

The Art and Science of Constructivist Supervision: Transforming Schools by Applying Needs-based Research

Walter S. Polka, Niagara University

Abstract

The author describes the theoretical background for the application of constructivism in the practice of educational leadership, examining the importance of a “high-need, high-touch” approach to staff supervision and management for change. The concept of the “effective change zone” is described, explicating the relationships between personal, professional, and organizational needs for coping with change. The author supports the concepts with data from a large-scale 2007 needs analysis survey conducted with educators in Georgia. The author concludes that the information presented supports the application of constructivist theory in the practice of effective educational leadership for 21st century schools.

Introduction

Constructivist supervisory leadership is both an art and a science involving “...reciprocal processes that enable participants in an educational community to construct meanings that lead toward a common purpose about schooling” (Lambert, Walker, Zimmerman, Cooper, Lambert, Gardner, & Slack, 1995, p. 29). The constructivist educational philosophy advocates that supervisors encourage all within their sphere of influence to use their respective experiences to actively construct understanding about organizational change that makes sense to them rather than have changes delivered to them in already organized forms. A constructivist supervisor emphasizes, “...concrete experiences, real-world tasks, and the central role of the individual in determining reality...” (Kauchak & Eggen, 2008, p. 199). This leadership orientation includes using personal artistry as well as applying best management principles.

An educational supervisor with this belief paradigm enables all stakeholders to link his/her new knowledge about change with prior knowledge and apply the expanded understandings to authentic situations (Foote, Vermette & Battaglia, 2001).

Constructivist leaders engaged in effectively transforming schools intentionally incorporate continuous interactions about change between themselves and his/her colleagues as well as among colleagues. This approach assures that personal, professional and organizational needs are addressed and meaningful outcomes are achieved...constructivist style!

This article provides information about the significance of addressing the needs of individuals engaged in the transformation of schools. The literature and research about those needs and the significance of managing in the “effective change zone” are presented to facilitate constructivist reflections regarding implementing innovations. A case study related to the statewide implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) is referenced to reinforce the key principles associated with the art and science of addressing those needs from a constructivist perspective to promulgate changes in schools.

Contexts of Schools and School Change

Contemporary constructivist leaders acutely comprehend that schooling is an open-social system consisting of the following three specific contexts: mega or global/nationwide; macro or statewide/regional context; and, micro or local school system/building context. The entire open-social system is impacted by each of the contexts and their respective social, political and economic environments in such a manner that as the environment changes so does the institution of schooling (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

These leaders astutely recognize the inter-related aspects of such an open-social system in that the entire system is in a state of constant flux (Polka & Guy, 2001) and everything in the micro-context of their school depends on everything else in the mega, macro, and micro contexts (Norton, 2005). They facilitate educational innovations both strategically and tactically using their personal artistry and applying key management

science principles. They intuitively know that, “To survive the organization must adapt and to adapt, it must change” (Hoy & Miskel, p. 20). They attend to the external factors impacting their school systems as well as the internal factors, especially the human “high-touch” needs of their respective school personnel to successfully implement and sustain meaningful educational changes (Kauffman, Herman & Waters, 2002). Constructivist leaders operate as both “change artists” and “change scientists”.

Focusing on the Micro-context Needs

The significance of the personal, professional, and organizational needs of individuals embarking on innovations has been well documented. The five personal needs of commitment, challenge, control, creativity and caring; as well as the six professional expectations of communication, empowerment, assistance in decision making, leadership, opportunity for personal growth and time, have been comprehensively analyzed as key factors contributing to successful change in education (Polka, Mattai & Perry, 2000). Educational leaders who focus on those micro-contextual ‘high-touch’ factors and appropriately apply the four key concepts of effective organizational planning, also known as organizational needs, which consist of comprehensiveness, concreteness, cooperativeness and continuousness are able to promote and sustain meaningful organizational innovations (Krug, 1957).

Research Related to the Micro-contextual Needs

During the dusk of the twentieth-century, social science research and literature on coping with change reinforced the five individual “high-touch” personal needs or dispositions as significant for organizational and personal satisfaction and productivity in a climate of pervasive flux (Polka, 1997). Accordingly, individuals who cope best with change are those who:

- look at life as a constant “challenge” and develop the ability to see change as an opportunity not a crisis (Csikszentmihaly, 1990).
- exhibit a strong “commitment” to themselves, their families, and their organizations (Kobasa, Maddi & Kahn, 1982).

