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The problem of this study was to analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas. The analysis was limited to the principals' perception of their role in these schools. The purposes were to trace the development of these schools in the United States, to identify the open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas, and to survey and analyze the role of the principal in such schools. Areas of responsibility that were analyzed included instruction and curriculum development, staff personnel administration, management of the school plant, and public relations.

The development of open plan elementary schools in the United States was traced in the survey of related literature. In Texas alone, 106 such schools were identified by the Texas Education Agency, Education Service Centers, Departments of Education of the colleges and universities, and selected superintendents of schools throughout the state.

A questionnaire which contained forty-four items was developed, validated by an experienced jury panel, and
mailed to the principals of these schools. The data accumulated through the use of this questionnaire were used to analyze the role of the principal.

The development and findings of this study are presented in five chapters. Chapter I presents an introduction to the study. In Chapter II a survey of related literature is reported. Chapter III contains details of the procedures used in collecting the data. Chapter IV consists of the findings of the study. The summary, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research are presented in the last chapter.

It was concluded from the findings that there seems to be a recent trend toward the construction of open plan elementary schools in Texas. Due to the newness of this concept the principals have had very little teaching or administrative experience in such schools. They are, however, aware of the need for more extensive preparation for the administration of these schools, and they realize the importance of keeping abreast of the many new curricular and organizational concepts that are being implemented in these schools.

Instructional supervision is an important responsibility of the open plan elementary school principal, and he has to be familiar with effective techniques for implementation of many innovative concepts such as team teaching, nongradedness, open education, and multi-age grouping. The principal
also assumes an important responsibility in coordinating the efforts of teachers in the selection of individualized instructional materials and development of the very important media center.

The in-service education program is extremely important in these schools, and the principal exercises a strong leadership role in its development. These principals also realize the importance of having teachers attend open plan workshops and visit other similar programs to seek new ideas. They also provide a staff development program that helps teachers who are experiencing difficulty in adjusting to the open plan concept.

Due to the flexibility offered by movable furniture and the open building design, effective plant utilization is an important responsibility of the principal. Due to the many innovative concepts being implemented, the building of public understanding and confidence in the program also assumes increased importance.

It was implied from the findings and conclusions of this study that open plan elementary schools will continue to gain widespread acceptance throughout Texas. The role of the principal of such schools will be especially affected by the expansion of shared decision making with the faculty.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

There exists today, possibly more than at any other time, a climate of change in education. In this great movement to revolutionize American education, more sweeping changes are being proposed at the elementary level than at any other level of schooling (5, p. 21). The search and struggle for improvement, and the seeking of education's "new frontier" engender a greater excitement in the professional educator than he has ever known. The elementary school principal today is in a happy position. The public he serves is ready for change; in fact, they expect it.

Perhaps one of the newest and most promising changes in elementary education has been the recent appearance of the open plan school. An open plan school is essentially what the words imply—a group of large open areas which have few, if any, interior walls and which feature individualized instruction. Each open complex has a flexible physical arrangement and a flexible teaching program (2, p. 2).

Many school districts throughout the United States are committing themselves to the implementation of open education by constructing open plan schools and changing
curriculum organization. Open education has been described as a school program that utilizes decentralized rooms or spaces, some free exploration by children of rooms and activities, varied learning activities, and teachers working with individuals, small groups, and/or large groups (7).

The entire state of Vermont has committed its program to the future development of open education. The trend toward implementation of open education in Texas is evidenced by the fact that open plan elementary schools have been constructed in some public school districts throughout the state, and many more are in the planning stages at this time.

As in any traditional public school, the local building principal plays a vital role in the success or failure of the open plan school in meeting the educational needs of its students. In fact, research has shown that the administrator is the key person in effective change at the institution and classroom levels (5, p. 11).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas as perceived by the principals of these schools.
Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. to trace the development of open plan elementary schools in the United States;

2. to identify open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas; and

3. to survey and analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas with special reference to the following responsibilities: (a) instruction and curriculum development, (b) staff personnel administration, (c) management of the school plant, and (d) public relations.

Background and Significance of the Study

There is little doubt that there exists in the United States a trend toward implementation of open education, especially at the elementary school level. In a recent symposium on the open plan school, Gores opened the seminar by declaring,

To our children 1941 is ancient history, and the year 2001 exists only in the movies; yet each is only thirty years away from the present. This is the "now" world. We cannot expect to educate the "now" generation by pushing them through schools and systems that were designed and based on communication as it existed fifty or even 100 years ago (2, p. 5).

Open education is in an evolutionary process. In England, the concept began during World War II when children and teachers were moved to safer rural areas to escape bombing attacks. The limited facilities and supplies caused
teachers to become very creative in seeking new educational
techniques. The theoretical base of open education relies
mainly on the work of Piaget, Montessori, Froebel, and
Pestalozzi, while Rogers receives much of the credit for
bringing many of the ideas associated with open education to
the United States (7).

Open education varies in the United States from struc-
tured programs in Montessori schools to loosely organized
programs in West Coast hippie communes. In New York, Webber
works in Public Schools 75, 84, and 144 with a program
called "open corridors." Rasmusen's work in Philadelphia is
well known, as is the program in North Dakota, where there
are more "one-room school houses" than in any other state in
this country (7).

Many writers are pointing to the open plan school as a
means of facilitating recent trends in educational organiza-
tion and teaching techniques. Hillison and Bongo (3, p. 57)
discuss the growing movement in open plan school construc-
tion as being compatible with the implementation of
continuous progress school organization. Chamberlin (1,
p. 103) also points to the new open plan building designs
as a means of facilitating team teaching and flexible group-
ing.

Many school districts throughout the United States are
committing themselves to the implementation of open educa-
tion by constructing open plan schools and changing
curriculum organization. The trend toward implementation of open education in Texas is evidenced by the fact that open plan elementary schools have been constructed throughout the state. Over thirty such schools have been constructed within the past five years, and many more are in the design stages at this time.

Many noted authorities on elementary school education are quick to emphasize the vital role that the local building principal plays in the success or failure of the school in meeting the educational needs of its students. Educational writers such as Wiles (8), Otto and Sanders (6), and Jarvis and Pounds (4) have emphasized the growing responsibilities of the elementary school principal and the challenges facing those who undertake this demanding job. The open plan elementary school presents still further challenges in the role of the principal.

At the present time open education and open plan schools are bursting on the educational scene, and public school districts throughout Texas are rapidly joining the movement. Although many such schools have already been constructed in Texas, records at the Texas Education Agency do not indicate a complete list of the schools in operation. Neither has there been an investigation of the very important role of the principal in the administration of open plan elementary schools throughout the state.
Definitions and Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were formulated:

Open education: a school program that utilizes (1) decentralized rooms or spaces, (2) some free exploration by children of room and activities, (3) varied learning activities, and (4) teachers working with individuals, small groups, and/or large groups.

Open plan elementary school: a school with large, open areas which has few, if any, interior walls and which features flexible physical arrangement, a flexible teaching program, and individualized instruction; students generally range in ages from five to twelve years.

Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to the open plan elementary schools that are in use throughout Texas.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that all open plan elementary schools in Texas could be identified by contacting (1) the Texas Education Agency, (2) executive directors of the Education Service Centers throughout the state, (3) the Departments of Education of colleges and universities, and (4) selected superintendents of schools believed to have open plan programs. It was further assumed that the principals of the
open plan elementary schools in Texas would respond honestly to the survey instrument.

Instrument

A review of the literature was used to clarify the areas of responsibility of elementary school principals, and a study of the development of open plan schools provided a basis for application of these responsibilities to these unique schools. Using the accumulated information, a questionnaire was then developed to survey the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas.

The questionnaire was submitted to a jury of nine persons selected from school officials familiar with the administration of open plan elementary schools. The jury consisted of three former principals of open plan schools, three central administrative staff members, and three consultants to open plan schools. This jury provided valuable assistance in determining the precise areas to be investigated and clarifying the wording of the instrument.

The jury submitted recommended changes and appropriate adjustments were made in the questionnaire. The instrument was then returned to the jury a second time for reevaluation of the individual changes. There had to be a consensus of seven of nine jury members in regard to each survey question and the final form of the survey questionnaire. This procedure gave validity and reliability to the survey instrument.
Procedures for Collection of Data

After the survey questionnaire had been devised and the jury procedure established its validity and reliability, it was sent out to all of the principals of open plan elementary schools in Texas as identified by (1) the Texas Education Agency, (2) executive directors of the Education Service Centers throughout the state, (3) the Departments of Education of colleges and universities, and (4) selected superintendents of schools believed to have open plan programs. A return of two-thirds of the survey questionnaires was considered adequate to support the objectives of the study.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data from the survey instrument was compiled, tabled, and reported to show the frequency of responses to each item. When applicable, the frequency of responses was converted to percentages.

The data collected and reported provided information concerning the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools currently operating in Texas. This information, and a review of the literature on the responsibilities of the elementary school principal as applied to open plan schools, was used to draw conclusions about current practices in Texas and draw implications concerning the future administration of these unique schools.
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CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

The role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas can be studied only after an examination of the history and development of open education in the primary schools of England. It also becomes important to understand the role of the headteacher in the British primary schools. It then becomes necessary to examine the transition of open education to the United States and its effect on the development of open plan elementary schools. The last topic to be investigated is the past, present, and future role of the elementary school principal in America.

Four sections have therefore been included in this chapter: (1) The History and Development of Open Education in England, (2) The Role of the Headteacher in British Primary Schools, (3) The Transition of Open Education to the United States, and (4) The Role of the Elementary School Principal in America.

The History and Development of Open Education in England

Across Western Europe, a bold upheaval has struck the once tradition-bound primary or elementary school education. Over the last decade rigid techniques have given way to
experimentation which seeks to blur the divisions between work and play; a change in curriculum design and a marked breakdown in the formal relations between students and teachers has also been evident (13).

Weinraub (13) observes that this dramatic change in education has spread from England, Denmark, and Sweden to such countries as Switzerland, West Germany, Greece, and Italy. Perhaps one of the most dramatic postwar educational developments in Europe has taken place in the British primary schools which are now a source of constant study by American educators. Today, nearly two-thirds of the British primary schools are attempting to fuse two of the more modern approaches to education: first, the "integrated day," where history, geography, and science are taught as single subjects; and second, "family groupings," where children of different ages are mixed in a single class, letting the strong help the weak and enabling each to move ahead at an individual pace.

Frequent visitors to the British primary schools, such as Randazzo (47) and Rathbone (48), observe that these educators use the terms "open education," "open classroom," and "informal education" to refer to the educational phenomenon associated with the recent reforms in British primary education. Many English educators refer to open education as a school program that utilizes decentralized rooms or spaces, some free exploration by children of rooms and activities,
varied learning activities, and teachers working with individuals, small groups, and/or large groups (47).

It is discussed by Weinraub (13) that the open classroom is an extension of the theories of such educators as Montessori and Piaget. Berson (7, p. 11) also adds that this informal, exciting education received some of its inspiration from such American educators as Dewey, Counts, Rugg, and others.

To gain a thorough understanding of the British primary school of today it is necessary to examine the educational system in England from which it evolved. Clegg (10) says the early English educational system was established to provide schools in which the children of the laboring poor, as they were called, might learn to read their Bibles. There was no intention that they should thereby be encouraged to rise above the station in life into which they were born.

The work which the children had to do in those early days was set out in a code of regulations issued by the central government. It was prescribed minutely in standards or grades, and no child was moved to a higher grade until he satisfied the school inspector that he could master the work of the grade in which he was placed at the time. The educational principles on which this rigid, structured educational system were founded were as unsound as its views on childhood were false. The teacher stood before the pupil and what the pupil learned, he learned by rote. He repeated
facts to his teacher, and the teacher decided whether they were right or wrong.

The early buildings consisted of classrooms, each some 400 to 500 square feet, sometimes connected by a corridor. They were serviced by a principal's room, a hall, a small staff room, and the usual outside sanitary offices across the yard. In each classroom there were forty to fifty children, seated at long bench desks. The desks were arranged to face the teacher's desk and the chalkboard so that all could attend to the same lesson, at the same time, under the same eye of authority.

The school day began at nine o'clock when a whistle froze the children into immobility. At the second blast they lined up in rows to enter school. Once inside, registers were called and the pupils were marshalled into halls for what was called "the assembly," consisting of prayers, a hymn, a Bible reading, followed by notices and any general remonstrances.

In the classroom the lesson began with a Scripture and was followed by arithmetic. A typical lesson might have had the children chanting multiplication tables or counting by twos, threes, fours, and so on. English consisted of comprehension exercises, punctuation exercises, exercises on nouns, verbs, and adjectives, dictation, and even parsing and analysis. Spelling was learned from daily lists, and there was much reading around the class. All of this
activity led up to "composition," which meant writing on a
given topic, using words and phrases previously written on
the blackboard. Poetry, often chosen for the school by the
headmaster, was learned by rote and recited.

Other activities included drawing and painting, which
was often done using templates and stencils. Physical edu-
cation began as a military drill but later turned to exer-
cises designed to strengthen specific muscles. History,
geography, and nature study were taught as facts to be in-
gested from books purchased in sets of forty or fifty.

Clegg observes that the purposes of education were
wrongly conceived. The work done tended to matter more than
what happened to the child as a consequence of his doing it.
What a child knew mattered more than the kind of person he
was becoming. The work was a by-product of teaching and
was more important than the child, who was the product.
Authority was often misused; children were hemmed in by
admonitions such as "Don't talk," "Don't move around,"
"Don't get out of line," "Don't ask questions," "Don't
fidget," "Don't make a noise," "Listen to me," "Look at me,"
"Do as I do," and "Do as I say."

Moorhouse (42, p. 35) and Clegg (10, p. 25) contend
that all of this was wrong. It denied children the right
to learn by choosing and discriminating and forming judg-
ments for themselves. The old educational system failed to
recognize the connection between learning and experience.
Due to a reevaluation of the learning process the English educational system of the past has slowly given way to the British primary school of today. Many of the schools today are similar to the one described by Clegg:

If I went into what I would call a good school today, whether the building was new or whether it was built in the last century, I should expect to find light, colorful classrooms with a broad band of pinup board around the walls on which examples of work from all the children in the class would be carefully and lovingly displayed at one time or another. It would, in the main, be painting and drawing, but there would almost certainly be some writing and mathematics. And I should in all likelihood be discreetly invited to admire the work of some pupils who at that moment stood most in need of a word of praise. Desks and tables would be arranged in groups rather than in rows. Somewhere in the room there would most certainly be a table on which were set out natural objects which were both beautiful and scientifically interesting. And elsewhere in the room there would probably be a well-arranged display of fabrics and objects of interest and beauty, designed to emphasize textures, colors, and shapes. There might be small animals kept as pets in the room. There would certainly be a generous and obvious supply of individual books of reference and fiction.

Some children would be standing, some sitting, some talking, some walking, and some working intently. There might be a child painting, another arranging flowers, two children with a stop watch timing ballbearings rolling down a plank, and a third tabulating the results. One group might be potato printing on fabric, while others would be reading, writing, measuring, modeling, or calculating, according to their choice (10, p. 28).

Another description of a good open classroom in Great Britain is given by Hapgood:

There was a quiet hum of children working and talking together, moving carefully and
purposefully in the room that was always crowded with children and things to learn from. Work went on all over the school—in the corridors, in the assembly hall, outdoors. The work of each child was his own, unique to him and respected as such. Yet the teacher was pivotal; children constantly conferred with her as she worked with individuals or small groups throughout the day. Always the classroom itself glowed with children's work in many media: paint, clay, fabric and paper collage, needlework, wood, calligraphy, bookbinding. No parent or educator anywhere would have to be told that such a scene represents good education (26, p. 66).

Moorhouse (42) emphasizes that while the integrated day and family grouping educational ideas are becoming firmly established and are spreading rapidly throughout England, a new relationship between teacher and student is also emerging. On a recent trip to a primary school in rural England she described the unique relationship of the students and teachers:

One finds on entering many primary schools today that for most of the day a number of different activities will be going on concurrently in each classroom or group of rooms. One group of children may be painting, another doing craftwork; some children may be writing; some may be cooking, others using clay; some sewing, some making books; some may be doing mathematics, and some working out a scientific problem. Children are getting their own materials and equipment as required and putting them back. The teacher cannot be seen at once, for there is no longer a "front" of the class and he/she may be somewhere in the room, sitting by a child discussing his work and giving it further impetus. One is struck by the initiative of the children, by their participation and involvement, by their sense of responsibility and self-discipline. To the uninitiated the impression is that the children can get on without a teacher, for they are working in a purposeful way; but, in fact, this engrossment is because the teacher has prepared a stimulating environment and because she
knows each child and his achievements and can see who is needing help at any particular moment—a word of approval or sign of interest will be sufficient to encourage many children to work out their own ideas (42, p. 36).

Moorhouse observes that two fundamental principles underlie these changes from a formal teacher-class relationship to a teacher-child relationship. First, there is a real appreciation and deep understanding of the uniqueness of each child. The second principle is that children learn from experience, from exploration, and from active participation in discovery. Many children are deprived of space, materials, experiences, freedom, and companionship in their home background, and all of these needs can be provided at school.

**Material Opportunity**

Materials of every kind should be available: basic materials, such as sand, water, clay, and wood; a collection of junk, boxes, containers of every size and shape in wood, cardboard, and plastic; a wide variety of cardboard and paper in different shapes, sizes, thicknesses, and colors; paints, pens, charcoal, pencils, a variety of brushes, crayons, in fact all kinds of media for making marks that a child can explore; a variety of pastes and glues; scissors; benches, a vise, and tools; an assortment of materials to stroke and use such as velvet, silk, satin, wool, cotton, linen, fur, and nylon. Each item has a different quality that can only be fully appreciated by handling and using and
coming to terms with the discipline they impose. All of these materials may be used at the child's own stage of development and maturity.

**Challenging Environment**

The school environment must be challenging. The skill of teaching is to present each child with the right challenge at the right time; too great an expectation of what a child is able to do can discourage the child, make him withdraw mentally from the struggle and become lazy or rebel in an aggressive attitude.

**Physical Conditions**

The physical conditions of the building can be either a help or a hindrance to learning. Teachers who believe in discovery transform old buildings, exploit all the advantages of wall space, and, by skillful use of furniture, create work areas for reading, for writing activities, for mathematical and scientific experiments, for practical experiences, and for music, so that children know where to go and where to find equipment for a particular task.

**Opportunities for Exploration**

Making discoveries about the things in school is only one aspect of learning; there is a world outside to be explored, be it rural or urban. It becomes necessary to extend the environment to be explored. Good experiences
would be a visit to a museum, a church, a theatre, a fire station, bus or railway station, a library, a place of historical interest, a different natural environment, or a busy, built-up city or port.

