responsibility	28	38	33	55	49
Shared Responsibility	60	52	53	29	42
Advisory Only	10	10	12	15	9
No Responsibility	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	2	0	2	1	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

- *a. Identifying and agreeing upon objectives
 b. Evaluating existing programs
 c. Developing and revising the curriculum
 d. Initiating curriculum innovation
 e. Improving instructional procedures

TABLE VI

BUSINESS FUNCTIONS: EXTENT OF THE NEW
ASSISTANT'S RESPONSIBILITY, OPINIONS OF
PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENTAGE

Answer	Activities Under Business Functions*		
	a	b	c
Major Responsibility	48	31	49
Shared Responsibility	34	40	26
Advisory Only	12	23	15
No Responsibility	6	6	9
No Response	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100

- *a. Budget planning--estimating costs of occupational education programs
 b. Determining school use of allocated funds
 c. Purchasing supplies and equipment used in the educational training program

TABLE VII

TEACHING PERSONNEL: EXTENT OF THE NEW
ASSISTANT'S RESPONSIBILITY, OPINIONS OF
PRINCIPALS, BY PERCENTAGE

Answer	Activities Under Teaching Personnel [*]						
	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Major Responsibility	13	4	10	35	42	0	9
Shared Responsibility	49	37	43	59	49	12	45
Advisory Only	26	36	30	1	7	17	39
No Responsibility	12	22	16	3	0	71	5
No Response	0	1	1	2	2	0	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*a. Recruiting of teachers in the occupational
education area

b. Making final selection of teachers

c. Assigning teachers to departments

d. Orienting new teachers

e. Providing in-service education for teachers

f. Determining salaries for teachers

g. Recommending teachers for promotion

No activity was rated ADVISORY ONLY by more than a few principals.

When all activities in the questionnaire were ranked according to the percentage of principals listing them as PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY, the first ten were from three major areas: School-Community Relations, Pupil Personnel and Instructional Program (see Table VIII).

B. FURTHER COMMENTS BY PRINCIPALS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

The principals were encouraged to comment about or qualify any of their responses or to mention any activities which they felt should have been included in the questionnaire. Many of the principals pointed out that the distinction between a PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY and a SHARED RESPONSIBILITY was not as easily defined as the questionnaire would imply. They felt that the assistant should offer strong leadership, but that major decisions in any of the five areas mentioned should reflect the combined efforts of the chief administrator, the assistant, and any others responsible for the administration of the total high school program.

Only five principals indicated that they saw no need for an assistant to handle the duties outlined in the study. Three of the five felt that they did need assistance in most of the areas outlined but preferred to get it from a director or coordinator of vocational education.

Sixty-five of the 106 principals stated that their schools had a vocational or occupational track. However, of the other 41, ten listed courses which they considered vocational or occupational, indicating that although they do not use the tracking system, they do have occupational educational offerings.

In further discussion with the interviewers, most principals stated that they do recognize the need for expansion of their present occupational offerings. In many schools, the occupational programs are being expanded and the principals indicated satisfaction with the results of those courses which they felt were in fact occupational education.

The principals felt that an assistant for occupational education, in order to fill adequately the role proposed for him, would have to be well trained in school administration and have a thorough knowledge of the needs and methods of training young people adequately for the world of work.

If trained persons were available, many principals felt that the greatest problem would then be that of locating additional funds for their salaries. If funds were made available, the principals indicated that both they and their boards of education would look favorably on the concept of a new assistant to give leadership to the development of better occupational training programs.

TABLE VIII
RANKING ORDER OF ALL ITEMS ON THE
QUESTIONNAIRE, BY PERCENTAGE OF
RESPONSES UNDER MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY

Rank	Activity	Percentage
1	Locating and organizing instructional materials	81
2	Determining local occupational education needs	76
3	Operating a student job-placement program	75
4	Establishing a student job-placement program	74
5	Developing relations with community agencies	70
5	Establishing and/or working with lay advisory committees	70
7	Conducting follow-up studies of students after graduation from or dropping out of high school	65
8	Involving local business and industry in the problems and programs of the school	64
9	Selecting students for occupational training	55
9	Initiating curriculum innovation	55
11	Offering vocational guidance services to students	50
11	Interpreting, for the school and the community, legislation affecting occupational education	50
13	Improving instructional procedures	49
13	Purchasing supplies and materials used in the educational training program	49
13	Providing in-service education for teachers	49
16	Budget planning--estimating costs of occupational education programs	48

TABLE VIII (Cont.)