- believe, and act as if they are in “control,” and can influence the course of events in their particular lives as opposed to being influenced by events (Glasser, 1990).
- possess the “creativity” to envision optimal experiences no matter their current condition (Csikszentmihaly).
- experience a “caring” family attitude in the work place that serves as source of strength for them in effectively adjusting to changes (DePree, 1989).

Figure 1. Personal Needs For Coping With Change



The above five “high-touch” personal needs: challenge, commitment, control, creativity and caring, have also been cited as key “hardiness factors” of management personnel who contributed to the success of companies classified in management research as those companies who, “... have made the leap from good to great” (Collins, 2001, p.82). Thus, these factors contribute to documented successes associated with key organizational changes.

The following six professional “high-touch” needs or expectations were comprehensively articulated in twentieth century educational research and literature: communication, empowerment, assistance in decision-making, leadership, opportunity for personal growth and time (Harnack, 1968). The significance of these six professional needs as related to effective educational planning activities was reconfirmed by subsequent research studies (Miller, 1981, Polka, 1977, Yuhasz, 1974) and are integral components

of contemporary research related to the professional needs of most significance for coping with change (Beane, Toepfer & Alessi, 1986; Brandt, 2000; Hall & Hord, 2006).

As shown in Figure 2, Polka (2007) subsequently articulated that school leaders promulgating changes in their respective organizations must be certain that the people being impacted by those changes have:

- the ability to know (communicate) about diverse thinking and feelings about the change.
- the ability to have significant input (empowerment) relating to the applications of the changes in their work settings.
- resource personnel available (assistance) to help scaffold their experiences.
- knowledge that their supervisors (leadership) are sincerely committed to the changes.
- comprehension of the benefits (opportunities) associated with changes.
- time to reflect about the changes to internalize (time) the benefits and pragmatically apply the changes in their daily operations (p.13).

Figure 2. Professional Needs for Coping with Change



The above six “high-touch” professional needs or expectations of people experiencing change have also been identified as critical to successful short-term implementation of innovations, as well as significant to long-term sustainability of organizational changes (Fullan, 2005; Kotter & Cohen, 2002; Hall & Hord, 2006).

Research conducted in 1992, with a sample of two hundred and seventy-nine (279) New York educators, specifically identified the significance of both the five personal needs and the six professional needs for the implementation of technological changes in education (Polka, 1994). Additional studies replicated that research. Three hundred and twelve (312) educators from two different samples at the end of the 20th century reconfirmed the significance of these “high-touch” micro-contextual needs as key factors to be addressed when dealing with educational changes (Polka, Mattai & Perry, 2000). The results of these studies identified that educational leaders must not only be cognizant of these “high-touch” needs but must directly provide for them in a customized manner to promote meaningful educational changes.

Educational planning as a strategic process for the improvement of teaching and learning first appeared in the educational literature of the post-World War I era (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Since that time, educational leaders have utilized several different approaches in designing programs to improve teaching and learning in light of changing societal factors (Brandt, 2000; Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Cook, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Dewey, 1938; Doll, 1972; Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Fullan, 1999; Freire, 1970; Hyman, 1973; Kauffman, Herman & Waters, 2002; Lieberman, 1986; Norton, 2005). Many of these cogent organizational planning frameworks have been effectively utilized and/or synthesized into useful paradigms for change in education. They are based on the premise that sound planning activities for improvement incorporate four key organizational change needs first identified by Krug (1957), namely that they are cooperative, comprehensive, continuous, and concrete.

Accordingly, to accommodate the organizational needs of individuals involved with innovations, Polka (2007), using Krug's model and predicated on meta-analyses of change research during the last three decades including Argyris, 1982; Blanchard & Waghorn, 1997; Collins, 2001; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Dufour, Eaker, & Dufour; 2004; Fullan, 1999; Hord, 1997; Kotter & Cohen, 2002; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Leithwood, 1994; Marzano, 2003; Senge, 1990; concluded, as illustrated in Figure 3 that effective change must incorporate:

- “cooperative” experiences undertaken by large groups of diverse stakeholders working in collegial settings (professional learning communities); the more people involved in the decision-making and problem analysis of innovations, the better and more sustainable the solution.
- “comprehensive” experiences that considers the vast array of real and potential intervening variables (people, things, and ideas) that may impact the implementation of the innovation.
- “continuous” experiences consisting of constant monitoring and adjusting of the innovation itself as the context changes; there should not be any pre-fixed immutable specific “end date” for the successful implementation of the change.
- producing specific artifacts or events related to the innovation in order for participants in the process to have “concrete” evidence that they can identify and celebrate as the outcomes of their collective efforts (p. 14).