Communication Media

One must always be aware that children have their own specific interests; they might have had some experiences at home or found something on the way to school that can be exploited by the teacher who is ready to discuss and lead the child on to an exploration of his own. The mass media at home and in school also make an impact that cannot be ignored.

Books

Firsthand experiences which stimulate interests and the need to communicate are the basis of primary education when the experiences are aided and developed by the acquisition of basic skills. A very important extension of the child's own environment is through books. Individual books on every kind of subject and aspect of the world around us, past and present, and at every reading level, must be at hand for immediate reference.

Animals

Children need to come in contact with living things as much as possible. This contact creates an awareness of the
wonder of creation, of the cycle of life, of birth, and of death.

Plants

The care of living plants and the close observation and sustained study of what happens in plant life will inculcate the scientific attitude in children. An accumulation of predigested scientific facts do not help a child to come to terms with his environment or his life.

Developments in other aspects of education such as movement, physical education, and drama are based on the same principles: the uniqueness of each child and the need for each child to discover himself and come to terms with the world around him. Teachers should be more concerned with a balance of experiences--literary, scientific, creative, aesthetic, practical, and spiritual--than with subjects, and more with the wholeness and harmony of growth--physical, intellectual, social, and emotional--than with instruction and academic learning (42).

The Role of the Headteacher in British Primary Schools

In England the headteacher is the counterpart of the principal in American schools. The headteacher is often referred to in England as the "headmaster" or "head" of the school.

To understand the role of the headteacher it is necessary to explore the background of the English educational
system and the relationship of the head to this system. This line of authority and relationship is described by Clegg in the following statement:

Authority in England—educational authority—is divided into three parts. First, there is a Parliament. Parliament provides approximately half the money for running a school, and it ties strings to this money. The strings are that we pay national scales of salary, that when we build buildings we observe minimal standards, and that the schools are subject to inspection by the central government inspectors.

Second, there is the local education authority, which is the executive body. The local education authority builds the schools, and appoints the principals or heads of the schools, and raises a rate to cover half the cost of the educational program. Then it divides up the cake—the total cake, which includes the funds raised locally and the funds promised through Parliament—and hands out sums of money to the individual schools.

The third group that exercises educational authority includes the managers of each school (a group of six or more people drawn from the locality) and the head of the school. Once they have their money, they can spend it pretty well as they like. The headmaster is responsible for spending the money, devising his syllabuses, and deciding what has to be taught (10, p. 23).

The description of educational authority above points out the fact that the headteacher has considerable influence over the educational program in his particular school. Cook and Mack (11, p. 7) propose that it is the headteacher's autonomy which makes possible developments which in other countries are impaired by external interference. Although local education authorities can, and do, make some demands, the headteacher exercises great influence over the educational program offered in his particular school.
A closer examination reveals that it is the head's definition of his role—the priorities he sets and the framework he seeks to establish within the school—that is of far greater importance than the issue of autonomy. The headteachers express the strong belief that they bear responsibility not only for the administration of their schools, but for the development of a definable philosophy in terms of which staff and children also function. These heads see their role as being that of an education specialist whose task is to shape what will work educationally, rather than primarily administratively. Their focus is on individuals, not on procedures. To achieve this role of education specialist they are quick to say that successful classroom teaching experience should be a prerequisite for becoming a head.

The heads interviewed by Cook and Mack (11) discussed the variety of tasks they feel responsibility for; the importance of personal contact with members of their teaching teams and of close relationships with children and the community and the necessity for an agenda which dictates priorities and operational follow-through. All of those interviewed see themselves, first and foremost, as teacher-trainers—as supports for staff, as catalysts, as innovators, as educationists. All give top priority to their role in the classroom, alongside of the teacher, subtly communicating style and philosophy.
Philosophy

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of the role of the headteachers is their ability to articulate a thoughtful philosophy of education. They make long-range goals and the work in their schools reflects the goals. The heads have a clearly defined philosophy, but it may be revised and improved as time passes. The headteachers and the staff also allow the children in the school a voice in shaping educational philosophy.

Building a Team

The heads believe that successful implementation of goals depends largely on a smoothly working team of competent educators, and it is the headteacher's responsibility to ensure that such a team exists. The importance of teamwork and individuality is stressed so that a definite emphasis on human relationships emerges.

The head is a teacher-trainer who must be in tune with current developments, and he must be able to present new ideas to the staff. The headteacher must be able to set the standards for the school.

Creating an atmosphere in the school which allows each individual to work in a cooperative way and develop to his capacity becomes a central goal in the British primary school. The head's job is to be the leader and coordinator of a team of professional educators. The teacher, together
with the head, sets the atmosphere of the classroom, determines the arrangement of the furniture and the display of materials, and decides the organization of time and focus (12). He is also the liaison between officialdom and the school, filtering through the things that must be done, and applying them to the actual school situation.

The headteacher's efforts to establish a cooperative atmosphere extend beyond the teaching staff to include everyone involved in the learning situation. Ancillary staff, volunteer workers, office staff members, are all regarded as part of a team working to make the school a stimulating and meaningful experience for the children (11).

**Continuing Education**

If the teacher must grow in competency, so must the head keep up to date with current trends in education. He must know which schools are forward-looking and go observe them himself. It is only by sharing ideas and observing other educators at work that one can broaden one's own horizons.

**Administration**

The headteachers in England accept administrative duties and paperwork as necessary responsibilities, but of secondary importance to the other aspects of their job. Administrative duties are often undertaken during the head's own time, so that he can be free to be with teachers, pupils,
and parents during the school day. Hapgood (26) emphasizes that the headteacher is not an "administrator" in the American sense. He is a master teacher working alongside the teachers in the classroom.

Staff Problems

There are two viewpoints in dealing with the teacher who cannot or will not work in a way consistent with the philosophy of the school. Some heads feel that they must find some way of dismissing that staff member. Others feel that they have to accept whoever is on the staff and work with that person in the best way possible.

There is general agreement in selecting new staff members. The headteachers feel that they must strive to build a balanced team. A new teacher might be hired because of special interests, skills, experience, training, or even sex. In some situations age might be a consideration in creating the desired balance (11).

Teacher Training

The headteachers are deeply concerned with the teacher-training aspect of their job. Helping teachers to ask the right questions about a child's work and training them to observe closely the developmental process are critical skills that must receive attention.

Classroom visits are frequent, and most heads spend at least two hours a day wandering in and out of classes. This
allows them the opportunity to work with both children and teachers. The head is a catalyst who constantly brings in new ideas and keeps staff members alert to current trends in education. One widespread method used to promote awareness is to organize staff visits to other schools.

**How Time is Used**

Many headteachers in England are finding more and more of their time spent on administrative duties and paperwork. They do feel that much of this type of work can be done before and after school hours, on weekends, or during holidays. This frees them to spend time with teachers, students, and parents during school hours.

**Changing a School**

To a great extent, exactly how the headteacher operates, how he makes adjustments, depends on how long he has been at a particular school, and on the situation that prevailed prior to his assignment to the school. A number of factors influence his role in changing a school: stability and size of staff, openings for new appointments, the experience of existing staff members, the building design, the availability of a renovation budget, community attitudes towards the school, and the number and age of the children. Added to these is, of course, the personality of the headteacher and the type of learning environment he wants to create in the school.
The Head and Parents

Most headteachers feel that the parents must become an integral part of the school if it is to become successful. While political pressures and educational accountability are not as strongly articulated issues in England as they are in the United States, the potentially supportive or destructive role which parents play is of primary concern. Some schools meet regularly with parents in both formal and informal settings. Most schools maintain an open door policy, encouraging participation in a variety of ways. It is very strongly felt that heads have an obligation both to communicate about the philosophy of the school and to relate the progress of each child to the parents.

The Power of the Position

Comparisons between British and American schools often cite the degree of autonomy granted to heads by the educational authority as being largely responsible for the existence of open schools. The headteacher seems to get few directives from the bureaucracy and is allowed considerably more independence than his American counterpart. The American principal, it seems, must concern himself with fire drills, health codes, and permission slips.

It should be pointed out that even in England some heads contend that administrative chores do not permit the development of a child-centered school. It is also interesting to note that many heads indicate that they are prepared
to manipulate and cajole those in the bureaucracy in order to get some things they desire.

The Transition of Open Education to the United States

In 1967, a British governmental body called the Central Advisory Council of Education published a report entitled \textit{Children and Their Primary Schools} (46). The chairman of the body producing the report was Lady Bridget Plowden, and it is now usually referred to as the Plowden Report. This remarkable official document called attention to the fact that British primary schools, regularly ignored in policy debates and short-changed in budgets, are on the way toward establishing certain good conditions for children's learning on a fairly large, national scale.

Using the Plowden Report as a source of information, Featherstone (20) wrote a series of articles in \textit{The New Republic} which described the new British infant school movement in laudatory terms. These articles introduced American educators to the Plowden Report. Americans discovered that the report outlined the tentative foundations of a new way of thinking about what schools should be like, involving new conceptions of the role of the teacher, the organization of the classroom, the nature of children's learning, how the school day should proceed, and what constitutes a proper curriculum for young children. It testified that many British headteachers and teachers are coming to think of a
good school as one in which children are taught to work independently and in small groups, and in an environment thoughtfully planned to permit choices from an array of materials (46).

Since the publication of the Plowden Report and the publicity it received in The New Republic, many American educators such as Spodek (52), Hapgood (26), and Rogers (49) have journeyed to England to observe and write about open education. These educators and many others who have been crossing the Atlantic continue to observe what is going on in the British infant schools and are returning with some glowing reports and appeals to imitate them in the United States. They contend that the infant school, with its stress on developing initiative, creativity, and critical thought processes in children, meets modern educational demands far more effectively than the traditional elementary school.

In a discussion of why American elementary schools are having problems, and are therefore ready for change, Spodek characterizes the problems in this way:

From the time we began to press for universal education as a social goal, we in the United States have had problems in the schools—many of them problems of "fit." When schools were designed for a small minority of the population, any child who couldn't conform to the school's expectations was simply expelled. If he didn't "fit the school" the problem was with him, not with the school—so we let him go somewhere other than to school—home, or to work.
When schools serve all children, however, the problem of "fit" becomes a more crucial one. By law a child cannot be easily expelled, and the failure of a child in school carries with it dire consequences (52, p. 140).

Other reasons for the acceptance of change are proposed by Knezevich in the following statement:

There are other compelling reasons for the acceptance of change. Schools are being asked to contribute more to the resolution of an ever-growing number of complex social, economic, and political problems. The burdens placed on schools are growing in number and complexity. More and more, people are turning to educational institutions to help solve the great social problems of our times, whether these be breaking the cycle of poverty, developing racial harmony, or ensuring continued economic growth (35, p. 11).

A number of signs on the social scene have suggested that public education in the United States is in a crisis state. A recently published book, critical of public education and written by Silberman (50), characterizes American schools as dull, lifeless institutions which oppress children. Other writers such as Kozol (36), Herndon (27), Holt (31, 32), and Leonard (37) are examples of deeply concerned teachers who, on the basis of experiences in classrooms, have something to say about American education. In discussing the past ten years of educational innovation in the United States, Featherstone (19), Goodlad and Anderson (24), and many others contend that America has finished a decade of busy educational reform, with little to show for it. Classrooms are still the same. Teachers deliver monologues or conduct more or less forced class discussions; learning
is still too much by rote; textbooks prevail; timetables and clocks set the pace; discipline is an obsession. The curriculum reforms of the 1960's created excellent materials, but they took the existing environment of the schools for granted.

Given the seriousness of the crisis in American schools, Spodek (52) and Trump and Baynham (54) present some alternative approaches to schooling that are being suggested: (1) community schools run by minority groups to be responsive to their needs, (2) involvement of private corporations who suggest that they can do a better job of educating children, (3) narrowly defining goals and teaching more directly to these goals in a more controlled fashion, and (4) changing the structure and content of educational experience.

There is no reason why a school system cannot support a number of alternatives within its confines. However, one of the alternatives that seems to make sense to Spodek (52), Berson (7), Clegg (10), Randazzo (47), and many others has been characterized as open education.

Talks with schoolmen around the United States and the increasing publicity of open education have convinced Hickman (28, p. 7) that this new approach to elementary education is widespread and swelling—among administrators, teachers, parents, and children. To express this explosion more statistically, in 1968 only thirty articles were published in the United States that even mentioned what was
going on in England; two years later there were over three hundred articles (48, p. xi).

The British school advocates have won a highly receptive audience in many different parts of this country. Within a very short time, adoptions of the infant school approach to elementary education have been cropping up in scores of American classrooms from isolated farm towns in North Dakota to Harlem neighborhoods in New York City.

Hickman (29) reports that schools trying out open education are jammed with visitors every day—usually educators willing to travel hundreds of miles to get a look at what goes on in an open classroom. Workshops, inservice sessions, and orientation programs are overflowing with participants and the small cadre of American experts on open education are neck-high in requests for appointments, interviews, and speeches.

A mystique about open education has already begun evolving. Much of this mystique is based on the belief that open schools offer proof for Silberman's contention that schools can be humane and still educate well (29).

A faculty member at the institution which has become the Mecca for teacher training in open education--North Dakota's New School of Behavioral Studies in Education--was bewildered by the number of people coming from everywhere to observe the training program. He indicated that they were just average people trying to do some difficult things.
This institution was established in 1968 as an experimental component of the University of North Dakota to provide an alternative program for both prospective and experienced elementary school teachers. It has been a major vehicle for constructive change in schools throughout the state, and has done much to introduce more individualized and personalized modes of instruction into elementary school classrooms. The program is designed to prepare the best kind of teacher possible. Such an elementary teacher they view as one who

- is committed to individualizing the instruction program in his classroom
- encourages children to plan their own learning activities
- provides for a variety of learning centers
- can diagnose most common learning problems and can work with children in overcoming these problems
- recognizes each child as a potential teacher of his peers
- utilizes the talents of parents in classroom instruction (45, p. 248).

Another American school that has a resemblance between its activities and the informal, bustling learning that goes on in the British infant schools is the Booker T. Washington Elementary School in Champaign, Illinois. This open school is jointly operated by the local public schools and the University of Illinois. Mathematics, new science, and the arts are essential components of the early childhood curriculum and are carefully integrated into the total program (7).
In the Washington school, Spodek and his colleagues, like other contemporary American educators who are discontented with dull classroom routines and drillmaster operations that frustrate and fail children, are helping teachers bring vitality and relevance into the classroom. Their approach focuses on the child's natural curiosity and love of learning by providing him with a responsive, informal classroom environment and personalized teacher guidance.

As you enter this school, you sense a relaxed, hospitable atmosphere as the corridors are alive with children and their works. Open book-lined shelves invite children to browse and borrow in a trusting atmosphere. The staff lounge is wide open and provides a meeting place where ideas are freely exchanged.

The three open classrooms in the primary unit are characterized by family grouping, an integrated school day, and an integrated curriculum which has emphasis on new science, mathematics, and the creative arts. Children of different ages are combined and they group themselves very much as they do in a neighborhood or on a playground—on the basis of common interests, comparable skills, and personal compatibility.

The integrated day means that most subjects are taught and learned simultaneously rather than in the typical manner in which the teacher either instructs all her students or works with a single group while the rest of the class does
quiet seat work or time fillers. In the open classroom, an array of learning centers permit all children to be actively learning at the same time.

A typical day at Washington School begins about 8:45 when children enter and go to their work immediately. They work for two hours without interruption at tasks that have been preplanned with the teacher and at centers that hold books, materials, and equipment for specific individual projects. About a half hour before lunch a teacher might bring her entire group together for a social studies lesson because she feels that social studies generate many ideas for learning in other areas such as geography, economics, science, and literature. After lunch the children are brought together for a few minutes to share ideas, discuss work in progress, or seek consultation on a particular project. Before dismissal, the teacher again calls the entire class together for a story which she personally reads to them.

According to Berson (7), what makes the day go so well is not the way the teacher plans, but the way she plans with each child, so that he can move his learning along without discontinuity. It is the learner’s continuous involvement and responsibility for his own learning that keeps the day and its work dynamic and flexible.

Mathematics, science, and creative arts are essential components of the integrated curriculum. While the arts
take many directions, mathematics is carefully structured along age-grade sequences. Science evolves spontaneously from the children's interest. Both science and mathematics require a great variety of physical objects which a child can touch, count, rearrange, measure, observe, and manipulate. Conventional materials such as workbooks, textbooks, pencils, paints, crayons, and dictionaries are present, but each child is using them in his own way.

In addition to the two examples just mentioned, the influence of the British primary schools can be observed in such places as Vermont, Texas, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C., where teachers of varying degrees of competence are setting up informal classrooms with varying degrees of success. A number of private schools have also been prompted to alter their patterns of teaching. Headstart centers frequently show traces of British influence (19).

The recent impetus that open education has received in the United States has had an effect on school programs and school design, and the impact has been especially noticeable in the open plan building concept that has been appearing on the educational scene since the late 1950's.

For a better understanding of the merger of these two concepts, it is necessary to examine briefly the background of American school design and organization. According to Macbeth (39, p. 8), traditional American school design and
organization became fixed in 1847 with the construction of the Quincy School in Boston, Massachusetts. There, children were sorted into grades, and each grade met privately in its own classroom where a teacher and approximately fifty-five children of about the same age sat together for the entire year. This three-story schoolhouse consisted of twelve identical rooms, four rooms to a floor. It was this school which inspired cliches such as "educating children in a box," and "classrooms resemble eggcrates." For the next 100 years, few school administrators and architects deviated from the "eggcrate design."

During the next century, modernization came slowly to American schools in the form of fewer students per room, movable desk-chair combinations, green chalkboards, and some audio-visual aids. Most new schools were still just big boxes filled with smaller boxes into which more and more students were crammed each year. Gores adds that for all practical purposes, schools were "laddered boxes negotiated in a dozen years by about half our children" (25, p. 74).

During the late 1950's and early 1960's architects all over the country began designing some open plan schools (39, p. 8). Gores (25, p. 78) states that school architects started using air conditioning and carpeting which opened up a whole new range of possibilities in school design. He points out that in 1954, the total sale of carpeting for schools was $50,000.00 while in 1966 it amounted to
$99 million. The elimination of interior partitions and substitution of movable furniture capitalized on the adaptability of people instead of relying on the manipulation of architectural elements. Some of these schools were big domes, while others had folding partitions (39, p. 9). In terms of architecture, form was beginning to be based on function.

Simultaneously, more and more schools began experimenting with new teaching concepts that were receiving increased publicity and support. Writers such as Goodlad (23, 24), Anderson (4, 5), and many others provided increased impetus to the teaching concepts such as team teaching, individualized instruction, and nongraded classes. These concepts were very appropriate in open plan schools (30, p. 57).