Rank	Activity	Percentage
17	Evaluating existing programs	38
18	Orienting new teachers	35
19	Interpreting the school's occupational education program to parents and patrons of the school	34
20	Developing and revising the curriculum	33
21	Determining school use of allocated funds	31
22	Identifying and agreeing upon objectives	28
23	Recommending teachers for promotion	14
24	Recruiting of teachers in the occupational education area	13
25	Assigning teachers to departments	10
26	Making final selection of teachers	4
27	Determining salaries for teachers	0

C. RELATED INFORMATION

Of interest to the interviewers, though not an essential part of the questionnaire, was the relationship of the principals' educational history and administrative experience to their responses. Though no direct correlation was found, the results are included here since they may be helpful as background information.

When asked to list their undergraduate and graduate majors, the principals mentioned twenty-five fields. Only 19 principals listed the same undergraduate major (history). General social studies ranked second with 17 mentions and mathematics was third with 15.

However, nearly half of the principals (51 of the 106) listed secondary school administration as their graduate major. General secondary education ranked second with 19 mentions.

When questioned about their background of administrative experience, 59 of the 106 principals reported 1-10 years of teaching experience before their first administrative experience. Only 19 of the 106 principals had taught 10-15 years before becoming a principal. Forty-seven of the principals had 1-5 years of experience as assistants or part-time principals before first being employed as full-time principals and 16 principals held assistant or part-time positions for 5-10 years.

Sixty-four of the 106 participants have occupied positions as full-time principals for ten years or less. Fifty-six principals have held their present positions for five years or less, 17 for 5-10 years, and 17 for 10-15 years.

Opinions of the interviewers compared favorably with those of the principals as to the extent to which the schools were meeting the occupational education needs of their students. There were, however, some notable exceptions. In 21 instances, the interviewer indicated that programs which the principal considered occupational or vocational were actually good general classes in industrial arts and did not have adequate depth to prepare students for employment.

Generally, interviewers felt that high schools were doing a realistic job with those courses designed with the objective of salable skills, but that most schools offered too few.

The interviewers felt that they were well received by the principals participating in the study. They rated 92 of the principals as interested or very interested and only 11 as neutral or uninterested. Three interviewers made no response.

D. CONCLUSIONS

A majority of the larger high schools in Michigan are offering some form of vocational or occupational program. Most of the principals of these schools are interested in expanding these programs, and they see the need for an assistant to give help and leadership.

Although the principals give top priority to the areas of Pupil Personnel, School-Community Relations and Instructional Program, they want an assistant to administer the program in occupational education.

Principals perceive the assistant as a person trained in both school administration and occupational education, who can work with the principal, other school personnel, and local civic, business, industrial, and professional groups to improve the high school's ability to prepare young people for employment.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the State Board of Control for Vocational Education:

1. Adopt reimbursement policies which will encourage boards of education to provide principals of high schools large enough to operate specialized vocational programs with an assistant (full or part-time) whose responsibility it would be to give leadership to the development of better programs for employment-bound youth.
2. Encourage graduate schools of education to include more courses designed to acquaint high school administrators with the current nature and needs of occupational education.
3. Encourage graduate schools of education offering work in vocational education and vocational administration to provide more training and experience in activities having to do with pupil personnel and school-community relations.
4. Provide special consultant services to high schools wishing to establish a pupil placement program.
5. Adopt reimbursement policies which will encourage high school administrators and their faculties to spend more time in activities such as program planning and development of materials.
6. Encourage visitation programs between administrators and faculty members of high schools to exchange ideas and experiences in occupational education.
7. Encourage principals to seek out potential leaders in occupational

programs among members of their faculties and to assist these persons in acquiring the training and experience they need to qualify for these positions.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

APPENDIX

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48104

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND PRACTICAL ARTS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 12, 1965

TO: Selected High School Principals in Michigan

FROM: Ralph C. Wenrich, Chairman
Department of Vocational Education and Practical Arts

SUBJECT: Request for an Interview

In the spring of 1963 The University of Michigan conducted a study to determine the kinds of assistance high school principals would consider to be most helpful in developing and operating special programs and services for employment-bound youth. A report on the study titled "High School Principals' Perceptions of Assistance Needed in Order to Develop More Adequate Programs for Employment-Bound Youth," was sent to you about a year ago.

In this study the majority of the high school principals who responded indicated that they do not have time to give leadership to the development and operation of more effective programs for employment-bound youth. Nearly three-fourths of the respondents indicated that programs for employment-bound youth in their schools could be improved if they had "an extra assistant whose job it would be to give leadership to the program."