Figure 3. Organizational Needs for Coping with Change



The Effective Change Zone

Effective leaders must engage and support others in the change process by using both their unique leadership artistry and their knowledge about the science of effective management (Von Bertalanffy, 1950; Senge, 1990; Norton, 2005). Those who implement innovations using key organizational planning concepts while maintaining and articulating their macro-perspectives about change, as well as their micro-contextual focus, manage in the “effective change zone”. Accordingly, these leaders are best positioned to effectuate and sustain significant educational innovations and experience more personal, professional, and organizational satisfaction and productivity because of their knowledge about open-social systems, their management skills and their personal dispositions towards change (Polka, 2007).

The “effective change zone” is similar to the “zone of proximal development” for individuals. This is the zone where learning and behavioral change is optimum, “...the point of readiness for a given concept” (Slavin, 2003. p.44). It occurs where “high-touch” interpersonal management practices, based on meeting personal and professional needs, intersect or commingle with the application of appropriate organizational planning concepts (Polka, 2007). Figure 4 illustrates this concept.

Constructivist supervisors, possessing dispositions congruent with transformational leaders, are most efficacious in managing in the “effective change zone”. They are proactive, raise the awareness levels of followers about inspirational collective interests, and help followers achieve unusually high performance outcomes (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). They manage the issues in a systematic manner scaffolding complex changes using simple, but sound, planning principles that can be appreciated, articulated and internalized by all involved (Hall & Hord, 2006).

The above five personal needs or dispositions and the six professional needs or expectations as well as the four key concepts of sound organizational planning or organizational needs have been identified as significant micro-contextual components for individual satisfaction and organizational productivity in diverse research studies and serve as major “high-touch” references for the effective planning, implementation and sustainment of educational changes. This perspective is consistent with the “real change” research of Kotter and Cohen (2002) who stated, “Both thinking and feeling are essential, and both are found in successful organizations, but the heart of change is in the emotions. The flow of see-feel-change is more powerful than that of the analysis-think-change” (p. 2). This concept is also congruent with constructivism.

Constructivist supervisors manage the people, things, and ideas of their organization in this “effective change zone”. They utilize key organizational planning processes and provide for the above “high-touch” micro-contextual needs of educators as they promote and sustain innovations. Figure 4, originally designed by Polka, specifically illustrates that the “effective change zone” occurs where the personal, professional and organizational need components of the micro-context intersect (Polka, 2007, p. 17). This is the arena where constructivist supervisors or those aspiring to become constructive supervisors employ their interpersonal artistry and their management science to promulgate and sustain educational changes.

Figure 4. The Focus of Constructivist Supervisors: The Effective Change Zone



The significance of this “high-touch” micro-contextual focus for constructivist supervisors as well as the imperativeness to scaffold in the “effective change zone” are further emphasized in other management of change research,

Everyone must take responsibility for understanding the concerns that they and other people have about change, and they must also be willing to ask for what they need and be there for others in their time of need ... Effective change is not something you do to people. It is something you do with them. (Blanchard & Waghorn, 1997, p. 200-201).

Fullan further corroborates the importance of this perception by insisting that sustainable changes in education are promoted by leaders who help people find

meaningful connections to each other in their respective school contexts, "... they find well-being by making progress on problems important to their peers and of benefit beyond themselves" (Fullan, 2005, p.104). Constructivist supervisors and their colleagues learn from each other in the finest Vygotsky tradition, by scaffolding each other in the "effective change zone", using both personal artistry and sound management science principles (Slavin, 2003).

The foregoing concepts related to the significance of constructivist supervisors attending to the personal, professional, and organizational needs of individuals were corroborated by a study of more than twelve hundred (1200) K-12 teachers who identified the importance of interpersonal relationships exhibited by educational leaders who facilitated effective school reforms (Blasé & Kirby, 2000).