Macbeth (39, p. 8) states that most of the innovative changes in building design occurred at the elementary or middle school level, but change is now also occurring at the secondary level. He points out that team teaching never achieved a standard definition, but schools designed for team teaching had many similar features. The instructional programs featured various roles for teachers such as differentiated staffing, children organized into groups of varied sizes for the instructional program, and modification of the traditional time sequence for instruction, as well as adaptation of the curriculum to instructional needs.
All of these emerging changes created a need for flexible space adaptable to different activities and different sized groups. Movable partitions, small group rooms, regular size classrooms, and large group rooms were found in the team schools. Many lessons in school design were learned from the team programs of the late 1950's and early 1960's, and these lessons resulted in planning to eliminate problems and provide more useful space and better staff design.

It turned out that "flexibility" had to be more than just having rooms of different sizes available. Small groups, large groups, and regular size groups were dictated by room sizes. Because of the fixed room sizes, instruction was often based on grouping procedures rather than on learning needs.

Movable partitions between rooms rarely created better teaching environments because teachers were reluctant to develop cooperative teaching programs. Also soundproofing of the partitions was often very poor.

Arranging classrooms in clusters or pods was an intermediate step toward the open plan of today. Classrooms were clustered around shared areas such as the library, or perhaps set apart as a group of classrooms in a pod with some multiple use or shared spaces. Although these designs have been quite popular, they often presented the same kinds of difficulties as the team schools.
Since a major need has been the formation of groups on the basis of instructional or learning needs rather than room size, it was then a logical step to remove walls between rooms to allow formation and re-formation of groups as necessary. The open plan concept basically provides space that can be used as deemed necessary by the staff and pupils.

Perhaps more important for education was the change from the emphasis on group teaching to more concern for the individual child and the development of individualized programs of instruction. Also important was the emergence of teacher sensitivity to the learning process rather than to the teaching process and the provision of appropriate learning environments. This important development is associated with the attention given the British primary schools and open education in the late 1960's.

The open plan school emerged as an entity in the late 1960's, and since its birth it has taken many forms. Open plan schools range from those with completely open space to those having only selected spaces open. In between these extremes there are many variations of the open plan.

Many educators like to say that we are returning to the one-room schoolhouse of early days, but in a recent conference of leading educators (17) it was emphasized that vast differences exist between the open plan school of today and the little red schoolhouse of 100 years ago. Sophisticated differences occur both in the teaching concepts used in the open plan school and in the design of the building itself.
In describing the open plan school of today, Anderson (3) speaks of teacher specialization, team teaching, large group and small group instruction, individualized instruction, and flexible scheduling as efforts to maximize learning opportunities. Schoolhouse planning has reflected these developments by providing larger units of space which can be readily subdivided.

A school in the Cypress-Fairbanks School District in Texas was designed and constructed in 1966 as an open plan elementary school. The Matzke Elementary School program is described in the following statement:

... Matzke's teachers seldom lecture. They rarely speak to more than 10 to 12 students at one time. The information-presenting process has been largely eliminated from the teacher's time. Students, singly or in groups, obtain information from media, all kinds of media, on their own. The teacher has time for the individual student, to discuss, to answer questions, to diagnose and prescribe.

There is no longer need for classroom privacy. Students move through the carpeted building, unscheduled, not in step with other students. Walls and doors, which cost money to build and maintain, are not needed. There is no need for containers and compartments which bind and restrict. Complete flexibility is achieved (3, p. 14).

There is no way at present to measure to what extent the students of Matzke have established habits of search and discovery and learning which will give them special advantages in life. Certain standardized tests used in the school district do indicate significant improvement on the part of Matzke students as compared with other elementary schools in
the district. In any case, the parents and the school administrators were sufficiently pleased with Matzke to plan and construct other open plan schools and convert a traditional building to the open concept.

Since 1966 other open plan elementary schools have been constructed throughout Texas. Within the past two years all of the seven elementary schools constructed in Dallas, Texas, have been designed as open plan schools. Evans (14) says the schools in Dallas are built on the premise that space is freedom, and freedom is the key to improving the learning process. One such school is the T. D. Marshall Community Center. The resource area which runs down the middle of the school is flanked by large open area learning centers, each with space equivalent to five old-style classrooms. Acoustical treatment of walls and ceilings and the use of carpeting permit the five teachers in each area to conduct classes simultaneously. Only portable bookcases, chalkboards, and other visual devices serve as dividers within the classroom areas. There are no traditional desks, only many different sizes and shapes of lightweight tables and chairs.

The principals and teachers emphasize that each child is capable of learning and they are constantly seeking better methods of diagnosing and prescribing individualized programs of learning. The school has abolished the traditional grades in favor of a continuous progression curriculum which allows each student to learn at an individual rate of speed rather than at a pace set by his classmates.
Anderson (2, p. 8) says that the whole idea of the open plan school is to create space and flexibility. He warns, however, that open plans work only under these conditions: space flexibility; time for staff planning; teachers with similar philosophies in program, housekeeping, and discipline; a variety of teacher strengths; meaningful programs; pupils working under teacher guidance; and a spirit of frankness, with respect for others.

The Role of the Elementary School Principal in America

In order to understand the role of the elementary school principal in the United States today, it is necessary to describe what has happened to the position since World War II. Eaves (16, pp. 2-4) explains that after World War II, the American public schools were in a "catch-up" period—building new schools, purchasing new equipment, and finding teacher personnel to meet the shortage that had reached crisis proportions. These were difficult days, but far more difficult days were ahead. Many educators, including many principals of elementary schools, did not anticipate them. The gigantic industrial development and the rapid social and economic change in American society were to pose many serious problems for which leaders were not prepared.

In 1950, many young men returning from military service began to teach in the elementary schools; superintendents and boards of education encouraged many of them to become
principals. Salaries increased and the principalship began to be regarded as a career position.

As the fifties passed, societal pressures started calling for new mathematics, new science, foreign languages in the elementary school, and a new look at the social studies. Educational television emerged and federal funds became available for the purchase of equipment and facilities. As new problems and demands arose, the elementary principals began to seek information and guidance by crowding into workshops and seminars.

In the middle sixties, principals became excited about the availability of federal funds for innovations and experiments relating to instruction and organization in the elementary schools. This new development in federal support added prestige to the principalship. Principals began to seek more responsibility for making decisions relating to instruction, school organization, equipment, and materials. These decisions had formerly been the responsibility of the central office. A 1968 status study of the elementary school principalship (43) indicated that school systems are moving in the direction of giving principals greater responsibility in decision making in many educational areas.

About the time elementary school principals appeared to be recovering from the confusions and the staggering responsibilities of getting their school programs through the difficult period of the fifties and early sixties,
teachers began a persistent demand for a greater part in policy making (15). At present, principals are still struggling to find their proper leadership role in this new relationship with teachers.

In looking back over the past eighteen years, Eaves observes,

... it seems to me that elementary school principals have attained a higher degree of professionalization. Their responsibilities have increased. The nature of the school staff has changed and has created new responsibilities. The direct instructional leadership job of elementary school principals is changing to a design for coordination and management. Effective coordination of the many activities of the elementary school requires more knowledge—about children, about instruction, about organization, about instructional materials, about society (16, p. 4).

In discussing the many responsibilities of the elementary school principal of today, Bowles (8), Jarvis and Pounds (34), Otto and Sanders (44), and others refer to the principal's involvement with such areas as instruction and curriculum development, staff personnel administration, management of the school plant, and public relations. All of these writers propose that the responsibilities are increasing as time passes.

Jacobson (33, p. 71) says that the recent changes in the role of the elementary principal have put the person holding this position under tremendous pressure. He calls principals "the most exposed of all educators." The principal interprets and symbolizes the system for the
neighborhood, the parent, the teacher, and the child, all of whom want the principal to represent them to the system. It is the principal who ultimately takes the call from the distraught parent, talks to the inquiring policeman, answers the urgent demand for data from the central office, confronts the questionable stranger in the school corridor, accounts for vandalism and damaged projectors, receives the neighborhood delegation, and much, much more. By the time principals have acquired familiarity with the dimensions of today's problems, tomorrow will have arrived with totally new problems.

Sinclair (51) adds that more than ever before, elementary students are voicing dissatisfaction with their educational environment. He says that there is an urgent need for principals and teachers to create refreshing educational surroundings that meet the personal and academic needs of children. A number of schools are already designing programs that emphasize the total atmosphere of the elementary school.

The elementary school principal is the focal point of the dilemmas confronting elementary education today. Goldhammer and Becker (21, p. 11) call him a "man caught in the middle." On the one hand he is supposed to speak for his school, his teachers, pupils, and neighborhood, hoping to achieve for them the resources essential for providing the best possible education. On the other hand he is supposed
to represent the school board and the central office and enforce their policies. The principal is supposed to give leadership to his staff, but increasingly, due to teachers' negotiations, decisions are made without his input.

According to Estes (18, p. 69), the decade of the sixties will go down as a time of rising rebellion against authority at all levels and in all areas, including education. As other powers developed—teacher power, student power, parent power, black power, and even flower power—the principal's authority slipped away.

Even as authority has slipped away from the principal, Estes (18), Annese (6), Goldhammer and Becker (21), Mahan (41), and scores of other noted educators are quick to add that the principal is still the key to a good school. In the seventies the principal's job must continue to be that of instructional leader.

Estes (18) observes that in spite of the fact that principals are finding less and less time to provide instructional leadership, nothing is going to happen very successfully in a school without the enthusiastic support and capable leadership of the principal. The principal must keep the learning process foremost in planning long and short range objectives and adopting programs that meet the needs of the individual student. Being an instructional leader involves building a competent team through supervision, staff development, and evaluation.
One of the main points of emphasis by Estes (18), Goldhammer and Becker (21), Annese (6), and many other educators is the concept of shared power. The principal must have the ability to share the decision-making process with all of those affected by the decisions such as teachers, parents, and students. Allen and Krasno (1, p. 42) emphasize that tomorrow's teachers will be innovation-oriented and will expect and require a flexible setting in which innovation is stimulated and encouraged by the principal. Sinclair (51) says that research supports the importance of the principal in innovation by identifying the superintendent at the district level and the principal at the building level as the crucial figures in planning and implementing educational improvement. Brown (9, p. 25) and McNalley (40, p. 89) propose that the principals of the future must work with their professional staffs in shaping educational policy and practice. Wayson (55, p. 3) feels that decision making must become decentralized to the point of involving all relevant parties. The elementary principals evidently are in tune with the changes in decision making because a research study conducted in 1968 (43) showed that in the past decade elementary school principals have placed more emphasis on instructional leadership through group decision making.

Another job that is receiving increased attention is that of communications. Goldman (22, p. 136) states that
many writers have documented the need for principals to gain increased understanding of, and to initiate extensive involvement with, the communities in which their school is located. Brown (9) stresses that parents are becoming far more knowledgeable about elementary education. Within the past year parents and other members of the community could read about educational programs such as open education in popular magazines such as Saturday Review (26, pp. 66-69) and Life (53, p. 6). Hapgood (26) emphasizes that the understanding and support of the community becomes even more important in establishing an open plan school. Wing and Mack (56, pp. 13-15) support this by pointing to the problems encountered in a New Hampshire community where an open school was established; the problems of misunderstanding were only overcome by extensive efforts of the principal to communicate the program to the community. Lewis emphasizes the role of parents by stating that "the demand for equality in education, improvement in the quality of education, and the increase of parent power may well stand out as the important forces in shaping the role of the principal" (38, p. 13).

The elementary principal must be the school's chief interpreter in presenting the school's purposes, its programs, its problems and its progress to its various publics. It is imperative that a principal design a systematic program of two-way communications with all of the audiences.
Communication is sometimes difficult, and it is a job that requires planning and expertise; but communication can be a key to the success of the school program.

In summary, the elementary school principal today is facing many new challenges. The increase in innovative changes in curriculum, organization, and facilities, and the concept of shared power add to these challenges.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


12. Informal Schools in Britain Today: The Teacher's Role, New York, Citation Press, 1971.


CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role of
the principal in the open plan elementary schools in Texas.
The analysis was limited to the principals' perceptions of
their role. The following procedures were designed to ob-
tain appropriate data: (1) identification of the open plan
elementary schools in Texas, (2) construction of the initial
survey questionnaire, (3) selection of a jury panel, (4)
validation of the initial questionnaire, (5) construction of
the final questionnaire, and (6) administration of the final
questionnaire.

Identification of the Open Plan
Elementary Schools in Texas

In order to identify the open plan elementary schools
in Texas a letter (Appendix A) was drafted that explained
the purpose of the study, described such schools, and asked
the respondent to report any schools meeting the description.
A form (Appendix B) for reporting open plan elementary
schools and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were enclosed
for the convenience of the respondent. This material was
mailed to the (1) Texas Education Agency, (2) executive
directors of the twenty Education Service Centers, (3) deans
of the Departments of Education of the fifty-five colleges
and universities, and (4) thirty-four selected superintendents throughout the state. The superintendents of schools were selected because they were believed to have open plan elementary schools within their districts.

The four categories listed above supplied 110 respondents and 86 of them returned the form listing open plan schools. This return of 78 per cent represented all areas of the state and was considered adequate to identify the open plan elementary schools in Texas.

The respondents identified 106 open plan elementary schools and their principals (Appendix C) presently operating in Texas. This number of schools was considered adequate to justify continuing the study.

Construction of the Initial Questionnaire

A review of the literature was used to clarify the areas of responsibility of elementary school principals, and a study of the development of open plan schools provided a basis for application of these responsibilities to these unique schools. Using the accumulated information, a tentative questionnaire was developed to survey the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas. Some of the questions were adapted from a research study on the elementary school principalship published by the National Education Association (1).
The tentative questionnaire and pertinent sections of the study proposal were discussed in conferences with a college professor, an open plan elementary school principal, and a coordinator of research and evaluation. The recommendations of these experienced educators were reviewed and changes in wording were made to increase the validity and reliability of the survey instrument. In the initial questionnaire, forty-one multiple choice questions were developed to provide specific data upon which to support the objectives of the study.

Selection of the Jury Panel

The jury panel was selected from school officials in Texas who were familiar with the administration of open plan elementary schools. The nine members (Appendix D) selected were three former principals of open plan elementary schools, three central administrative staff members, and three consultants to open plan schools. They represented large and small school districts throughout the state of Texas.

Each prospective jury member was called by telephone and requested to participate in the validation procedure. Their role in approving or disapproving the items on the questionnaire based on clarity and appropriateness was explained. Each agreed to participate and return his reply within ten days.
Validation of the Initial
Questionnaire

The initial questionnaire of forty-one items (Appendix F), a letter of instruction (Appendix E), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to the jury panel to obtain their approval for validation of the individual items. Each judge was asked to consider whether or not each item would provide appropriate information and if each item was clearly stated. A validity response was provided in the left margin of the questionnaire. Numbers "1," "2," and "3" were typed in the margin preceding each item number. The members of the jury panel were asked to respond by circling the "1" if the question and responses were clearly stated and appropriate for the study. If the jury member was undecided on an item, he was to circle the number "2." If the item was unclear or considered inappropriate to the study, the jury member was asked to circle the number "3."

A space was provided at the end of the questionnaire for the jury member to submit additions or corrections. Each member was requested to certify the acceptance of the questionnaire as complete or with noted exceptions.

On the first reading of the initial questionnaire twenty-one of the forty-one items received unanimous approval. Ten items received one "undecided" rating, and ten items received one "unclear or inappropriate" rating.
Using the suggestions of the panel members the following changes were made in the initial questionnaire: (1) the directions were clarified, (2) twenty-six word changes were made, (3) two questions were reversed in sequence, (4) responses were added to eleven questions, and (5) three questions were added to the instrument.

Upon completion of the suggested changes the revised questionnaire (Appendix H) with a letter in instruction (Appendix G) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to each member of the jury panel. Each judge was again asked to consider whether or not each item would provide appropriate information and if each item was clearly stated. The same validity response rating system used in the first mailing was repeated in this second mailing. A space was again provided at the end of the questionnaire for the jury member to submit additions or corrections. Each jury member was requested to certify the acceptance of the instrument as complete or with noted exceptions. It was decided that acceptance of an item by seven of the nine members of the jury panel would constitute validity and justify inclusion in the final questionnaire.

Construction of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire (Appendix J) was constructed from the responses of the jury panel to the second mailing of the instrument. Forty-two of the forty-four items
received unanimous approval and two items received approval of eight of the nine members. All items were ruled valid and included in the final questionnaire with no changes. No additions or deletions were recommended.

The questions were typed on eight balanced pages with a cover sheet for identification and instructions (Appendix J). These were printed on a mimeograph machine, and regular twenty-pound weight paper was selected to provide an attractive, readily identifiable questionnaire. A cover letter (Appendix I) was also typed to introduce and explain the study. This questionnaire was used to survey all open plan elementary schools in Texas that had been previously identified.

Administration of the Final Questionnaire

The validated survey questionnaire was administered to the principals of the 106 open plan elementary schools in Texas. The cover letter (Appendix I) explaining the purpose of the study and requesting participation, a survey instrument (Appendix J), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the principal, by name, of each of the 106 open plan elementary schools in Texas. The principal was asked to respond by checking one or more choices to the survey questions according to the instructions.

The questionnaires were dated, numbered, and assigned to the reporting group as they were mailed. They were
checked off a working list of the schools as they were returned.

These procedures resulted in a return of eighty-five usable questionnaires, or 80 per cent. Two survey instruments were returned with incomplete responses and one principal who had just been appointed reported that he felt unqualified to complete the instrument. Seventeen per cent of the questionnaires were not returned. This return of usable questionnaires exceeded the two-thirds standard considered acceptable by 13 per cent.

As the questionnaires were received, the responses to each of the forty-four items were manually recorded on columned data sheets. After the deadline for returning the questionnaires, the number of responses for each item were totaled. Percentages for each response were also computed. The number and percentage of each response is reported in the forty-four tables included in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to identify the open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas and analyze the role of the principal in these schools. The analysis was limited to the principals' perceptions of their role. The data gathered during this investigation are presented in Chapter IV under three sections: (1) Identification of the Open Plan Elementary Schools in Texas, (2) Presentation of Findings, and (3) Summary of the Responses to the Study.

Identification of the Open Plan Elementary Schools in Texas

In order to identify the open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas, a letter was drafted that explained the purpose of the study, described such schools, and asked the respondent to report any schools meeting the description. This letter and a form for reporting the schools were mailed to the (1) Texas Education Agency, (2) executive directors of the twenty Education Service Centers, (3) deans of the Departments of Education of the fifty-five colleges and universities, and (4) thirty-four selected superintendents throughout the state. The superintendents
of schools were selected because they were believed to have open plan elementary schools within their districts.