We are currently engaged in a study designed to determine how high school principals would use an assistant whose responsibility it would be to develop occupationally oriented programs for employment-bound youth. As a part of this study, arrangements have been made for persons currently engaged in the University of Michigan Leadership Development Project to interview high school principals included in the study. You will therefore receive a call from one of these men requesting that he be granted an interview with you. This interview should require no more than 20 to 30 minutes. It is hoped that you will find it possible to cooperate with us in this study by granting the interview, and possibly by allowing the interviewer to visit the areas in your building in which programs for employment-bound students are now being offered.

AN ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
(Questionnaire Guide)

Interviewer:_____

Principal:_____

Date of Interview:_____

Many of those currently concerned with the problem of meeting the need for realistic occupational education in the high school are suggesting that principals of larger high schools should have an assistant in charge of occupational education. It is assumed that his primary function would be that of developing, and giving assistance in the administration of, the occupational education portions of the school's instructional program.

The primary purpose of this questionnaire is to assist in determining the types of duties and responsibilities for which such assistants should be prepared.

Should a need be established for such an assistant in your school, the new position may include a number of responsibilities. In his role of developing and helping to administer the occupational education program for your school, to what extent do you feel the assistant principal would be involved in and have responsibility for each of the following areas:

The New Assistant Principal Would:

	Have primary responsibility for this area subject only to veto power of principal	Share responsibility for this area with the principal	Act only as an advisor to the principal in this area	Not be involved at all in this area
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM				
a. Identifying and agreeing upon objectives	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Evaluating existing programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Developing and revising the curriculum	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Initiating curriculum innovation	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Improving instructional procedures	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Locating and organizing instructional materials	_____	_____	_____	_____
SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS				
a. Involving local business and industry in the problems and programs of the school	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Establishing and/or working with lay advisory committees	_____	_____	_____	_____

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS (Continued)

c. Determining local occupational education needs through recognized methods, such as community surveys	—	—	—	—
d. Developing relations with such community agencies as M.E.S.C., chambers of commerce, law enforcement agencies, representatives of labor and management, and other professional organizations	—	—	—	—
e. Interpreting the school's occupational education program to parents and patrons of the school	—	—	—	—
f. Interpreting, for the school and the community, legislation affecting occupational education	—	—	—	—

PUPIL PERSONNEL

a. Offering vocational guidance services to students	—	—	—	—
b. Selecting students for occupational training	—	—	—	—
c. Establishing a student job placement program	—	—	—	—
d. Operating a student job place program	—	—	—	—
e. Conducting follow-up studies of students after graduating from--or dropping out of-- high school	—	—	—	—

TEACHING PERSONNEL (Teachers whose courses affect occupational education)

a. Recruiting of teachers in the occupational education area	—	—	—	—
b. Making final selecting of teachers	—	—	—	—
c. Assigning teachers to departments	—	—	—	—

TEACHING PERSONNEL (Continued)

d. Orienting new teachers	—	—	—	—
e. Providing in-service education for teachers	—	—	—	—
f. Determining salaries for teachers	—	—	—	—
g. Recommending teachers for promotion	—	—	—	—

BUSINESS FUNCTIONS

a. Budget planning--estimating costs of occupational education programs	—	—	—	—
b. Determining school use of allocated funds				
c. Purchasing supplies and equipment used in the educational training program	—	—	—	—

FURTHER COMMENTS:

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Principal

- _____ 1. Undergraduate major
- _____ 2. Graduate Major
- _____ 3. Highest degree received
- _____ 4. Total number of years teaching experience prior to becoming a principal
5. What subjects have you taught? _____

- _____ 6. Number of years as an assistant or part-time principal
- _____ 7. Number of years as a full-time principal
- _____ 8. Number of years in present position

The Instructional Program

No Yes

- | | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| _____ | _____ | 1. Do you have a college preparation track? |
| _____ | _____ | 2. Do you have a general education track? |
| _____ | _____ | 3. Do you have a vocational or occupational education track? |

Comment: _____

Which courses in your curriculum do you consider to be vocational or occupational?

- | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ | 3. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 5. _____ | 6. _____ |

Of those courses considered vocational, which do you feel are doing a realistic job of preparing students for today's labor market?

_____ All of them

_____ None of them

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ |

INTERVIEWER'S REPORT

To the Interviewer:

Since the interview guide was so designed as to leave little room for expansion of points or mention of any preface of qualification which may have been included with some answers given, this space has been provided for a written description of your visitation.

In making your report, please include some evaluation of the following:

The principal's attitude toward your mission and the information requested:

_____ Very interested _____ Interested _____ Neutral _____ Disinterested

Your impressions of present occupational course offerings in the school:

Types of courses offered _____

Physical facilities _____

The length of your interview _____

Any problems which you encountered with the questionnaire or its administration:

Your evaluation of this total interview experience and any benefits which you feel you derived from participation:

Please use the reverse side of this sheet for further comments.