The Georgia Performance Standards: A Contemporary Needs Research Case Study

In Fall 2007 the author, in collaboration with doctoral students from Georgia Southern University, conducted a quantitative study of the implementation needs of teachers and administrators who were directly involved in this statewide curriculum change. A quantitative instrument was developed that included specific need component statements designed to gather information about the personal, professional and organizational needs of participants throughout the academic years of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 in effectively implementing the Georgia Performance Standards following their adoption by the Georgia Department of Education in 2004. The instrument (see Appendix A) consisted of implementation need statements based on previous needs research (Harnack, 1968; Polka, 1977; Polka, 1997; Polka, Mattai & Perry, 2000; Yuhasz, 1974). It included 55 specific need statements derived from the 15 components associated with the needs of educators implementing innovations as previously articulated as "effective change zone needs" in this paper:

- Personal Needs: challenge, commitment, control, creativity and caring.
- Professional Needs: communication, empowerment, assistance, leadership, opportunity, and time.

- Organizational Needs: cooperativeness, comprehensiveness, concreteness and continuousness.

Using the convenience-purposive sampling technique, a total of 420 survey instruments were distributed to known GPS implementers throughout the state of Georgia. A total of 229 useable surveys were returned for analysis, a return rate of 54.5%. The following Likert scale was employed to solicit participant perceptions of their personal, professional and organizational needs to implement the GPS: 1) not considered a need, 2) a need of relatively little importance, 3) a need of moderate importance, 4) a need of considerable importance, or 5) a need of great importance (Polka, 2009, p.193).

According to the sample demographic data, the participants in this research study represented the teachers who have been teaching the subjects that have been part of the first three implementation phases of GPS. And, since most of the sample had over 10 years of teaching experience (53%), this sample was considered an experienced sample. In addition, since almost a third of the sample (31.1%) identified that they had over 16 years of teaching experience, this sample was considered to represent a fairly senior group of educators who have been involved with educational changes during their respective careers. Thus, the sample was considered a knowledgeable group of professionals to question about their experiences implementing innovations such as the GPS (Polka, p. 194).

The analysis of the data collected from the sample regarding their needs to implement the GPS in their respective educational settings clearly identified the importance of providing for personal, professional, and organizational needs in micro-contexts. The needs in the personal needs category combined for the highest mean score identified by the sample of 4.13 on the 1-5 Likert-type scale, followed by the organizational needs category with an aggregate mean score of 4.09 and the needs in the professional needs category had the lowest aggregate mean score of 4.08. However, each of these scores as well as the total mean score of 4.10 for all of the needs definitely illustrates the importance of these needs to educators implementing change since the scores were all in the “Need of Considerable Importance” range as rated by the this sample. In

addition, it should be noted that there was no significant differences in the rankings of these needs based on teaching level (elementary, middle school or high school), teaching experience, subjects taught, or time spent implementing GPS. (Polka, p.195). Thus, this contemporary study reinforces the imperativeness to the constructivist supervisor of recognizing that individuals implementing innovations possess personal, professional, and organizational needs that must be addressed in a differentiated manner in order to facilitate the adoption of change as well as to sustain it. They must supervise in that “effective change zone” and be ready, willing and able to provide “scaffolding” to their colleagues to meet those needs. Table 1 illustrates this sample’s ranking of the 15 component needs from the three general need categories.

**Table 1. Rank Order of “Effective Change Zone” Needs
- Georgia Performance Standards Survey (N=229)**

Rank	Component Need	Need Category	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	<i>Caring</i>	Personal	4.36	.637
2	<i>Time</i>	Professional	4.33	.561
3	<i>Leadership</i>	Professional	4.32	.611
4	<i>Cooperation</i>	Organizational	4.28	.716
5	<i>Communication</i>	Professional	4.18	.681
6	<i>Comprehensive</i>	Organizational	4.17	.669
7	<i>Creativity</i>	Personal	4.14	.693
8	<i>Commitment</i>	Personal	4.12	.709
9	<i>Control</i>	Personal	4.10	.637
10	<i>Concreteness</i>	Organizational	4.08	.656
11	<i>Challenge</i>	Personal	3.98	.640
12	<i>Assistance</i>	Professional	3.97	.637
13	<i>Continuous</i>	Organizational	3.90	.781
14	<i>Empowerment</i>	Professional	3.88	.702
15	<i>Opportunity</i>	Professional	3.89	.815

Thus, this sample identified the importance of caring, time, leadership, cooperation and communication as their top five component needs for the implementation of the GPS program. These needs had a mean score of at least 4.18 (i.e., slightly more than “Considerable Importance” to them). The next five ranked needs were those of comprehensiveness, creativity, commitment, control and concreteness. These needs had a mean score of at least 4.08 making them also of “considerable Importance” to this sample. Even the last five needs of challenge, assistance, continuousness, empowerment and opportunity were all at the upper end of that score with a mean score of at least 3.89 (Polka, 2009, p. 196).