These four categories supplied 110 respondents, and 86 of them returned the form listing open plan elementary schools. This return of 78 per cent represented all areas of the state and was considered adequate to identify the open plan elementary schools in Texas.

The respondents identified 106 open plan elementary schools and their principals presently operating in Texas (Appendix C). A validated questionnaire was then mailed to the principals who had been identified.

Presentation of Findings

The findings presented here are the results of the survey questionnaire, "The Role of the Principal in Open Plan Elementary Schools in Texas." The forty-four items in the survey instrument were designed to provide data to analyze the role of the principal in the open plan elementary schools presently operating in the state of Texas. Special emphasis was directed to the following topics: (1) general information concerning the school and the principal, (2) instruction and curriculum development, (3) staff personnel administration, (4) management of the school plant, (5) public relations.

The data from each of the forty-four items on the survey questionnaire will be presented in separate tables.
These data will be presented by number of responses and percentages for each answer. The answers are also presented by totals of schools participating in the study.

Summary of the Responses to the Study

The data presented in the tables in this section indicate the opinions of the principals of open plan elementary schools in Texas who responded to the survey questionnaire. Of the 106 schools surveyed, usable responses were received from 85, or 80 per cent. Two survey instruments were returned with incomplete responses, and one principal who had just been appointed reported that he felt unqualified to complete the questionnaire. Seventeen per cent of the survey instruments were not returned. This return of eighty-five usable questionnaires exceeded the two-thirds standard considered acceptable by 13 per cent.

A study of the data in Table I indicates that open plan elementary programs are relatively new in the state of Texas. Twenty-eight principals, or 33 per cent, reported that the open plan program has been in operation in their school less than one year. When the first four response categories were totaled, they revealed that seventy-three, or 86 per cent, of the programs have been in operation three years or less. Only two schools reported an open plan program in operation more than six years.
The data in Table II indicate that the pupil enrollments in the open plan elementary schools vary. No principals reported a pupil enrollment of less than 100 and only four reported more than 1000 students in a particular building. Twenty-nine respondents, or 34 per cent, reported 400-599 students; and 16 schools, or 19 per cent, reported housing 200-399 students. When taken collectively, the data
TABLE II

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School Enrollment</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>100-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>200-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>400-599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>600-799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>800-999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>More than 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number two: Elementary school enrollment.

**Percentage does not total 100% due to rounding error.

in two response categories revealed that 53, or 63 per cent, of the schools contain 400-799 students.

The data in Table III reveal a wide variety of age combinations of children taught in the open plan elementary schools in Texas. The fact that some school districts have kindergarten programs and some do not is reflected in these data. The most frequent age combination reported was ages six through twelve, with thirty schools, or 35 per cent, reporting this combination. Twenty-nine schools, or 34 per cent, reported teaching five-year-olds, while forty-seven, or 55 per cent, reported teaching six-year-old children.
TABLE III

AGES OF CHILDREN IN THE SCHOOLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages of Children</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 5-8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 5-9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 5-10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 5-11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e 5-12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f 6-8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 6-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h 6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 6-11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j 6-12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number three: Circle the ages of children normally taught in the school.

Three schools reported that some three-year-old children were in the open plan program. One school commented that an open plan program is operational only in the first grade, while the other five grades use a more traditional organizational structure.

A study of the data in Table IV indicates that the ethnic composition of the student bodies of the reporting schools is predominantly Anglo. Seventy-two schools, or about 85 per cent, reported that the ethnic composition of their students is 65 per cent or more Anglo. Six schools.
TABLE IV
ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE STUDENT BODIES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Composition</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Predominantly Anglo (65% or more)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Predominantly Negro (65% or more)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Predominantly Mexican-American (65% or more)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number four: Ethnic composition of the student body.

or 7 per cent, reported predominantly Negro students. Only two schools reported predominantly Mexican-American students. Five schools indicated a more balanced ethnic composition which could not be classified in the first three response categories.

The data in Table V indicate that 47 per cent of the open plan elementary schools serve families whose average annual income is in the $5,000 to $10,000 range. Twenty-five schools, or 29 per cent, serve families whose average annual income is in the $10,000 to $20,000 range. Only 4 per cent of the schools reported serving families whose average annual income is less than $3,000, and no school reported serving families whose annual income exceeds $30,000.
TABLE V

AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME OF THE FAMILIES SERVED BY THE SCHOOLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Annual Income</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Less than $3,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b $3,000-$5,000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c $5,000-$10,000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d $10,000-$20,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e $20,000-$30,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f More than $30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number five: Average income of the families served by the school.

In regard to the number of full-time teaching positions in the schools, Table VI reveals that no principals reported having less than five full-time teachers; 5 per cent reported five to nine teachers; 15 per cent have ten to fourteen teachers; and 19 per cent have fifteen to nineteen teachers; and 19 per cent also reported having twenty to twenty-four teachers. Only 6 per cent of the principals reported having thirty to thirty-four full-time teachers, and 8 per cent reported having thirty-five to thirty-nine teachers. Only two of the eighty-five schools reported having more than forty full-time teaching personnel.
### TABLE VI
FULL-TIME TEACHING POSITIONS IN THE SCHOOLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Teaching Positions</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a  Less than 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  5-9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  10-14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d  15-19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e  20-24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f  25-29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g  30-34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h  35-39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i  More than 40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number six: Number of full-time teaching positions in the building.

An analysis of the data in Table VII reveals other full- or part-time personnel that complete the staffs of open plan elementary schools in Texas. In regard to the office staff, only 16 per cent of the respondents reported that the school has an assistant principal, and only 2 per cent indicated the presence of an administrative intern. The principals reported that 91 per cent of the schools have a secretary, while 33 per cent indicated the presence of a clerk.

Eighty respondents, or 94 per cent, reported that a school nurse is available either full- or part-time. Only
### TABLE VII

**OTHER FULL- OR PART-TIME PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Full- or Part-Time Personnel</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Assistant principal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Administrative intern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Head teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Secretary</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Clerk(s)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Teacher aide(s)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g School nurse</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h School physician</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i School dentist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Psychologist(s)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Speech therapist(s)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Reading specialist(s)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m Physical therapist(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n Guidance counselor(s)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Social worker(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p Teacher of homebound</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Visiting Teacher</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r Other</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number seven: Other personnel available full- or part-time.

Two respondents reported that a school physician is available and no principal indicated that a school dentist is present.
Seventy-five principals, or 88 per cent, reported that a speech therapist is available to help students with speech problems. Other personnel reported available by some principals included psychologists, physical therapists, social workers, teachers of homebound students, and visiting teachers. Seventy-nine, or 93 per cent, of the principals reported that teacher aides are utilized in the schools.

An analysis of Table VIII reveals that most of the open plan elementary programs are operating in school districts whose total pupil enrollment is between 2,500 and 50,000 students. In fact, 62 schools, or 73 per cent, reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Pupil Enrollment</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a  Less than 300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  300-1,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  1,000-2,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d  2,500-5,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e  5,000-15,000</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f  15,000-50,000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g  50,000-100,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h  100,000-150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i  More than 150,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number eight: Total pupil enrollment in school district.
district enrollments within this range. Only 11 per cent of the programs were reported as being in school districts of 2,500 or less students, and only 16 per cent reported as being in school districts of more than 50,000 student enrollment.

In examining the characteristics of principals who administer open plan elementary schools in Texas, the data in Table IX reveal that 85 per cent of the principals reported

**TABLE IX**

**PRINCIPALS' TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOLWORK***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in Schoolwork</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 2-5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 6-9 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 10-13 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 14-17 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e 18-21 years</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f 22-25 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 26-29 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h More than 29 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number nine: Your total years of experience in schoolwork.

having ten or more years of experience in schoolwork. Those reporting less than ten years of experience totaled twelve principals, or 15 per cent. It is interesting to note that
14 per cent reported having more than twenty-nine years of experience in schoolwork.

In reporting their total years of experience as an elementary school administrator in Table X, 7 per cent reported

**TABLE X**

**EXPERIENCE AS AN ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience as Elementary Principal</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 2-5 years</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 6-9 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 10-13 years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e 14-17 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f 18-21 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 22-25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h 26-29 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i More than 29 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number ten: Your total years of experience as an elementary principal.*

one year of experience as an elementary principal, 36 per cent indicated two to five years of experience, 19 per cent reported six to nine years of experience, 13 per cent reported ten to thirteen years of experience, and 16 per cent reported fourteen to seventeen years of experience as an elementary school principal. When totaled collectively, the last four response categories indicate that 9 per cent
reported more than eighteen years of experience as an elementary school principal.

An analysis of the data in Table XI reveals that thirty-seven principals, or 44 per cent, reported that they

**TABLE XI**

**EXPERIENCE IN OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in Open Plan Elementary School</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number eleven: Number of years you have been assigned to an open plan elementary school.

have been assigned to an open plan elementary school less than one year. Twenty-six respondents, or 31 per cent indicated that they have been assigned to such a school for two years. The total of these two response categories revealed that 75 per cent of the principals reported that they have been assigned to open plan elementary schools two years or less. This leaves only 25 per cent who have been assigned
as principals of open plan elementary schools three or more years.

In regard to their preparation for the principalship of an open plan elementary school, Table XII reveals that

**TABLE XII**

**PREPARATION FOR THE PRINCIPALSHIP OF AN OPEN PLAN SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation for Principalship</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Administrator's certificate</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Additional college course</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Professional reading</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Workshops or seminars</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Visits to other open plan schools</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Prior teaching experience in open plan school</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Previously a principal of open plan school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Elementary teacher in traditional elementary school</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Secondary teacher in traditional secondary school</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Schools Reporting</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twelve: Your preparation for the principalship of this open plan elementary school.

95 per cent of the respondents reported having an administrative certificate. Seventy-nine, or 93 per cent, reported that they have visited other similar schools to observe open
plan program. Seventy-two, or 85 per cent, indicated that they have also attended workshops or seminars, and 82 per cent have done professional reading to increase their knowledge of the open plan concept. About one-half, or 51 per cent, indicated having taken additional college work in preparation for the principalship.

In reporting prior teaching experience, 68 per cent indicated that they have been an elementary teacher in a traditional school, 35 per cent have taught in a traditional secondary school, while only 7 per cent have taught in an open plan school. Only one respondent has been a principal in another open school before taking the present assignment.

Two principals reported that they have been elementary school consultants, one has been an elementary supervisor, one has been a superintendent of a school district, and one respondent has been a high school principal. Only one principal reported that he has been an administrative intern in an open plan school.

It appears from the data in Table XII that the principals of open plan elementary schools use various methods and have many different experience records in preparation for their present positions. It is interesting to note that only 68 per cent have been elementary school teachers.

In an analysis of the principals' methods for continuous personal professional growth, the data in Table XIII reveal the importance of workshops and seminars. In fact, 88 per
TABLE XIII

METHODS FOR CONTINUOUS PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods for Personal Professional Growth</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a  Study groups</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  Workshops or seminars</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  Action research projects</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d  Observation of other schools</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e  Professional reading</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f  Affiliation with professional organizations</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g  Additional college courses</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h  Travel</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i  Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirteen: Your methods for continuous personal professional growth.

... of the respondents indicated attendance at these meetings. Sixty-six, or 78 per cent, of the principals reported that they still observe other schools in order to increase their competency. Seventy-three, or 86 per cent, continue to do professional reading, while 80 per cent maintain affiliation with professional organizations to strengthen their skills. About 45 per cent reported that they still enroll in college courses, while 34 per cent use travel as a method for continuous personal professional growth. Only 18 per cent work on action research projects.
One principal remarked that district open plan discussions are helpful. Another commented that in-service training within the school is beneficial.

In an analysis of the ethnic group and sex of the respondents, the data in Table XIV indicate that seventy-two,

TABLE XIV
ETHNIC GROUP AND SEX OF THE PRINCIPALS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group and Sex</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Anglo male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Anglo female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Negro male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Negro female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Mexican-American male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Mexican-American female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number fourteen: Principal's ethnic group/sex.

**Percentage does not total 100% due to rounding error.

or 85 per cent, are Anglo men, while eight, or 9 per cent, are Anglo women. Only two principals are Negro men, and two are Negro women. One principal is a Mexican-American man while no female principals reported being of this nationality.

In Table XV, eighty-two, or 96 per cent, of the principals reported that they have a master's degree. Only
TABLE XV
HIGHEST EARNED COLLEGE DEGREE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Earned Degree</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Master's degree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Doctoral degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number fifteen: Highest earned college degree.

three principals reported that they have earned a doctoral degree.

The data in Table XVI indicate that seventy-eight, or 92 per cent, of the principals reported that they do not

TABLE XVI
TEACHING DUTIES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Duties</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number sixteen: Do you teach any classes in addition to your administrative duties?
have any teaching responsibilities in addition to their administrative assignment. Only seven principals, or 8 per cent, indicated that they assume some teaching duties in addition to their administrative work.

When asked if they are principals of more than one school, eighty-three respondents indicated that they do not administer more than one school, as shown in Table XVII.

**TABLE XVII**

**NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Assignments</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a  Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  No</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number seventeen: Are you principal of more than one school?

Only two principals reported having more than one administrative assignment.

In regard to the principal's age, the data in Table XVIII reveal this to be rather evenly distributed. Four principals are under thirty years of age. Twenty-five, or 29 per cent, of the principals are in their thirties, and thirty-four, or 40 per cent are in their forties. Twenty-two of the principals are fifty-one or older; this accounts for 26 per cent of the respondents.
TABLE XVIII

PRINCIPALS' AGES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Ages</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>46-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>51-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>56-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>66 or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number eighteen: Principal's age.

It appears from the data in Table XIX that practically all of the open plan elementary schools in Texas feature team teaching in their organizational structure. In fact, eighty-three, or 98 per cent, indicated the presence of team teaching.

The respondents also indicated a move toward implementation of a nongraded curriculum. Twenty-seven, or 32 per cent, of the principals reported having a nongraded program. Forty-five, or 53 per cent, reported that their program is graded with some nongraded features. Only ten schools, or 12 per cent, reported that their organizational structure is entirely graded.
TABLE XIX
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Graded</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Nongraded</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Graded with some nongraded features</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Team teaching</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Multi-age grouping</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Self-contained</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Departmentalized</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Platoon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number nineteen: Organizational structure of the school.

Other principals reported multi-age grouping, self-contained, departmentalized, and platooned organizational structures. Two respondents indicated an emphasis on individualized instruction, one reported achievement level grouping in language arts and mathematics, and one reported using the modified Joplin program.

In Table XX, thirty-six principals, or 42 per cent, reported that their school could be described as having large, open areas or learning centers. Sixteen, or 19 per cent, reported that their building is totally open with very few interior walls. Fifteen respondents, or 18 per cent,
TABLE XX
DESCRIPTION OF SCHOOL PLANTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of School Plant</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Large open areas or learning centers</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Clusters with movable walls</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Traditional cubicles with fixed walls</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Large open area with several small special teaching spaces</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Totally open</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty: Most accurate description of school plant design.

described their facility as having a large open area with several small special teaching spaces. Twelve principals, or 14 per cent, indicated that learning areas are designed in clusters with movable walls separating them. Five principals indicated that they have some traditional cubicles with fixed walls.

The data in Table XXI clearly indicate that the open plan elementary schools in Texas utilize movable furniture such as separate chairs and tables that facilitate flexibility. In fact, 88 per cent of the respondents reported use of this type of student furniture. Only 9 per cent
TABLE XXI
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT FURNITURE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Furniture</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Traditional furniture such as monolithic chair-desks, not easily moved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Movable furniture such as separate chairs and tables that facilitate flexibility</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-one: Most accurate description of student furniture.

**Percentage does not total 100% due to rounding error.

reported the use of traditional furniture that is not easily moved. Two principals commented that both types of furniture are used in their schools.

A study of the responses of principals in Table XXII indicates the presence of some of the concepts of open education in the majority of the open plan elementary schools in Texas. Eighty-two, or 96 per cent, responded that teachers often work with various size groups of children, while 93 per cent indicated that the learning environment has varied learning activities. The emphasis on making learning an exciting activity was also indicated by 93 per cent of the principals. An emphasis on individualized instruction and independent learning was reported by 86 per
TABLE XXII
ORGANIZATION FOR LEARNING IN THE SCHOOLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization for Learning</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Learning centers or spaces are decentralized</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Provision is made for some free exploration by students</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>The learning environment has varied learning activities</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Teachers often work with various size groups</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>There is an emphasis on individualized instruction</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Teachers help students become independent learners</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>There is an emphasis on making learning an exciting experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Volunteer parents and/or students are used as teacher aids</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-two: Please check the statements that apply to the organization for learning in the school.

cent of the respondents. Sixty-eight, or 80 per cent, indicated that provision is made for some free exploration by students, while 53 per cent indicated that learning spaces are decentralized. It was also reported by 72 per cent of
the principals that volunteer parents and/or students are used as teacher aides and tutors.

The responses in Table XXIII emphasize that all reporting principals are responsible for instructional supervision in the school. Sixty-seven, or 79 per cent, have some assistance from a supervisor of instruction, while 18 per cent receive no assistance. Only one principal indicated that he shares a joint responsibility with a supervisor assigned full time to the school. One respondent commented

TABLE XXIII

RESPONSIBILITY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Supervision</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Principal is responsible and has some assistance from a supervisor of instruction</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Principal is completely responsible and has no assistance</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Principal is not responsible due to complete supervision from the central office</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Principal is jointly responsible with supervisor assigned full time to school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-three: The principal's responsibility for instructional supervision.
that this responsibility is shared by the principal, team leaders, and central staff members. Another commented that an elementary coordinator works with the principal in instructional supervision.

The vital role of the principal in developing the curriculum of open plan elementary schools is emphasized by the responses in Table XXIV. Sixty-five, or 76 per cent, of

TABLE XXIV
ROLE IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Development</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Carries out prescriptions of the Texas Education Agency and the local Board of Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Follows closely school system programs without trying to influence its development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Follows closely school system program with some influence on its development</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop curriculum cooperatively for school system with adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-four: The principal's role in developing the curriculum.

**Percentage does not total 100% due to rounding error.
the principals indicated that teachers, principals, and supervisors develop the curriculum cooperatively for the school system with adaptation to the individual schools left up to the local building principals and teachers. This indicates that the principal's decisions are shared with the teachers in the building. Eleven respondents, or 13 per cent, reported that they follow closely the school system program, but have some influence on program development. One respondent emphasized that the principals and teachers develop the curriculum to meet the individual needs of the students. It should be noted that only one of eighty-five respondents reported that he follows closely the school system programs without trying to influence its development, while only seven indicated that they just carry out the prescriptions of the Texas Education Agency and the local Board of Education.

The principal's role in developing the organizational structure is very similar to that of curriculum development. In Table XXV sixty-four, or 75 per cent, of the respondents indicated that teachers, principals, and supervisors develop the organizational structure cooperatively for the school system while adaptation to the individual schools is left up to the local principals and teachers. Fifteen respondents, or 18 per cent, reported that they follow closely the school system organizational structure but exercise some influence on its development. One principal commented that just he
### TABLE XXV

**ROLE IN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Development</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a  Carries out prescriptions of the central administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  Follows closely school system program without trying to influence its development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  Follows closely school system program with some influence on its development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d  Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop the organizational structure cooperatively for school system with adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e  Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-five: The principal's role in developing the organizational structure.

and the faculty are responsible for selecting the organizational structure. They are free to implement a nongraded curriculum utilizing team teaching. Only three principals indicated that they do not exercise any influence on the development of the organizational structure.

The responses of the principals in Table XXVI indicate that they share the decisions concerning pupil placement with the faculty. Fifty respondents, or 59 per cent, reported that within the framework of general school system
TABLE XXVI
ROLE IN PUPIL PLACEMENT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Placement</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Within framework of general school system policies, teacher works with</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents, child, and principal on placing each child</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Teacher decides on failure or promotion with help from principal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Children placed according to policies and standards developed by the faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Children placed and promoted in accordance with required system-wide,</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniform policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-six: The principal's role in determining pupil placement.

policies, the teacher works with parents, children, and the principal on placing each child in the program. Eleven, or 13 per cent, of the principals help the teachers decide on failure or promotion of individual students, while 18 per cent reported that they work with the faculty in developing placement policies. Only 8 per cent of the principals indicated that children are placed in accordance with required, system-wide policies.
A study of the responses by principals in Table XXVII reveals that, while many of the open plan schools are still using a district-wide reporting system, many principals are working with teachers, supervisors, children, and parents to modify the reporting technique. Thirty-four, or 40 per cent, reported that they are working with these groups to improve the reporting technique.

The data presented in Table XXVIII clearly indicate the coordinating role of the principal in the selection of instructional materials. Sixty-nine, or 81 per cent, of the respondents reported that the faculty, working with the
TABLE XXVIII

ROLE IN SELECTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of Instructional Materials</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Faculty, working with the principal, makes request for materials in terms of school program</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Principal or his representative works with a school system committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c No standard list of materials teachers indicate need</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Use materials selected by the central office</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Principal selects materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-eight: The principal's role in selecting instructional materials.

principal, makes requests for materials in terms of the school program. One principal commented that the new Texpak accounting system places even more responsibility at the local building level in ordering materials to meet the needs of the children. Only four principals reported that materials are selected by the central office.

A study of the responses in Table XXIX clearly indicates the important role of the principal in the development of a resource or media center in the open plan elementary school. In fact, 91 per cent of the principals reported
TABLE XXIX

ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF A MEDIA CENTER*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Center Development</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The librarian or media specialist is completely charged with this responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Principal, teachers, librarian and supervisor work together to develop the center</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Principal makes all final decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Central administration makes all final decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number twenty-nine: The principal's role in developing a resource or media center.

that they work with the librarian, supervisor, and teachers to develop the media center. Two principals commented that this is a very important function of open plan administrators because of the importance of these centers to this type of school. Only one respondent indicated that he makes all of the final decisions concerning the development of the resource center.

An analysis of the data in Table XXX indicates that new curriculum programs are being developed in practically all of the new open plan elementary schools. In fact, only two
TABLE XXX

ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW CURRICULUM PROGRAMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of New Curriculum Programs</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Program supervisor</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Supports and encourages</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Provides resources</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Responsible for implementation</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e There are no new programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being developed at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty: The principal's role in developing new curriculum programs.

principals reported that no new programs are being developed in their schools. Seventy-eight, or 92 per cent, reported that one of their responsibilities is to support and encourage teachers involved in the development of new curriculum programs. Fifty-three, or 62 per cent, indicated that they provide resources for this development, while 40 per cent act as the program supervisor for these projects. Forty-one, or 48 per cent, acknowledged complete responsibility for the implementation of new curriculum programs in the school.

An analysis of the data in Table XXXI indicates that principals of open plan elementary schools in Texas play a
TABLE XXXI
ROLE IN IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement of Instruction</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Providing many instructional materials and maintaining high morale</td>
<td>Number 69 Percentage 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Keeping abreast of research and school developments and encouraging the staff to experiment</td>
<td>Number 73 Percentage 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Observing the teaching-learning act and making suggestions</td>
<td>Number 66 Percentage 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Leading discussions at faculty meetings</td>
<td>Number 53 Percentage 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>Number 2 Percentage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>Number 85 Percentage 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-one: The principal's role in improving instruction within the building.

vital role in the improvement of instruction at the local building level. Seventy-three respondents, or 86 per cent, reported that they must keep abreast of research and school developments and encourage the staff to experiment with new instructional techniques. Sixty-nine, or 81 per cent, of the principals reported that they must provide many instructional materials and maintain high morale among staff members. Sixty-six, or 78 per cent, reported that they constantly observe the teaching-learning act and make suggestions to teachers. Leading discussions at faculty
meetings is a technique reported by 62 per cent of the principals. Two principals commented that they use team meetings to encourage the staff to experiment.

A review of the data in Table XXXII reveals that seventy-seven respondents, or 91 per cent, reported that

**TABLE XXXII**

**TECHNIQUES OF PROGRAM EVALUATION***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Evaluation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a General observation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Structured observation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Detailed research design</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Standardized test analysis</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Schools Reporting             | 85     | . .        |

*Survey question number thirty-two: The principal's technique for program evaluation.

they use general observation techniques to aid in evaluating the school program. Thirty-four principals, or 40 per cent, reported use of a more structured observational technique to aid in program evaluation. Slightly more than one-half of the principals, or 62 per cent, reported that they use standardized test analysis for program evaluation, while only 14 per cent indicated use of a detailed research design. Four principals commented that they use principal-team
conferences, while one indicated use of a parent questionnaire to aid in program evaluation.

The responses in Table XXXIII indicate that the principal's role in the selection of faculty members is evenly

TABLE XXXIII
ROLE IN SELECTION OF FACULTY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of Faculty</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a All assignments are made by the central office; principal has no say in selection</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Has right to present specification and accept or reject candidates</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Is expected to outline qualifications, examine personnel records, interview applicants and recommend applicants for assignment</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Employs teachers without the assistance of the central office</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-three: The principal's role in selecting the faculty.

distributed among three techniques. Twenty-nine principals reported that they are expected to outline qualifications, examine personnel records, interview applicants, and recommend applicants for assignment. Twenty-six respondents, or
31 per cent, indicated that they have the right to present specifications and accept or reject candidates. Twenty-five, or 29 per cent, of the principals reported that all assignments are made by the central office and they have no voice in the selection.

Three principals reported that they employ teachers without the assistance of the central office. It is interesting to note that two principals commented that the teachers have a voice in the selection of new faculty members.

It was previously reported in Table XIX that 98 per cent of the open plan elementary schools have team teaching as a part of their organizational structure. The assignment of teaching teams then becomes an important function in the efficient operation of these schools. In Table XXXIV

**TABLE XXIV**

**ROLE IN ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHING TEAMS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment of Teams</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Principal makes all assignments</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Principals and teachers work together to assign teaching teams with principal making final decision</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-four: The principal's role in assigning teaching teams within the building.*
sixty-five principals, or 76 per cent, reported that they involve teachers in making these assignments. These same respondents indicated that the principal still must exercise final authority in the assignment of teams.

Only seventeen principals, or 20 per cent, indicated that they alone make all team assignments. Two principals commented that this is done by the central office, while one principal reported that he and an assistant superintendent make these decisions.

A review of the data in Table XXXV indicates that open plan principals use several different techniques for evaluating teachers. Forty respondents, or 47 per cent, reported that they use a rating scale provided by the central office to rate all teachers annually or more often. Nineteen principals, or 22 per cent, indicated that both the teacher and the principal make an annual appraisal of teaching performance. Twelve respondents, or 14 per cent, reported that they make a more detailed descriptive report for each teacher. Five principals indicated that they only make reports on probationary teachers, and three principals reported that no evaluation is required. Five principals commented that evaluations are made several times a year on probationary teachers.
**TABLE XXXV**

**RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Teachers</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a No evaluation is required</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Reports only on probationary teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Program applies to all teachers and includes a teachers' self-appraisal and a principal's appraisal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Makes annual descriptive report for each teacher, stating judgment of his teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Rates all teachers annually or more often using rating sheet or scale provided by central office</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Rates biennially or less often</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-five: The principal's responsibility for evaluating teachers.

The development of an efficient in-service education program assumes new importance in open plan schools. The data in Table XXXVI indicate that over one-half of the schools reported that the program is developed at the building level. Thirty-eight, or 45 per cent, of the respondents indicated that they use district guidelines; but they also work with the staff to define objectives, develop, and evaluate the in-service program. Eleven, or 13 per cent, of
### TABLE XXXVI

ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-service Education for Staff Members</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a  Implements district's prescribed program for all personnel</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  Principal designs and implements the program</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  Principal appoints committees to develop the program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d  Using district guidelines, principal and staff define objectives, develop, and evaluate the program</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e  There is no program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f  Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-six: The principal's role in developing in-service education for all staff members.

The respondents reported that they alone develop the program. Two principals reported that a teacher committee assumes responsibility for program development. Twenty-seven respondents, or 32 per cent, reported that they implement a district-wide program designed for all personnel. Five principals commented that they work with committees to implement a district-wide program.

In an open plan elementary school it becomes even more important to expose the staff to new ideas resulting in
change of practice. This type of facility offers so much flexibility that teachers must constantly seek new ways to use it efficiently.

An analysis of the data in Table XXXVII indicates that principals prefer to provide time for and coordinate teacher

**TABLE XXXVII**

**TECHNIQUES FOR EXPOSING STAFF TO NEW IDEAS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure to New Ideas</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Encourage college work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Encourage professional reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Provide time for attendance at conference and workshops</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Provide time for visitation to observe other teachers and schools</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-seven: The principal's most successful method of exposing the staff to new ideas resulting in change of practice.

visitation to observe other teaching environments. In fact, fifty-one, or 60 per cent, of the principals reported that they find this method to be most beneficial. Nineteen respondents, or 22 per cent, indicated preference for providing time for teachers to attend conferences or workshops. Only 6 per cent of the principals reported that they prefer to encourage teachers to take college work, and only 7 per
cent prefer to encourage professional reading. Two principals commented that they find their own school workshops to be most beneficial, while two others prefer just to encourage teachers to experiment.

In open plan schools the problem of helping teachers whose experience has been in a more traditional school environment adjust to the open concept sometimes arises. The data in Table XXXVIII indicate that only two of the

**TABLE XXXVIII**

**TECHNIQUES FOR HELPING TEACHERS ADJUST TO THE OPEN PLAN CONCEPT***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Teachers Adjustment to Open Plan</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Place teachers on teams that use more traditional techniques</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Transfer or release teachers who do not adjust</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Continuously encourage and support these teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Provide a staff development program designed to meet individual needs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-eight: The principal's techniques for helping "traditional" teachers adjust to the open plan concept.
eighty-five respondents commented that this is not a problem in their school, since these teachers are never assigned to their building.

Sixty principals, or 71 per cent, indicated that they continuously encourage and support these teachers in their adjustment period. Fifty-one, or 60 per cent, reported that they provide a staff development program to meet the individual needs of these teachers. Only 9 per cent of the principals indicated that they place these teachers on teams that use more traditional techniques. It should be noted that twenty-four, or 28 per cent, of the principals indicated that they transfer or release those teachers who do not make the adjustment to the open concept.

A review of the data in Table XXXIX relative to the principal's role in designing the open plan building indicated that over one-half, or 62 per cent, provided some input during the design stages. Twenty-two principals, or 26 per cent, reported that the building was planned by the central staff with input from the principal, teachers, and community. Twelve principals, or 14 per cent, reported that they worked directly with the central staff in designing the building. One principal commented that he alone designed the facility, while two others reported that they worked directly with the architect.
### TABLE XXXIX
ROLE IN BUILDING DESIGN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Was not assigned during the planning stages</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Building was planned by architects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Building planned by central staff and architects</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Building planned by central staff with input from the principal, teachers, and community</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Principal worked with central staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number thirty-nine: The principal's role in designing the open plan building.

An analysis of the data in Table XL indicates that most of the open plan buildings were designed to facilitate the implementation of team teaching. In fact, seventy-five of the eighty-five respondents, or 88 per cent, reported this as being the case. Forty-two, or 49 per cent, of the principals reported that the building was designed to house a nongraded curriculum; and 39 per cent indicated the building was designed to implement a graded curriculum with some nongraded features. Twenty-six principals, or 31 per cent, indicated that the implementation of multi-age grouping...
TABLE XL
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR WHICH OPEN PLAN BUILDING WAS DESIGNED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Design</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Graded</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Nongraded</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Graded with some nongraded features</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Multi-age grouping</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Departmentalized</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Platoon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Team teaching</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number forty: The design of the open plan elementary school was created to facilitate implementation of what type of organizational structure?

influenced the design of the facility. Only 6 per cent of the respondents reported that the building was designed to house a graded curriculum. One principal commented that the facility was designed to implement any organizational structure that would work.

A review of the data in Table XLI reveals that the principal is chiefly responsible for planning for effective utilization of the open plan elementary school; however, teachers share in this decision-making process. Forty-four principals, or 52 per cent, reported that they coordinate
TABLE XLI

ROLE IN PLANNING FOR EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF THE SCHOOL PLANT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization of School Plant</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Principal plans all scheduling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Principal utilizes teacher and student input in planning and scheduling</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Principal coordinates planning and scheduling of teachers</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number forty-one: The principal's role in planning for effective utilization of the school plant.

The planning and scheduling done by the teachers. Thirty-six, or 42 per cent, of the respondents indicated that they use teacher and student input in planning and scheduling of the learning activities. Only two of the eighty-five respondents reported that the principal alone plans all of the scheduled activities. One principal commented that he plans with the team leaders.

A review of the data in Table XLII indicates that principals use many different mediums to build public understanding of the school program. Eighty-three principals, or 98 per cent, reported the use of parents and parent organizations to build greater public understanding. The
TABLE XLII

MEDIUMS USED TO BUILD PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediums Used to Build Public Understanding</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Parents and parent organizations</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Pupils</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Teachers</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Community contacts and organizations</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Newspaper</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Radio</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Television</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h School publications or Bulletins</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number forty-two: Mediums used to build public understanding.

Use of teachers was reported by 89 per cent, while the use of students was indicated by 70 per cent of the principals. Fifty-six respondents, or 66 per cent, indicated that they make use of community contacts and organizations, while 62 per cent reported the use of school publications or bulletins. Only a small percentage of the principals reported the use of radio or television in building public understanding. Three principals commented that they use parent conferences as a means to increase public understanding.
A study of the responses by principals in Table XLIII indicates that an effort is made to communicate with many groups concerning the school program. Eighty-two principals, or 96 per cent, reported that they strive to communicate with the parents in the community, and 85 per cent reported communications with the students. Seventy-nine respondents, or 93 per cent, indicated communications are established with the superintendent and the central staff. Only 65 per cent of the principals reported communications with the Board of Education. Fifty-eight principals, or 68 per cent, indicated efforts to communicate with the local building staff. It is interesting to note that 73 per cent of the principals

### TABLE XLIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups With Whom School Communicates</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Board of Education</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Superintendent and central staff</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Local building staff</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Pupils</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Parents</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Community</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools Reporting</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number forty-three: Groups with whom your school communicates.*
reported that they attempt to communicate the school program to the community as a whole.

A review of the data in Table XLIV reveals the emphasis that the principals of open plan elementary schools in Texas

**TABLE XLIV**

**ROLE IN PUBLIC RELATIONS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>Distribution of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Improve public understanding of school purposes, instructional programs, and roles and responsibilities of the staff</td>
<td>Number: 77 Percentage: 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Determine public opinion about the school</td>
<td>Number: 39 Percentage: 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Secure the moral and financial support of the public</td>
<td>Number: 40 Percentage: 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Develop a feeling of public responsibility for education</td>
<td>Number: 48 Percentage: 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Build public confidence in the school and its operation</td>
<td>Number: 66 Percentage: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Make the public aware of educational change and need for progress in education</td>
<td>Number: 69 Percentage: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Involve the public in solution to educational problems</td>
<td>Number: 46 Percentage: 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Other</td>
<td>Number: 1 Percentage: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Schools Reporting</strong></td>
<td>Number: 85 Percentage: ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey question number forty-four: The principal's role in public relations.
place on a good public relations program. Seventy-seven principals, or 91 per cent, reported that they have a responsibility to improve public understanding of school purposes, instructional programs, and the roles and responsibilities of the instructional staff. Sixty-six respondents, or 78 per cent indicated that they feel it is important to build public confidence in the school and its operation. Approximately 81 per cent indicated a need to make the public aware of educational change and the need for progress in education.

Thirty-nine, or 46 per cent, of the principals reported that they attempt to determine public opinion about the school, and 54 per cent of the respondents indicated that they try to involve the public in seeking solutions to educational problems. Forty principals, or 47 per cent, indicated one purpose of their public relations program is to secure the moral and financial support of the public that they serve.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The problem of this study was to analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas. The analysis was limited to the principals' perceptions of their role in these schools. The purposes of the study were (1) to trace the development of open plan elementary schools in the United States, (2) to identify open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas, and (3) to survey and analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas with special reference to the following responsibilities: (a) instruction and curriculum development, (b) staff personnel administration, (c) management of the school plant, and (d) public relations.

The related literature was subdivided into four sections: (1) The History and Development of Open Education in England, (2) The Role of the Headteacher in British Primary Schools, (3) The Transition of Open Education to the United States, and (4) The Role of the Elementary School Principal in America. It was in this survey of related literature
that the development of open plan elementary schools in the United States was traced.

In order to identify the open plan elementary schools presently operating in the state of Texas, a letter of explanation and a form for reporting such schools were mailed to the Texas Education Agency, executive directors of the twenty Education Service Centers, deans of the Departments of Education of the fifty-five colleges and universities, and thirty-four selected superintendents of schools throughout the state. The superintendents were selected because they were believed to have open plan elementary schools within their districts.