Table 2 identifies that the top 15 specific need statements from the survey all have a mean score of at least 4.29 which is better than a “Need of Considerable Importance”. The top five need statements were those related to getting assistance to implement the innovation, having communication about the impact of the innovation and time to make changes associated with the innovation as well as working in a caring environment that enabled individuals to implement the innovation without fear of failure or criticism from supervisors or colleagues.

**Table 2. Rank Order of the Top 15 Specific Survey Needs
- Georgia Performance Standards Survey (N=229)**

Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation	Specific GPS Implementation Survey Need Statement	General Need Category w/ specific need component
1	4.56	.714	Receiving assistance in the identification of the needs, interests, and characteristics of the learner	Professional - Assistance
2	4.50	.718	Communication between individual teachers and building administrators about the relationship of the GPS to the teaching learning process	Professional - Communication
2	4.50	.673	Time to determine specific group and individual classroom activities that may be used to teach GPS	Professional - Time
4	4.49	.754	Time to determine the specific assessment tools used in appraising student progress according GPS	Professional - Time
5	4.47	.747	Being able to take risks implementing the GPS without fear of criticism	Personal - Caring
6	4.39	.790	Communicating curriculum innovations to our school community, our students and their parents	Organizational - Comprehensive
7	4.38	.767	Having adequate human and material resources for effective GPS teaching learning environment	Professional - Leadership
8	4.33	.808	Having others in school assist in the implementation of GPS	Personal - Caring
9	4.32	.874	Helping people within the school community comprehend the GPS goals and objectives	Professional - Leadership
10	4.32	.826	Knowing that my faculty and administrations recognize that there are internal and external factors that impact curriculum change	Organizational - Comprehensive
11	4.31	.858	Having the ability to change recommended implementation strategies associated with curriculum innovations such as GPS	Personal - Creativity
12	4.31	.808	Knowing that I may actively interact with my colleagues to plan our GPS implementation	Organizational - Cooperative
13	4.3	.787	Having choices in terms of content, subject matter, centers of interest, or other strategies related to GPS	Personal - Empowerment
14	4.3	.840	Having choices about instructional resources related to teaching the GPS, ie.: texts, supplements and instructional references including software	Personal - Empowerment
15	4.29	.828	Communication between individual teachers and central office personnel about the relationship of the GPS to the teaching learning process	Professional - Communication

Both Table 1 and Table 2 also illustrate the inter-relationships of these personal, professional, and organizational needs. The top four specific need statements that were ranked highest as evidenced in Table 2 came from the professional needs general category, but, aggregate rankings of specific need statements placed caring from the personal needs category as the highest ranked component need by a very slim margin. Time, leadership, and communication from the professional needs category as well as cooperation and comprehensiveness from the organizational needs category were also ranked as very high needs by this sample. These results underscore the imperativeness for constructivist supervisors to differentiate their supervision to reflect the customized needs of their supervisees.

The results of this sample are also consistent with results from previous samples related to similar needs studies in that the “high-touch” needs of assistance, communication, time and a caring workplace are identified as keys to successful implementation of innovations ((Polka, 2007; Polka, Mattai & Perry, 2000). These are the behaviors associated with being a constructivist educational leader and supervisor who practices both the art and science of implementing and sustaining changes in education.

Implications for Constructivist Supervision

Constructivist educational supervisors possess an acute focus that change in education is a process, not an event, and is accomplished first by individuals (Hall & Hord, 2006). The most effective educational changes (i.e., those that yield the most personal and organizational satisfaction and productivity) are those that occur in the “effective change zone” and reflect attention given to the five personal needs or dispositions of challenge, commitment, control, creativity, and caring, as well as the six professional needs or expectations of communication, empowerment, assistance in decision-making, leadership, opportunity for professional growth, and time as well as the four key organizational planning needs of cooperativeness, comprehensiveness, continuousness and concreteness.