Forms listing open plan elementary schools and their principals were received from 86 of the 110 respondents. This return of 78 per cent represented all areas of the state and was considered adequate to identify the open plan elementary schools presently operating in the state of Texas. The respondents identified 106 schools that met the description of an open plan elementary school.

A questionnaire which contained forty-four items was developed to survey the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas. This survey instrument was validated and mailed to the principals of the 106 schools along with a letter requesting participation in the study. This procedure resulted in a return of eighty-five usable questionnaires, or 80 per cent.
In the presentation of findings, Chapter IV, tables were utilized to report data which were accumulated from the survey questionnaire. These data were presented by the number of responses and percentages for each answer.

Findings

In regard to the open plan schools in the United States, the survey of the literature revealed the following findings:

a. Since 1968, the concepts of open education have gained widespread acceptance in many elementary schools throughout the United States.

b. The open plan elementary school emerged as an entity in the United States in the late 1960's, and the recent acceptance of the concepts of open education has had an influence on its development.

In regard to the open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas, the data from the survey questionnaire revealed the following findings:

a. Many open plan elementary schools have been constructed in Texas within the past five years; over 100 such schools were identified in this study. Eighty-six per cent of these schools have been constructed within the past three years.

b. Most of the open plan elementary schools in Texas were constructed to facilitate the implementation of team teaching and some degree of nongradedness.
c. The concepts of team teaching, nongradedness, and open education are being utilized to some degree in most of the open plan elementary schools in Texas. Multi-age grouping is also being used in about one-third of these schools.

d. Movable furniture such as separate chairs and tables that facilitate flexibility are being used in 88 percent of the open plan elementary schools in Texas.

In regard to the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas, the data from the survey questionnaire revealed the following findings:

a. In addition to administrative certification, the principals prepared for the principalship by attending open plan workshops, visiting other similar school programs, and reading about the concepts of open education. They use similar techniques to maintain their continuous professional growth.

b. Only 7 per cent of the principals have had prior teaching experience in an open plan school, and only 8 percent presently assume any teaching duties in addition to their administrative responsibilities.

c. The principals' ages are rather evenly distributed, with a general range of thirty to sixty-five years.

d. Practically all of the principals are responsible for instructional supervision and provide leadership for the implementation of many new curricular and organizational concepts such as team teaching, nongradedness, and open
education. About 75 per cent of the principals also involve teachers in making decisions concerning the implementation of these concepts.

e. The principals coordinate the efforts of the teachers in the selection of individualized instructional materials.

f. In 91 per cent of the open plan elementary schools the principal and teachers work with the librarian and library supervisor to develop the media center.

g. Forty per cent of the principals are working with teachers, supervisors, students and parents in modifying and improving the pupil progress reporting system.

h. The principals use various techniques to evaluate the open plan program. The analysis of standardized test results and detailed research designs are beginning to be used to supplement general observational techniques.

i. Seventy-one per cent of the principals participate in the selection of faculty members to be assigned to the building.

j. In 76 per cent of the schools the principal and teachers work together to assign teaching teams, with the principal making the final decisions.

k. In most of the schools the in-service education program is developed at the building level.

l. Most principals prefer to provide time for teachers to observe other teaching environments and attend workshops
on the open plan concept in order to seek new ideas resulting in change of practice. This supplements the local building staff development program.

m. The principals continuously encourage and support teachers who are experiencing difficulty in adjusting to the open plan concept. Most of them also provide a staff development program designed to meet the individual needs of these teachers.

n. Forty-two per cent of the principals participated in designing the open plan facility. In many instances the teachers and community were involved in this planning.

o. The open plan building design and the movable furniture offer great flexibility in scheduling and plant utilization. Many principals utilize teacher and student input in planning and scheduling, and many of them coordinate planning and scheduling done mostly by the teachers.

p. Many innovative concepts are associated with the open plan concept. Principals use many mediums to build public understanding, confidence in the program, and an awareness of educational change and the need for progress in education.

Conclusions

In regard to the open plan schools in the United States, the following conclusions are drawn from the survey of the literature:
a. In the United States the concepts of open education appear to be most popular at the elementary school level.

b. Many new teaching concepts such as team teaching, nongradedness, and open education appear to be compatible with the open plan elementary school concept.

In regard to the open plan elementary schools presently operating in Texas, the following conclusions are drawn from the data obtained through the survey questionnaire:

a. There seems to be a trend toward the construction of open plan elementary schools throughout most areas of Texas, and this type of building design is relatively new to the statewide educational scene.

b. The open plan elementary schools in Texas were primarily designed to facilitate the implementation of team teaching and some degree of nongradedness. It appears that, in addition to these educational concepts, the concepts of open education and multi-age grouping of children are also being implemented in most of the schools.

c. Movable furniture that facilitates flexibility seems to be a significant feature in the open plan elementary school.

In regard to the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas, the following conclusions are drawn from the data obtained through the survey questionnaire:
a. Due to the newness of the open plan elementary school in Texas, principals have had very little teaching or administrative experience in open plan schools.

b. The principals of open plan elementary schools are aware of the need for more extensive preparation for the administration of these schools. They also realize the importance of keeping abreast of new curricular and organizational concepts that are compatible with such schools.

c. The age of the administrator does not appear to be an important factor in the selection of open plan elementary school principals.

d. Instructional supervision is an important responsibility of the open plan elementary school principal, and he has to be familiar with techniques for effective implementation of many new curricular and organizational concepts such as team teaching, nongradedness, and open education.

e. The selection of effective instructional materials is being done at the local building level, and the principal has an important responsibility in coordinating the efforts of teachers in the selection process.

f. Due to the importance of the media center in these schools, the principals devote much time to its proper development.

g. The involvement of teachers in the decision making process appears to receive a high priority with the principals of open plan elementary schools.
h. The in-service education program is very important in the open plan elementary school, and the principal exercises a strong leadership role in its development.

i. Staff development is being expanded beyond the confines of the local building. Principals realize the importance of having teachers attend open plan workshops and visit other open plan educational programs to seek new ideas.

j. Teachers sometimes experience difficulty in adjusting to the open plan concept. Principals realize the importance of encouraging and supporting these teachers, and they often provide a staff development program designed to help these teachers make the adjustment.

k. Due to the flexibility offered by the building design and the movable furniture, effective plant utilization is an important responsibility of the principal.

l. Due to the many innovative concepts generally associated with the open plan elementary school, the building of public understanding and confidence in the program becomes an important responsibility of the principal. A good public relations program is necessary to build an awareness of educational change and the need for progress in education.

Implications

In regard to the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas, certain implications are as follows:
a. The open plan elementary school will continue to gain widespread acceptance throughout Texas and the rest of the United States.

b. Administrators, teachers, and parents throughout Texas will need to become more familiar with the concepts of team teaching, nongradedness, multi-age grouping, open education, and other innovative educational concepts that appear to be compatible with the open plan elementary school.

c. The increasing demand for movable furniture that facilitates flexibility will have an impact on furniture design and utilization. Teachers and principals will exercise more authority in selecting furniture to meet individual school needs.

d. Due to the specialized training and preparation necessary for the open plan elementary school principalship, there will be an increased emphasis at the college and public school level on preparing effective administrators for these schools. More open plan workshops will need to be established in Texas. A statewide demonstration school network will also need to be established to enable principals to observe the administration of other open plan elementary schools.

e. Principals who can implement the innovative curricular and organizational concepts that seem to be compatible
with the open plan elementary school will need to be selected for these schools.

f. The use of instructional materials will be influenced by the innovative teaching concepts present in open plan elementary schools. As principals and teachers at the building level become more skilled in the selection of individualized instructional materials, adjustments will need to be made in many of the textbooks and materials that are designed for use at the elementary school level.

g. Due to the increased importance of the media center in open plan elementary schools, principals will need to receive training in coordinating its proper development.

h. In this age of accountability principals will need to be skilled in the techniques of evaluating the effectiveness of the open plan program.

i. Principals of open plan elementary schools will have to be capable of providing leadership in the development of an in-service education program that encompasses many new innovative curricular and organizational concepts.

j. Principals of open plan elementary schools will need to be capable of involving staff members in the assignment of teaching teams, and the principals will have to be familiar with the concepts of differentiated staffing.

k. Open plan workshops and a statewide network of open plan demonstration schools will need to be established to provide for more teacher exposure to new ideas.
1. Principals will need to be capable of helping teachers who have difficulty adjusting to the open plan concept.

m. Due to the success that the headteachers have experienced in England, the principals of open plan elementary schools might consider the possibility of assuming more teaching responsibility.

n. Whenever feasible, school districts will appoint the principal and staff during the design stages of the open plan school so that their valuable input can be incorporated into the planning of the facility.

o. The flexibility offered by the open plan design increases the need for principals who are skilled in implementing effective plant utilization.

p. Due to the many innovative concepts associated with the open plan elementary school, a good public relations program becomes even more important to the success of the educational program.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon this study of the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas, the following recommendations for future research are made:

a. It is recommended that similar studies of the role of the principal be conducted in other states that have open plan elementary schools.
b. It is recommended that further investigation be conducted to clarify the role of the principal in specific areas of responsibility.

c. It is recommended that a study be conducted to compare the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools to that of principals in more traditional schools.

d. It is recommended that a study be conducted that investigates the role that open plan elementary school principals would like to have in such a school.

e. It is recommended that a longitudinal study be conducted that involves the extensive observation of several successful open plan elementary school principals.
Dear Fellow Administrator:

At the present time I am writing a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. E. Vaughn Huffstutler, Professor, Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University. The problem of this study is to analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas.

Since there is not a complete list of these schools at the present time, one of the first steps is to identify all of the open plan elementary schools that are in use throughout the state. For the purpose of this study this type of school is described as one with large, open areas which has few, if any, interior walls and which features a flexible physical arrangement, a flexible teaching program, and individualized instruction; students generally range in ages from five to twelve years.

It would be a tremendous help to this researcher if you would take the time to list the schools that you feel meet the description given above. A form and self-addressed, stamped envelope are enclosed for your convenience. Your consideration in returning this information to enable me to meet a December schedule will be most highly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Justin Wakeland, Principal
T. D. Marshall Community Center

Enclosures
TO: JUSTIN WAKELAND, PRINCIPAL  
T. D. MARSHALL COMMUNITY CENTER 
915 BROOKIERE STREET 
DALLAS, TEXAS 75216 

FROM: 

SUBJECT: THE FOLLOWING SCHOOLS MEET THE DEFINITION OF AN OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AS DEFINED IN YOUR LETTER. I HAVE LISTED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's Full Name</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City and Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Use additional pages if necessary)

I would like a copy of the dissertation abstract.
I am unaware of any open plan elementary schools in this area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School and District</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamo Heights I. S. D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Texas 782(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. F. J. Crouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703 Trafalgar (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alief I. S. D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alief, Texas 774(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. B. Boone Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. James Woodfin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11400 Bissonnet (72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle R. H. S. D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle, Texas 762(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle Open Plan Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. J. D. McKeown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington I. S. D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Texas 760(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. J. T. Lackey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 Coke Drive (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. J. D. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Rebecca (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Hill Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. H. T. Peacock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 W. Tucker Street (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Johns Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. E. L. Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Sherry Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Little Elementary School</td>
<td>Dr. Kenneth McEwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4215 Little Road (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berta May Pope Elementary School</td>
<td>901 Chestnut Drive (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roquemore Elementary School</td>
<td>2001 Van Buren Drive (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Short Elementary School</td>
<td>2000 California Lane (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Ray Swift Elementary School</td>
<td>1101 South Fielder Drive (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. L. Thorton Elementary School</td>
<td>2301 East Park Row (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Ross Wimbish Elementary School</td>
<td>1601 Wright Street (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Valley Elementary School</td>
<td>3000 Jones Road (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Heights Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nola Dunn Elementary School</td>
<td>201 South Dobson Street (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. E. Frazier Elementary School</td>
<td>900 Hillside Drive (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline G. Hughes Middle School</td>
<td>316 S. W. Thomas (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mound Elementary School</td>
<td>205 S. W. Thomas (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Branch Elementary School</td>
<td>13521 Tom Field Road 75234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conroe I. S. D.
Conroe, Texas 773(01)

Lamar Elementary School
Rayford Road (01)

Mr. George Branch

Corpus Christi I. S. D.
Corpus Christi, Texas 784(03)

Sanders Elementary School
4102 Congressional (12)

Mr. Rolor E. Ray

Corsicana I. S. D.
Corsicana, Texas 751(10)

J. W. Fannin Elementary School
3201 N. Beaton (10)

Mr. Raymond Anderson

Cypress-Fairbanks I. S. D.
Houston, Texas 770(40)

Bane Elementary School
14008 Reo Street (40)

Mr. R. M. Sowers

Holbrook Elementary School
6402 Langfield Road (18)

Mrs. Margaret Gleason

Lamkin Elementary School
Box 40040 (40)

Mr. Walter B. Bell

Matzke Elementary School
18102 Jones Road
Rt. 2, Box 148
Cypress, Texas 77429

Mrs. Robbie Sheridan

Post Elementary School
7600 Equador Street (40)

Mr. C. M. Owens

Dallas I. S. D.
Dallas, Texas 752(04)

Arlington Park Community Center
5606 Wayside Drive (35)

Mrs. Harryette Ehrhardt

Robert Cooke Buckner Community Learning Center
400 Ella Avenue (17)

Mr. Torbett W. Croft

B. F. Darrell Community Center
4730 S. Lancaster Road

Mr. Wade Stepp
T. D. Marshall Community Center
915 Brookmere (16)

Jose Navarro Community Learning Center
3530 Kingsbridge (12)

Erasmo Seguin Community Learning Center
111 W. Corning Street (24)

Priscilla L. Tyler Community Learning Center
2333 Calypso Street (12)

Deer Park I. S. D.
Deer Park, Texas 775(36)

Deer Park Elementary School
2920 Luella (36)

Parkwood Elementary School
203 Ivy Street
Pasadena, Texas (03)

Denton I. S. D.
Denton, Texas 762(01)

Frank Borman Elementary School
2429 Parwin Street (01)

DeSoto I. S. D.
DeSoto, Texas 751(15)

Northside Elementary School
525 Ray Street (15)

Duncanville I. S. D.
Duncanville, Texas 751(16)

Central Elementary School
302 E. Freeman Street (16)

Hastings Elementary School
602 W. Center Street (16)

El Paso I. S. D.
El Paso, Texas 799 (99)

Burnet Elementary School
3700 Thompson (04)
Ennis I. S. D.
Ennis, Texas 751(19)

Stephen F. Austin Elementary School Mr. Troy Selzer
Austin Drive

Fort Worth I. S. D.
Fort Worth, Texas 761(07)

Benbrook Elementary School
800 Mercedes Street (26) Mr. Frederick Murphy

E. M. Daggett Elementary School
958 Page Street (10) Mr. Charles A. Franklin

Diamond Hill Elementary School
3000 Oscar Street (06) Mr. Frank Pupek

Morningside Elementary School
2601 Evans Avenue (04) Mr. Dale T. Lee

Galena Park I. S. D.
Galena Park, Texas 775(47)

Green Valley Elementary School
13350 Woodforest Mr. John H. Laird
Houston, Texas 77015

North Shore Elementary School
Box 565 77015 Mr. Louis E. Zelenevitz

Galveston I. S. D.
Galveston, Texas 77550

Island Elementary School Mr. Gladnio Parker

Garland I. S. D.
Garland, Texas 750(40)

Golden Meadows Elementary School
1725 Travis (42) Mr. Tommy Attaway

Handley Elementary School
3725 Broadway Street (41) Mr. Jimmy V. Walters

Heather Glen Elementary School
5119 Heather Glen (41) Mr. Angus E. Cody

Hillside Elementary School
2014 Dairy Road (41) Mr. Boone Williams
Walnut Glen Elementary School
3101 Edgewood (42)

Grand Prairie I. S. D.
Grand Prairie, Texas 750(50)

James Bonham Elementary School
1301 E. Coral Way (50)

Eisenhower Elementary School
2102 N. Carrier (50)

Houston Elementary School
N. W. 16th Street & College (50)

L. B. Johnson Elementary School
605 Stonewall

Hereford I. S. D.
Hereford, Texas 790(45)

Tierra Blanca Elementary School
615 Columbia Drive (45)

Houston I. S. D.
Houston, Texas 770(27)

Ashford Elementary School
1815 Shannon Valley Dr. (27)

Will Rogers R. & D. Center
3101 Weslayan (27)

The Model School
Campus Betsy Ross Elementary School
Administrator
2819 Bay

Humble I. S. D.
Humble, Texas 773(38)

Foster Elementary School
1800 Trailwood Village Dr. (38)

Hurst-Euless-Bedford I. S. D.
Hurst-Euless-Bedford 760(53)

South Euless Elementary School
605 S. Main (39)
Irving I. S. D.
Irving, Texas 750(60)

Sally B. Elliott Elementary School Mr. Earl Peeler
1900 South Story (60)

W. T. Hanes Elementary School Mr. Joel Easter
2730 Cheyenne (62)

Klein I. S. D.
Spring, Texas 773(73)

Greenwood Forest Elementary School Mr. Herman Moore
13200 Radenz Road (40)

Haude Elementary School Mr. James Hall
3111 Louetta Road (73)

Northampton Elementary School Mr. Patrick Brown
6404 Root Road (73)

Lancaster I. S. D.
Lancaster, Texas 751(46)

Houston Elementary School Mr. Glen Jones
3100 Houston School Road (46)

Lexington I. S. D.
Lexington, Texas 789(47)

Lexington Elementary School Mr. Clifton Seifert

Madisonville I. S. D.
Madisonville, Texas 778(64)

Madisonville Elementary School Mr. Larry Krumnow

North East I. S. D.
San Antonio, Texas 782(86)

Camelot Elementary School Mrs. Geneva Schleimer
7410 Ray Bon (39)

Clear Spring Elementary School Mrs. Esther Pape
4311 Clear Spring (17)

Regency Place Elementary School Mr. Henry Coers
2635 Bitters Road (17)
Rosebud-Lott I. S. D.
Rosebud, Texas 765(70)

Lott Elementary School
Box 98
Lott, Texas 76656

Rosebud Intermediate School
202 S. College Street (70)

Rosebud Primary School
Hwy. 77 South
P. O. Box 638 (70)

San Angelo I. S. D.
San Angelo, Texas 769(01)

James Bowie Elementary School
3700 Forest Trail (01)

James W. Fannin Elementary School
1702 Wilson (03)

South San Antonio I. S. D.
San Antonio, Texas 782(24)

Neil Armstrong Elementary School
7111 Apple Valley Drive (42)

Five Palms Elementary School
7138 Five Palms Drive (24)

Kindred Elementary School
7811 Kindred (24)

Spring I. S. D.
Spring, Texas 773(73)