Consequently, educational innovations that address contemporary cultural forces such as: instructional accountability, technology, and diversity as well as others that may emerge should be introduced to educators and implemented from a mega and macro-perspective, but with primary focus given to their micro-contextual “high-touch” needs. The innovations related to people, things, and ideas will, then, be more successfully implemented and they will be more sustainable because constructivist supervisors managed in the “effective change zone.”

Summary

Contemporary constructivist educational supervisors or those aspiring to become one, need to focus on attending to those personal, professional, and organization factors to effectively manage the ever-changing educational landscape of the twenty-first century. They must continuously hone their open-social system acumen and utilize both their personal change artistry and their management science skills to help their respective employees and organizations adapt to their future. According to Fullan, the sustainability of school efforts is related to “...continuous improvement, adaptation, and collective problem solving in the face of complex challenges that keep rising” (Fullan, 2005, p.22). The imperativeness of this constructivist supervisory approach is consistent with the comprehensiveness advocated by contemporary strategic planners,

“If we are not to dehumanize, oversimplify and artificially make our educational world linear and restricted, it is imperative that we develop strategic plans based upon the actual realities of our organization and society, which are complex” (Kaufman, Herman & Watters, p.109).

Therefore, constructivist educational supervisors who function in the “effective change zone” and maintain their acute perspective regarding schooling as an open-social system will be most likely to implement and sustain the institutional changes necessary for the future.

References Cited

- Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, learning, and action: Individual and Organizational*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Beane, J., Toepfer, C., Alessi, S. (1986). *Curriculum planning and development*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blanchard, K. & Waghorn, T. (1997): *Mission possible: Becoming a world class organization while there's still time*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Blasé, J. and Kirby, P. (2000). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What successful principals do*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Brandt, R. (2000). *Education in a new era*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brooks, J. & Brooks, M. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.
- Cook, W. (1995). *Strategic planning for America's schools*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Deal, T. & Peterson, K. (2009). *Shaping school culture: Pitfalls, paradoxes, and promises*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Dell.
- Dewey, J. (1996). *Experience in education*. New York: MacMillan. (Original work published 1938).
- Doll, R. (1972). *Leadership to improve schools*. Worthington, Ohio: CA Jones Publishing.
- Dufour, R., Eaker, R. & Dufour, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- Eisner, E. & Vallance, E. (Eds.). (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan Publishers.
- Foote, C., Vermette, P., & Battaglia, C. (2001). *Constructivist strategies: Meeting standards and engaging adolescent minds*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Rev.ed. New York: Continuum.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces – the sequel*. Philadelphia,PA: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Georgia Education Department. (2004). Retrieved April 18, 2007.
<http://www.georgiastandards.org>
- Glasser, W. (1990). *The quality school*. New York: Harper.
- Hall, G. & Hord, S. (2006). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles and potholes* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harnack, R. (1968). *The teacher: Decision maker and curriculum planner*. Scranton, PA: International Textbook Co.
- Hord, S. (1997). *Professional-learning-communities-continuous-improvement*. Austin, TX: SEDL Publications.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw.
- Hyman, R. (1973). *Approaches in curriculum*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kauchak, D. & Eggen, P. (2008). *Introduction to teaching: Becoming a professional*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kaufman, R., Herman, J. & Watters, K. (2002). *Educational planning: Strategic, tactical and operational*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press.
- Kobasa, S., Maddi, T. & Kahn, S. (1982). Hardiness and health: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43.
- Kotter, J. & Cohen, D. (2002). *The heart of change: Real life stories of how people change their organizations*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Krug, E. (1957). *Curriculum planning*. New York: Harper.

- Kuhnert, R. & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/development analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 648-657.
- Lambert, L.; Walker, D.; Zimmerman, D.; Cooper, J.; Lambert, M.; Gardner, M.; Slack, P.(1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). *Developing expert leadership for future schools*. London, England: Falmer Press.
- Lieberman, A. (1986). (ed.). *Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft, and concept*. New York : Teachers College Press.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Miller, R. (1981). *A study of the cooperative curriculum planning approaches to individualized instruction*. Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. (UMI 9840304).
- Norton, M. (2005). *Executive leadership for effective administration*. Boston: Pearson.
- Ornstein, A. & Hunkins, S. (1988). *Curriculum: Foundation, principles and issues*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Polka, W. (1977). *Curriculum planning for the individualization of instruction*. Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. (UMI 7813988).
- Polka, W. (1994). Balancing high-tech needs and high-touch needs for the effective implementation of technology. *The eleventh international conference on technology and education* (p. 250-252). Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, College of Education Press.
- Polka, W. (1997). High-tech + high-touch = twenty-first century educational Success. *Educational HORIZONS*, 75(2), 64-65.
- Polka, W. (2007). Managing people, things and ideas in the “effective change zone”: A “high- touch” approach to educational leadership at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Educational planning*, 16(1), 12-17.