Bammel Elementary School
Rt. 6, Box 601-102
Red Oak Road
Houston, Texas 77090

Ponderosa Elementary School
17202 Butte Creek
Houston, Texas 77090

Spring Elementary School
922 Wunsche (73)
Spring Branch I.S.D.
Spring Branch, Texas 770(24)

Nottingham Elementary School
570 Nottingham Oaks (24) Mr. M. L. Eldredge

Spring Shadows Elementary School
9725 Kempwood (55) Miss Joan Whitten

Wall I.S.D.
Wall, Texas 769(57)

Wall Elementary School
P. O. Box 259 (57) Mr. Wilbert Jost

Wichita Falls I.S.D.
Wichita Falls, Texas 763(07)

Fannin Elementary School
710 Burk Road (04) Mr. Marion N. Taylor

Fowler Elementary School
5100 Ridgecrest (10) Mr. James L. Pinkler

In regard to the location of the 106 open plan elementary schools in Texas, approximately 92 per cent of them are located in metropolitan areas. It is also interesting to note that 98 per cent of the schools are located within a 50-mile radius of a metropolitan area; the remaining 2 per cent are in a school district with an average daily attendance of more than 1000 students. The average daily attendance of the smallest school district with an open plan elementary school is 311 students.
APPENDIX D

NINE-MEMBER JURY FOR THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Three Former Open Plan Elementary School Principals

1. Mrs. Kay Killough
   Instructor-Department of Curriculum and Instruction
   University of Texas at Austin
   Sutton Hall, Office 416
   Austin, Texas 78712
   Telephone: AC 512 - 471-7595

2. Miss Faye Catledge
   Coordinator-Curriculum Development
   Dallas Independent School District
   3700 Ross Avenue
   Dallas, Texas 75204
   Telephone: AC 214 - 824-1620

3. Mr. Kenneth Bush
   Assistant Superintendent-Instruction
   Carrollton-Farmers Branch Independent School District
   1711½ Walnut Street
   Carrollton, Texas 75006
   Telephone: AC 214 - 242-2856

Three Central Administrative Staff Members

1. Dr. Joe Harper
   Superintendent of Schools
   Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District
   Box 10040
   Houston, Texas 77090
   Telephone: AC 713 - 626-2677
5. Mr. Forest Watson  
Superintendent of Schools  
Ennis Independent School District  
116 W. Ennis Avenue  
Ennis, Texas  
Telephone: AC 214 - 875-2446

6. Mr. Joe M. Pitts  
Assistant Superintendent-Elementary Operations  
Dallas Independent School District  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204  
Telephone: AC 214 - 821-1620

Three Consultants to Open Plan Elementary Schools

7. Mrs. Glenn Holmes  
Academic Services Department  
Education Service Center - Region X  
210 Abrams Road  
P. O. Box 1300  
Richardson, Texas 75080  
Telephone: AC 214 - 231-6301

8. Mrs. Lovelle Womack  
Elementary Consultant  
Arlington Independent School District  
1203 Pioneer Parkway  
Arlington, Texas 76010  
Telephone: AC 817 - 274-7354

9. Miss Helen Fulton  
Elementary Supervisor  
Spring Branch Independent School District  
955 Campbell Road  
Spring Branch, Texas  
Telephone: AC 713 - 464-1511
Dear

Your assistance is requested in establishing the validity of a survey questionnaire to be used as a part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. This dissertation is being done under the direction of Dr. E. Vaughn Huffstutler, Professor, Division of Educational Leadership.

The problem of the study will be to analyze the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas with special reference to the following responsibilities:

a. Instruction and curriculum development
b. Staff personnel administration
c. Management of the school plant
d. Public relations

A validated questionnaire will be sent to all of the principals of open plan elementary schools that are identified by (1) the Texas Education Agency, (2) Executive Directors of Education Service Centers throughout the state, and (3) the Departments of Education of colleges and universities in Texas.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether or not each of the 41 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2". If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3". At the close of the questionnaire there is a place for your comments, corrections, and deletions. It is the researcher's intent that the final questionnaire be an efficient and effective instrument. Your assistance in this endeavor is highly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Justin Wakeland, Principal
T. D. Marshall Community Center
APPENDIX F

Survey Questionnaire
(Sample)

Directions: Please answer every item as it applies to your present assignment.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1 2 3 1. Number of years school has been in operation
   ○ Less than 1  ○ 4
   ○ 1  ○ 5
   ○ 2  ○ 6
   ○ 3  ○ More than 6

1 2 3 2. Elementary school enrollment
   ○ Less than 100  ○ 100-199
   ○ 200-399  ○ 400-599

1 2 3 3. Circle the ages of children normally taught in your building.
   Example: Graded organization 1-6 normally include ages 6-12.

1 2 3 4. Ethnic composition of your student body
   ○ Predominantly Anglo (65% or more)
   ○ Predominantly Negro (65% or more)
   ○ Predominantly Mexican-American (65% or more)
   ○ Mixed

1 2 3 5. Average income of the families served by your school
   ○ Less than $3000  ○ $10,000-$20,000
   ○ $3000-$5000  ○ $20,000-$30,000
   ○ $5000-$10,000  ○ More than $30,000

1 2 3 6. Number of full-time teaching positions in your building
   ○ Less than 5  ○ 5-9
   ○ 10-14  ○ 15-19
   ○ 20-24  ○ More than 24

1 2 3 7. Pupil enrollment in the entire school district
   ○ Less than 300  ○ 500-15,000
   ○ 300-1000  ○ 15,000-50,000
   ○ 1000-2500  ○ 50,000-100,000
   ○ 2500-5000  ○ More than 100,000
8. Other personnel available full or part time--please place the number of each inside the circle

- Assistant principal
- Administrative intern
- Teacher-in-charge
- Secretary
- Clerk(s)
- Teacher aide(s)
- School nurse
- School physician
- School dentist
- Psychologist(s)
- Speech therapist(s)
- Reading specialist(s)
- Physical therapist(s)
- Guidance counselor(s)
- Social worker(s)
- Teacher of homebound
- Visiting teacher
- Other

9. Your total years of experience in schoolwork

- 2-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10-13 years
- 14-17 years
- 18-21 years
- 22-25 years
- 26-29 years
- More than 29 years

10. Your total years of experience as a principal

- 1 year
- 2-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10-13 years
- 14-17 years
- 18-21 years
- 22-25 years
- 26-29 years
- More than 29 years

11. Number of years you have been assigned to present open plan school

- Less than 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- 6 years
- More than 6 years

12. Your preparation for this principalship

- Administrator's certificate
- Additional college course(s)
- Professional reading
- Workshops or seminars
- Visits to other open plan schools
- Prior teaching experience in open plan school
- Previously a principal of open plan school
- Elementary teacher in traditional elementary school
- Secondary teacher in traditional secondary school
- None
- Other

13. Principal's ethnic group/sex

- Anglo male
- Anglo female
- Negro male
- Negro female
- Mexican-American male
- Mexican-American female
- Other
1 2 3 14. Highest earned college degree
   □ Bachelor's degree   □ Doctor's degree
   □ Master's degree    □ No degree

1 2 3 15. Do you teach any classes in addition to your administrative duties?
   □ Yes
   □ No

1 2 3 16. Are you principal of more than one school?
   □ Yes
   □ No

1 2 3 17. Principal's age
   □ Under 30
   □ 31-35
   □ 36-40
   □ 41-45
   □ 46-50
   □ 51-55
   □ 56-65
   □ 66 or over

1 2 3 18. Organization structure of your school
   □ Graded
   □ Nongraded
   □ Graded with some nongraded features
   □ Multi-age grouping
   □ Self-contained
   □ Departmentalized
   □ Platoon
   □ Team teaching
   □ Other

1 2 3 19. School plant design
   □ Large open spaces or learning centers
   □ Clusters with moveable walls
   □ Traditional cubicals with fixed walls
   □ Large open area with several small special teaching spaces
   □ Totally open
   □ Other

1 2 3 20. Furniture
   □ Traditional furniture such as monolithic chair-desks, not easily moved
   □ Moveable furniture such as separate chairs and tables that facilitate flexibility
   □ Other

1 2 3 21. Please check the statements that apply to your school
   □ Learning centers or spaces are decentralized
   □ Provision is made for some free exploration by students
   □ The learning environment has varied learning activities
   □ Teachers often work with various size groups
   □ There is an emphasis on individualized instruction
INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

1 2 3 22. The principal's responsibility for instructional supervision
   ○ Principal is responsible and has some assistance from a
     supervisor of instruction
   ○ Principal is responsible and has no assistance
   ○ Principal is bypassed by supervision from the central office
   ○ Principal works closely with supervisor assigned full time
to school

1 2 3 23. The principal's role in developing the curriculum
   ○ Carries out prescriptions of state law and the local board
   ○ Follows closely school system program without trying to
     influence its development
   ○ Follows closely school system program with some influence
     on its development
   ○ Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop curriculum
     co-operatively for school system with adaptation to
     individual schools up to principal and teachers

1 2 3 24. The principal's role in developing the organizational structure
   (refer to question #18)
   ○ Carries out prescription by the central administration
   ○ Follows closely school system program without trying to
     influence its development
   ○ Follows closely school system program with some influence
     on its development
   ○ Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop the organ-
     izational structure co-operatively for school system with
     adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers

1 2 3 25. The principal's role in determining pupil placement
   ○ Within framework of general school system policies, teacher
     works with parents, child, and principal on placing each child
   ○ Teacher decides on failure or promotion with help from principal
   ○ Children placed according to policies and standards developed
     by the faculty as a whole
   ○ Children placed and promoted in accordance with required,
     system-wide, uniform policies

1 2 3 26. The principal's role in selecting pupil progress reporting system
   ○ Uses district-wide reporting system
   ○ Teachers, principal, and supervisors, working with students
     and parents, are modifying the reporting technique
   ○ Teachers are modifying the reporting system
   ○ Other
123 27. The principal's role in selecting instructional materials
   - Faculty, working together, makes requests for materials in terms of school program
   - Principal or his representative works with a school system committee
   - No standard list of materials; teachers indicate need
   - Use materials selected by the central office

123 28. The principal's role in developing a resource or media center
   - The librarian or media specialist is completely charged with this responsibility
   - Principal, teachers, librarian, and supervisor work together to develop the center
   - Principal makes all final decisions
   - Central administration makes all final decisions

123 29. The principal's role in developing new curriculum programs
   - Program supervisor
   - Supports and encourages teachers involved
   - Provides resources
   - Responsible for implementation
   - There are no new programs being developed at this time
   - Other

123 30. The principal's role in improving instruction within the building
   - Providing many instructional materials and maintaining high morale
   - Keeping abreast of research and school developments and encouraging the staff to experiment
   - Observing the teaching-learning act and making suggestions
   - Leading discussions at faculty meetings
   - Other

STAFF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

123 31. The principal's role in selecting the faculty
   - All assignments are made by the central office; principal has no say in selection
   - Has right to present specifications and accept or reject candidates
   - Is expected to outline qualifications, examine personnel records, interview applicants, and recommend applicants for assignment
   - Employs teachers without the assistance of the central office
1 2 3 32. The principal's role in assigning teaching teams within the building
   - Principal makes all assignments
   - Principal and teachers work together to assign teaching teams
     with principal making final decisions
   - Other

1 2 3 33. The principal's responsibility for evaluating teachers
   - No evaluation is required
   - Reports only on probationary teachers
   - Program applies to all teachers and includes a teacher's self-appraisal and a principal's appraisal
   - Makes annual descriptive report for each teacher, stating judgment of his teaching effectiveness
   - Rates all teachers annually or oftener using rating sheet or scale provided by central office
   - Rates biennially or less often
   - Other

1 2 3 34. The principal's role in developing in-service training for staff
   - Implements district's prescribed program for all personnel
   - Principal designs and implements the program
   - Principal appoints teacher committee to develop the program
   - Using district guidelines, principal and teachers define objectives, develop and evaluate the program
   - There is no program
   - Other

1 2 3 35. The principal's best method of exposing the staff to new ideas resulting in change of practice
   - Encourage college work
   - Encourage professional reading
   - Provide time for attendance at conferences and workshops
   - Provide time for visitation to other teachers and schools
   - Other

1 2 3 36. The principal's techniques for helping traditional teachers adjust to the open plan concept
   - Place teachers on teams that use more traditional techniques
   - Transfer or release teachers who do not adjust
   - Continuously encourage and support these teachers
   - Other
MANAGEMENT OF THE SCHOOL PLANT

1 2 3 37. The principal's role in designing the open plan building
   ○ Was not assigned during the planning stages
   ○ Building planned by architects
   ○ Building planned by central staff and architects
   ○ Building planned by central staff with input from the principal, teachers, and community
   ○ Principal worked with central staff
   ○ Other

1 2 3 38. The principal's role in planning for effective utilization of the school plant
   ○ Principal plans all scheduling
   ○ Principal utilizes teacher and student input in planning and scheduling
   ○ Principal co-ordinates planning and scheduling of teachers
   ○ Other

PUBLIC RELATIONS

1 2 3 39. Media used to build public understanding
   ○ Parents and parent organizations
   ○ Pupils
   ○ Teachers
   ○ Community contacts and organizations
   ○ Newspaper
   ○ Radio
   ○ Television
   ○ School publications or bulletins
   ○ Other

1 2 3 40. Publics that your school communicates with
   ○ Board of Education
   ○ Superintendent and central staff
   ○ Local building staff
   ○ Pupils
   ○ Parents
   ○ Community
   ○ Other

1 2 3 41. The principal's role in public relations
   ○ Improve public understanding of school purposes, instructional programs, and roles and responsibilities of the staff
   ○ Determine public opinion about the school
   ○ Secure the moral and financial support of the public
   ○ Develop a feeling of public responsibility for education
   ○ Build public confidence in the school and its operation
   ○ Make the public aware of educational change and need for
Dear Nolan Estes,

Your assistance is again requested in establishing the validity of my survey questionnaire. I would like to thank you for your promptness and helpful suggestions on the first mailing. The jury's unanimous acceptance of the validity of the instrument is very encouraging. The suggestions have been incorporated into this second writing of the questionnaire, and I am seeking your final approval of all items prior to sending the instrument to the principals.

At the suggestion of the jury the following changes were made:

1. The directions were clarified.
2. Several changes in wording clarified certain questions.
3. For uniformity a space for "Other" was added to some questions.
4. Questions 13, 32, and 40 were added to the instrument.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether or not each of the 44 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2". If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3". At the close of the instrument there is a place for your comments, corrections, and deletions. It is the researcher's intent that the final questionnaire be an efficient and effective instrument.

Your assistance in returning the questionnaire within three days will enable me to mail the instrument to principals and receive responses prior to the Christmas holidays. Again, thank you for your time and expert help in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Justin Wakeland

JW/ab

Enclosures
APPENDIX H

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

TO:
PRINCIPALS OF OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

FROM:
JUSTIN WAKELAND, PRINCIPAL, T. D. MARSHALL COMMUNITY CENTER, DALLAS, TEXAS

DATE:
DECEMBER 11, 1971

PURPOSE:
THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS PART OF A DOCTORAL STUDY AT NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY TO INVESTIGATE THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

RESPONDENT:
1. Name________________________

2. Position________________________

3. Name of School________________________

4. Address________________________

5. Would you like a copy of the final report?
Yes _____  No _____

DIRECTIONS:
Please mark your answers in the spaces provided as they apply to the current operation of the school you administer.

In the questions marked with an asterisk (*) more than one response is acceptable.
DIRECTIONS: Please mark your answers in the spaces provided as they apply to the current operation of the school you administer. In the questions marked with an asterisk (*) more than one response is acceptable.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1 2 3 1. Number of years open plan program has been in operation in the school
   ○ Less than 1      ○ 4
   ○ 1                ○ 5
   ○ 2                ○ 6
   ○ 3                ○ More than 6

2 3 2. Elementary school enrollment
   ○ Less than 100
   ○ 100-199
   ○ 200-399
   ○ 400-599
   ○ 600-799
   ○ 800-999
   ○ More than 1000

1 2 3 3. Circle the ages of children normally taught in the school.
   Example: Graded organization 1-6 normally include ages 6-12.
   3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

1 2 3 4. Ethnic composition of the student body
   ○ Predominantly Anglo (65% or more)
   ○ Predominantly Negro (65% or more)
   ○ Predominantly Mexican-American (65% or more)
   ○ Other

1 2 3 5. Average income of the families served by the school
   ○ Less than $3000
   ○ $3000-$5000
   ○ $5000-$10,000
   ○ $10,000-$20,000
   ○ $20,000-$30,000
   ○ More than $30,000

1 2 3 6. Number of full-time teaching positions in the building
   ○ Less than 5
   ○ 5-9
   ○ 10-14
   ○ 15-19
   ○ 20-24
   ○ More than 40
Other personnel available full or part time—please indicate the number of each inside the circle:

- Assistant principal
- Administrative intern
- Head teacher
- Secretary
- Clerk(s)
- Teacher aide(s)
- School nurse
- School physician
- School dentist
- Psychologist(s)
- Speech therapist(s)
- Reading specialist(s)
- Physical therapist(s)
- Guidance counselor(s)
- Social worker(s)
- Teacher of homebound
- Visiting teacher
- Other

Total pupil enrollment in the school district:

- Less than 300
- 300-1000
- 1000-2500
- 2500-5000
- 5000-15,000
- 15,000-50,000
- 50,000-100,000
- 100,000-150,000
- More than 150,000

Your total years of experience in schoolwork:

- 2-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10-13 years
- 14-17 years
- 18-21 years
- More than 21 years

Your total years of experience as an elementary principal:

- 1 year
- 2-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10-13 years
- 14-17 years
- 18-21 years
- 22-25 years
- 26-29 years
- More than 29 years

Number of years you have been assigned to an open plan elementary school:

- Less than 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- 6 years
- More than 6 years

Your preparation for the principalship of this open plan elementary school:

- Administrator's certificate
- Additional college course(s)
- Professional reading
- Workshops or seminars
- Visits to other open plan schools
- Prior teaching experience in open plan school
- Previously a principal of open plan school
- Elementary teacher in traditional elementary school
- Secondary teacher in traditional secondary school
- None
- Other
123*13. Your methods for continuous personal professional growth
   ○ Study groups
   ○ Workshops or seminars
   ○ Action research projects
   ○ Observations of other schools
   ○ Professional reading
   ○ Affiliation with professional organizations
   ○ Additional college courses
   ○ Travel
   ○ Other

123*14. Principal's ethnic group/sex
   ○ Anglo male
   ○ Anglo female
   ○ Negro male
   ○ Negro female
   ○ Mexican-American male
   ○ Mexican-American female
   ○ Other

123*15. Highest earned college degree
   ○ Bachelor's degree
   ○ Master's degree
   ○ Doctor's degree
   ○ Other

123*16. Do you teach any classes in addition to your administrative duties?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

123*17. Are you principal of more than one school?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

123*18. Principal's age
   ○ Under 30
   ○ 31-35
   ○ 36-40
   ○ 41-45
   ○ 46-50
   ○ 51-55
   ○ 56-65
   ○ 66 or over

123*19. Organizational structure of the school
   ○ Graded
   ○ Nongraded
   ○ Graded with some nongraded features
   ○ Team teaching
   ○ Multi-age grouping
   ○ Self-contained
   ○ Departmentalized
   ○ Platoon
   ○ Other

123*20. Most accurate description of school plant design
   ○ Large open spaces or learning centers
   ○ Clusters with moveable walls
   ○ Traditional cubicals with fixed walls
   ○ Large open area with several small special teaching spaces
   ○ Totally open
   ○ Other
21. Most accurate description of student furniture
   O Traditional furniture such as monolithic chair-desks, not easily moved
   O Moveable furniture such as separate chairs and tables that facilitate flexibility
   O Other _______________________________ _______________________________

22. Please check the statements that apply to the organization for learning in the school.
   O Learning centers or spaces are decentralized
   O Provision is made for some free exploration by students
   O The learning environment has varied learning activities
   O Teachers often work with various size groups
   O There is an emphasis on individualized instruction
   O Teachers help students become independent learners
   O There is an emphasis on making learning an exciting activity
   O Volunteer parents and/or students are used as teacher aides
   O Other _______________________________ _______________________________

INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

23. The principal's responsibility for instructional supervision
   O Principal is responsible and has some assistance from a supervisor of instruction
   O Principal is completely responsible and has no assistance
   O Principal is not responsible due to complete supervision from the central office
   O Principal is jointly responsible with supervisor assigned full time to school
   O Other _______________________________ _______________________________

24. The principal's role in developing the curriculum
   O Carries out prescriptions of the Texas Education Agency and the local Board of Education
   O Follows closely school system program without trying to influence its development
   O Follows closely school system program with some influence on its development
   O Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop curriculum co-operatively for school system with adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers
   O Other _______________________________ _______________________________
123 25. The principal's role in developing the organizational structure (refer to question #19)
- Carries out prescription of the central administration
- Follows closely school system program without trying to influence its development
- Follows closely school system program with some influence on its development
- Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop the organizational structure co-operatively for school system with adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers
- Other

123 26. The principal's role in determining pupil placement
- Within framework of general school system policies, teacher works with parents, child, and principal on placing each child
- Teacher decides on failure or promotion with help from principal
- Children placed according to policies and standards developed by the faculty as a whole
- Children placed and promoted in accordance with required, system-wide, uniform policies
- Other

123 27. The principal's role in selecting pupil progress reporting system
- Uses district-wide reporting system
- Teachers, principal, and supervisors, working with students and parents, are modifying the reporting technique
- Teachers are modifying the reporting system
- Other

123 28. The principal's role in selecting instructional materials
- Faculty, working with the principal, makes requests for materials in terms of school program
- Principal or his representative works with a school system committee
- No standard list of materials; teachers indicate need
- Use materials selected by the central office
- Principal selects materials
- Other

123 29. The principal's role in developing a resource or media center
- The librarian or media specialist is completely charged with this responsibility
- Principal, teachers, librarian, and supervisor work together to develop the center
- Principal makes all final decisions
- Central administration makes all final decisions
- Other
### 1.2.3 *30. The principal's role in developing new curriculum programs

- Program supervisor
- Supports and encourages teachers involved
- Provides resources
- Responsible for implementation
- There are no new programs being developed at this time
- Other

### 1.2.3 *31. The principal's role in improving instruction within the building

- Providing many instructional materials and maintaining high morale
- Keeping abreast of research and school developments and encouraging the staff to experiment
- Observing the teaching-learning act and making suggestions
- Leading discussions at faculty meetings
- Other

### 1.2.3 *32. The principal's technique for program evaluation

- General observation
- Structured observation
- Detailed research design
- Standardized test analysis
- Other

### STAFF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

### 1.2.3 *33. The principal's role in selecting the faculty

- All assignments are made by the central office; principal has no say in selection
- Has right to present specifications and accept or reject candidates
- Is expected to outline qualifications, examine personnel records, interview applicants, and recommend applicants for assignment
- Employs teachers without the assistance of the central office
- Other

### 1.2.3 *34. The principal's role in assigning teaching teams within the building

- Principal makes all assignments
- Principal and teachers work together to assign teaching teams with principal making final decisions
- Other
123 35. The principal's responsibility for evaluating teachers
   ○ No evaluation is required
   ○ Reports only on probationary teachers
   ○ Program applies to all teachers and includes a teacher's self-appraisal and a principal's appraisal
   ○ Makes annual descriptive report for each teacher, stating judgment of his teaching effectiveness
   ○ Rates all teachers annually or more often using rating sheet or scale provided by central office
   ○ Rates biennially or less often
   ○ Other ____________________________

123 36. The principal's role in developing in-service education for all staff members
   ○ Implements district's prescribed program for all personnel
   ○ Principal designs and implements the program
   ○ Principal appoints committees to develop the program
   ○ Using district guidelines, principal and staff define objectives, develop and evaluate the program
   ○ There is no program
   ○ Other ____________________________

123 37. The principal's most successful method of exposing the staff to new ideas resulting in change of practice
   ○ Encourage college work
   ○ Encourage professional reading
   ○ Provide time for attendance at conferences and workshops
   ○ Provide time for visitation to observe other teachers and schools
   ○ Other ____________________________

123 38. The principal's techniques for helping "traditional" teachers adjust to the open plan concept
   ○ Place teachers on teams that use more traditional techniques
   ○ Transfer or release teachers who do not adjust
   ○ Continuously encourage and support these teachers
   ○ Provide a staff development program designed to meet individual needs
   ○ Other ____________________________

MANAGEMENT OF THE SCHOOL PLANT

123 39. The principal's role in designing the open plan building
   ○ Was not assigned during the planning stages
   ○ Building planned by architects
   ○ Building planned by central staff and architects
   ○ Building planned by central staff with input from the principal, teachers, and community
   ○ Principal worked with central staff
   ○ Other ____________________________
The design of the open plan elementary school was created to facilitate implementation of what type of organizational structure?
- Graded
- Nongraded
- Graded with some nongraded features
- Multi-age grouping
- Departmentalized
- Platoon
- Team teaching
- Other

The principal's role in planning for effective utilization of the school plant
- Principal plans all scheduling
- Principal utilizes teacher and student input in planning and scheduling
- Principal co-ordinates planning and scheduling of teachers
- Other

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The principal's role in public relations
- Improve public understanding of school purposes, instructional programs, and roles and responsibilities of the staff
- Determine public opinion about the school
- Secure the moral and financial support of the public
- Develop a feeling of public responsibility for education
- Build public confidence in the school and its operation
- Make the public aware of educational change and need for progress in education
- Involve the public in solution to educational problems
- Other
After reading and responding to the validity of the items on the questionnaire, I find it complete with the following additions or corrections:

Signature____________________

Date____________________

(Use Additional Pages As Needed)
December, 1971

Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Dear Fellow Principal:

Your help is requested in a study of the role of the principal in open plan elementary schools in Texas. The study is being done as a part of a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. E. Vaughn Huffstutler, Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University. The enclosed questionnaire is being sent to the principals of all open plan elementary schools as identified by the (1) Texas Education Agency, (2) Education Service Centers, (3) colleges and universities, and (4) selected superintendents throughout the state.

Due to the limited number of these unique schools in Texas, it is important that all principals respond to the questionnaire. You can be assured that no personal or school identification will be revealed by fact or implication.

A response from each principal will be an important contribution to the study. The completion of the questionnaire should require no more than thirty minutes of your time. Your consideration in returning the questionnaire to enable me to meet a December schedule will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Justin Wakeland, Principal
T. D. Marshall Community Center

JW/ab
Enclosures
APPENDIX J

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN OPEN PLAN
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

TO:
PRINCIPALS OF OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

FROM:
JUSTIN WAKELAND, PRINCIPAL, T. D. MARSHALL COMMUNITY CENTER, DALLAS, TEXAS

DATE:
DECEMBER 1, 1971

PURPOSE:
THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS PART OF A DOCTORAL STUDY AT NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY TO INVESTIGATE THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN OPEN PLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN TEXAS

RESPONDENT:
1. Name
2. Position
3. Name of School
4. Address
5. Would you like a copy of the final report?
   Yes  No

DIRECTIONS:
Please mark your answers in the spaces provided as they apply to the current operation of the school you administer.
In the questions marked with an asterisk (*) more than one response is acceptable.
DIRECTIONS: Please mark your answers in the spaces provided as they apply to the current operation of the school you administer. In the questions marked with an asterisk (*) more than one response is acceptable.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Number of years open plan program has been in operation in the school
   O Less than 1  O  4
   O  1  O  5
   O  2  O  6
   O  3  O More than 6

2. Elementary school enrollment
   O Less than 100  O  600-799
   O  100-199  O  800-999
   O  200-399  O More than 1000
   O  400-599

3. Circle the ages of children normally taught in the school.
   Example: Graded organization 1-6 normally include ages 6-12.
   3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

4. Ethnic composition of the student body
   O Predominantly Anglo (65% or more)
   O Predominantly Negro (65% or more)
   O Predominantly Mexican-American (65% or more)
   O Other

5. Average income of the families served by the school
   O Less than $3000  O $10,000-$20,000
   O $3000-$5000  O $20,000-$30,000
   O $5000-$10,000  O More than $30,000

6. Number of full-time teaching positions in the building
   O Less than 5
   O 5-9  O 25-29
   O 10-14  O 30-34
   O 15-19  O 35-39
   O 20-24  O More than 40
7. Other personnel available full or part time—please indicate the number of each inside the circle

- Assistant principal
- Administrative intern
- Head teacher
- Secretary
- Clerk(s)
- Teacher aide(s)
- School nurse
- School physician
- School dentist
- Psychologist(s)
- Speech therapist(s)
- Reading specialist(s)
- Physical therapist(s)
- Guidance counselor(s)
- Social worker(s)
- Teacher of homebound
- Visiting teacher
- Other

8. Total pupil enrollment in the school district

- Less than 300
- 300-1000
- 1000-2500
- 2500-5000
- 5000-15,000
- 15,000-50,000
- 50,000-100,000
- 100,000-150,000
- More than 150,000

9. Your total years of experience in schoolwork

- 2-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10-13 years
- 14-17 years
- 18-21 years
- 22-25 years
- 26-29 years
- More than 29 years

10. Your total years of experience as an elementary principal

- 1 year
- 2-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10-13 years
- 14-17 years
- 18-21 years
- 22-25 years
- 26-29 years
- More than 29 years

11. Number of years you have been assigned to an open plan elementary school

- Less than 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- 6 years
- More than 6 years

12. Your preparation for the principalship of this open plan elementary school

- Administrator's certificate
- Additional college course(s)
- Professional reading
- Workshops or seminars
- Visits to other open plan schools
- Prior teaching experience in open plan school
- Previously a principal of open plan school
- Elementary teacher in traditional elementary school
- Secondary teacher in traditional secondary school
- None
- Other
*13. Your methods for continuous personal professional growth

- Study groups
- Workshops or seminars
- Action research projects
- Observations of other schools
- Professional reading
- Affiliation with professional organizations
- Additional college courses
- Travel
- Other

14. Principal's ethnic group/sex

- Anglo male
- Mexican-American male
- Anglo female
- Mexican-American female
- Negro male
- Other
- Negro female

15. Highest earned college degree

- Bachelor's degree
- Doctor's degree
- Master's degree
- Other

16. Do you teach any classes in addition to your administrative duties?

- Yes
- No

17. Are you principal of more than one school?

- Yes
- No

18. Principal's age

- Under 30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41-45
- 46-50
- 51-55
- 56-65
- 66 or over

*19. Organizational structure of the school

- Graded
- Nongraded
- Graded with some nongraded features
- Team teaching
- Multi-age grouping
- Self-contained
- Departmentalized
- Platoon
- Other

20. Most accurate description of school plant design

- Large open spaces or learning centers
- Clusters with moveable walls
- Traditional cubicals with fixed walls
- Large open area with several small special teaching spaces
- Totally open
- Other
21. Most accurate description of student furniture
   - Traditional furniture such as monolithic chair-desks, not easily moved
   - Moveable furniture such as separate chairs and tables that facilitate flexibility
   - Other

22. Please check the statements that apply to the organization for learning in the school.
   - Learning centers or spaces are decentralized
   - Provision is made for some free exploration by students
   - The learning environment has varied learning activities
   - Teachers often work with various size groups
   - There is an emphasis on individualized instruction
   - Teachers help students become independent learners
   - There is an emphasis on making learning an exciting activity
   - Volunteer parents and/or students are used as teacher aides
   - Other

INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

23. The principal's responsibility for instructional supervision
   - Principal is responsible and has some assistance from a supervisor of instruction
   - Principal is completely responsible and has no assistance
   - Principal is not responsible due to complete supervision from the central office
   - Principal is jointly responsible with supervisor assigned full time to school
   - Other

24. The principal's role in developing the curriculum
   - Carries out prescriptions of the Texas Education Agency and the local Board of Education
   - Follows closely school system program without trying to influence its development
   - Follows closely school system program with some influence on its development
   - Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop curriculum co-operatively for school system with adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers
   - Other
25. The principal's role in developing the organizational structure
(refer to question #19)
- Carries out prescription of the central administration
- Follows closely school system program without trying to influence its development
- Follows closely school system program with some influence on its development
- Teachers, principals, and supervisors develop the organizational structure co-operatively for school system with adaptation to individual schools up to principal and teachers
- Other ________________________

26. The principal's role in determining pupil placement
- Within framework of general school system policies, teacher works with parents, child, and principal on placing each child
- Teacher decides on failure or promotion with help from principal
- Children placed according to policies and standards developed by the faculty as a whole
- Children placed and promoted in accordance with required, system-wide, uniform policies
- Other ________________________

27. The principal's role in selecting pupil progress reporting system
- Uses district-wide reporting system
- Teachers, principal, and supervisors, working with students and parents, are modifying the reporting technique
- Teachers are modifying the reporting system
- Other ________________________

28. The principal's role in selecting instructional materials
- Faculty, working with the principal, makes requests for materials in terms of school program
- Principal or his representative works with a school system committee
- No standard list of materials; teachers indicate need
- Use materials selected by the central office
- Principal selects materials
- Other ________________________

29. The principal's role in developing a resource or media center
- The librarian or media specialist is completely charged with this responsibility
- Principal, teachers, librarian, and supervisor work together to develop the center
- Principal makes all final decisions
- Central administration makes all final decisions
- Other ________________________
*30. The principal's role in developing new curriculum programs
   ○ Program supervisor
   ○ Supports and encourages teachers involved
   ○ Provides resources
   ○ Responsible for implementation
   ○ There are no new programs being developed at this time
   ○ Other

*31. The principal's role in improving instruction within the building
   ○ Providing many instructional materials and maintaining high morale
   ○ Keeping abreast of research and school developments and encouraging the staff to experiment
   ○ Observing the teaching-learning act and making suggestions
   ○ Leading discussions at faculty meetings
   ○ Other

*32. The principal's technique for program evaluation
   ○ General observation
   ○ Structured observation
   ○ Detailed research design
   ○ Standardized test analysis
   ○ Other

STAFF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

33. The principal's role in selecting the faculty
   ○ All assignments are made by the central office; principal has no say in selection
   ○ Has right to present specifications and accept or reject candidates
   ○ Is expected to outline qualifications, examine personnel records, interview applicants, and recommend applicants for assignment
   ○ Employs teachers without the assistance of the central office
   ○ Other

34. The principal's role in assigning teaching teams within the building
   ○ Principal makes all assignments
   ○ Principal and teachers work together to assign teaching teams with principal making final decisions
   ○ Other
35. The principal's responsibility for evaluating teachers
   - No evaluation is required
   - Reports only on probationary teachers
   - Program applies to all teachers and includes a teacher's self-appraisal and a principal's appraisal
   - Makes annual descriptive report for each teacher, stating judgment of his teaching effectiveness
   - Rates all teachers annually or more often using rating sheet or scale provided by central office
   - Rates biennially or less often
   - Other

36. The principal's role in developing in-service education for all staff members
   - Implements district's prescribed program for all personnel
   - Principal designs and implements the program
   - Principal appoints committees to develop the program
   - Using district guidelines, principal and staff define objectives, develop and evaluate the program
   - There is no program
   - Other

37. The principal's most successful method of exposing the staff to new ideas resulting in change of practice
   - Encourage college work
   - Encourage professional reading
   - Provide time for attendance at conferences and workshops
   - Provide time for visitation to observe other teachers and schools
   - Other

38. The principal's techniques for helping "traditional" teachers adjust to the open plan concept
   - Place teachers on teams that use more traditional techniques
   - Transfer or release teachers who do not adjust
   - Continuously encourage and support these teachers
   - Provide a staff development program designed to meet individual needs
   - Other

MANAGEMENT OF THE SCHOOL PLANT

39. The principal's role in designing the open plan building
   - Was not assigned during the planning stages
   - Building planned by architects
   - Building planned by central staff and architects
   - Building planned by central staff with input from the principal, teachers, and community
   - Principal worked with central staff
   - Other
40. The design of the open plan elementary school was created to facilitate implementation of what type of organizational structure?

- Graded
- Nongraded
- Graded with some nongraded features
- Multi-age grouping
- Departmentalized
- Platoon
- Team teaching
- Other

41. The principal's role in planning for effective utilization of the school plant:

- Principal plans all scheduling
- Principal utilizes teacher and student input in planning and scheduling
- Principal co-ordinates planning and scheduling of teachers
- Other

PUBLIC RELATIONS

42. Media used to build public understanding:

- Parents and parent organizations
- Pupils
- Teachers
- Community contacts and organizations
- Newspaper
- Radio
- Television
- School publications or bulletins
- Other

43. Groups with whom your school communicates:

- Board of Education
- Superintendent and central staff
- Local building staff
- Pupils
- Parents
- Community
- Other

44. The principal's role in public relations:

- Improve public understanding of school purposes, instructional programs, and roles and responsibilities of the staff
- Determine public opinion about the school
- Secure the moral and financial support of the public
- Develop a feeling of public responsibility for education
- Build public confidence in the school and its operation
- Make the public aware of educational change and need for progress in education
- Involve the public in solution to educational problems
- Other
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