- Polka, W. (2009). Leadership in the effective change zone: A case study of the high-touch needs of educators implementing the Georgia Performance Standards. In C. Achilles, B. Irby, B. Alford, & G. Perreault (Eds.), *Remembering our mission: Making education and schools better for students*. (187-199). The 2009 Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Lancaster, PA: DEStech Publications.
- Polka, W. & Guy, A. (2001). Developing a systematic approach to educational planning for the new millennium. *Educational planning*, 12(1). 27-33.
- Polka, W., Mattai, R., Perry, R. (2000). High tech; High touch. *The school administrator*, 57(4). 32-36.
- Slavin, R. (2003). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1950). *The theory of open systems in physics and biology*. *Science*, (3).
- Yuhasz, L. (1974). *Curriculum planning needs of teachers within a differentiated staffing organization*. Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. (UMI 7429247).

Appendix A

Survey

The Implementation Needs of Educators Associated with the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) 2007

Introductory Letter to Participants

Dear Georgia Educators,

Dr. Walter S. Polka, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership at Georgia Southern University, is requesting your participation in a study of educator needs associated with the implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). The study is being conducted with the assistance of doctoral students from both the Savannah and Augusta Cohorts. The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in the attached survey.

The survey instrument consists of three parts: **Part I, “Demographic Data,”** is designed to gather information about your educational experiences. **Part II, “Personal, Professional and Organizational Needs”** is designed to gather information about the importance of the personal, professional and organizational needs as you perceive them for the effective implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). **Part III, “Open-Ended Questions,”** is designed for you to respond to five open ended questions if you so desire.

The completion of the survey should take you about 20 minutes. Completion of the instrument will be considered permission to use your responses in analyzing the relationships between demographic data and the needs associated with the implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). Please be assured that your responses will be confidential. If this research is published, no information that would identify you or your school will be written. The data will be most useful if you respond to every item on this instrument; however, you may choose not to answer one or more of the items on the survey.

Thank you for your time and energy in completing this survey. The results will provide us with valuable data about the needs of educators associated with the implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).

Sincerely,

Walter S. Polka, Ed.D
Associate Professor/Educational Leadership
College of Education, Georgia Southern University

Part I. Demographic Data

The following data will help us identify relationships between the background of educators, and their personal, professional and organizational needs vis-à-vis the implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).

Directions: Please circle the appropriate response(s).

Date: Spring 2007

A. Your present teaching service level:

- (1) Pre K-Grade 5 (2) Grade 6-8 (3) Grade 9-12

B. Total Educational Experience:

- (1) 1-5 years (2) 6-10 years (3) 11-15years (4) 16-21 years (5) over 21 years

C. The subject(s) you presently teach

- (1) All Subjects
- (2) Language Arts/English
- (3) Mathematics
- (4) Science
- (5) Social Studies

E. How long have you been implementing Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) in your educational career?

- (1) Never (2) Less than 6 months (3) 6 months to 1 year (4) 1 to 2 years (5) 2 to 3 years

Part II. Personal, Professional and Organizational Needs

Directions: Please read the descriptive component for each of the personal, professional or organizational needs listed and circle the number which corresponds to your perceptions of the relative importance of each need to you as you implement the Georgia Performance Standards(GPS). Use the following scale as a reference:

- 1. Not Considered a Need.
- 2. A Need of Relatively Little Importance.
- 3. A Need of Moderate Importance.
- 4. A Need of Considerable Importance.
- 5. A Need of Great Importance.

**PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS
RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEORGIA
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (GPS)**

	No Need	Little Need	Moderate Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
1. Communication between individual teachers about the relationship of the GPS to the teaching-learning process is...	1	2	3	4	5
2. Communication between individual teachers and building administrators about the relationship of the GPS to the teaching learning process is...	1	2	3	4	5
3. Communication between individual teachers and central office personnel about the relationship of the GPS to the teaching learning process is...	1	2	3	4	5
4. Having choices in terms of content, subject matter, centers of interest, or other strategies related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
5. Having choices about classroom activities or techniques, related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
6. Having input into the identification of appropriate assessment tools to appraise student progress related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
7. Having choices about instructional resources related to teaching the GPS such as: texts, supplemental materials and instructional references including software is...	1	2	3	4	5
8. Receiving assistance in the identification of the needs, interests, and characteristics of the learner is...	1	2	3	4	5
9. Receiving assistance in determining specific instructional objectives related to the GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
10. Receiving assistance in selecting and developing GPS related tests and instructional materials (software) is...	1	2	3	4	5
11. Receiving assistance in planning and implementing GPS enriched teaching- learning activities is...	1	2	3	4	5
12. Receiving assistance from available resource personnel to aid in the implementation of the GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
13. Helping people within the school community comprehend the GPS goals and objectives is...	1	2	3	4	5
14. Having a school climate that provides opportunities for faculty to accept and exercise various leadership responsibilities is...	1	2	3	4	5
15. Having adequate human and material resources for an effective GPS enriched teaching learning environment is...	1	2	3	4	5
16. Participation in district-level professional development programs related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5

**PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS
RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEORGIA
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (GPS)**

	No Need	Little Need	Moderate Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
17. Participation in building-level curriculum planning activities related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
18. Participation in district-wide curriculum development projects related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
19. Time to determine specific group and individual classroom activities that may be used to teach GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
20. Time to select subject matter areas, issues, or problems that may serve as vehicles for accomplishing the objectives of GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
21. Time to select from a wide variety of possible instructional materials, including software, to be used in the learning experiences related to GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
22. Time to determine the specific assessment tools to be used in appraising student progress according to the GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
23. Viewing the Georgia Performance Standards as a positive change in “the way one does their teaching-learning business” is...	1	2	3	4	5
24. Being a member of an organization that is always seeking new ways of “doing business” is...	1	2	3	4	5
25. Having a perspective that change will always occur is...	1	2	3	4	5
26. Positively approaching the implementation of the Georgia Performance Standards is...	1	2	3	4	5
27. Being able to select the degree of Georgia Performance Standards use in your teaching- learning situations is...	1	2	3	4	5
28. Modifying the recommended use of GPS activities in your teaching learning settings is...	1	2	3	4	5
29. Controlling the use of pre-packaged GPS curriculum and instructional related products is ...	1	2	3	4	5
30. Being able to reconfigure the various GPS curriculum and instruction recommendations to suit personal professional views is...	1	2	3	4	5
31. Developing an attitude of ownership in regards to GPS implementation is...	1	2	3	4	5
32. Being able to see the “short” term advantages for implementing the GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
33. Being able to see the “long” term advantages for implementing the GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
34. Being personally committed to the GPS innovations in education is...	1	2	3	4	5

**PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS
RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEORGIA
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (GPS)**

	No Need	Little Need	Moderate Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
35. Having the ability to change recommended implementation strategies associated with curriculum innovations such as GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
36. Having a sense of fun in implementing curriculum innovations like GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
37. Exploring new and different ways to implement GPS related changes is...	1	2	3	4	5
38. Having others in school assist in the implementation of GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
39. Being able to take risks implementing the GPS without fear of criticism is...	1	2	3	4	5
40. Having supervisors who demonstrate concern for personal feelings vis-à-vis GPS implementation is...	1	2	3	4	5
41. Feeling that my school encourages the faculty to make decisions regarding GPS is...	1	2	3	4	5
42. Knowing that I may actively interact with my colleagues to plan our GPS implementation program is...	1	2	3	4	5
43. Feeling a part of a team that has some control over the development, implementation and evaluation of GPS at our school is...	1	2	3	4	5
44. Knowing that my faculty and administrations recognize that there are internal and external factors that impact curriculum change in my school is...	1	2	3	4	5
45. Knowing that the development, implementation and evaluation of GPS involves broad thinking as well as specific actions is...	1	2	3	4	5
46. Recognizing that my organization views curriculum change as a comprehensive preK-12 process with attention given to the impact of those changes is...	1	2	3	4	5
47. Communicating curriculum innovations to our school community, our students and their parents is...	1	2	3	4	5
48. Having a perspective that educational changes will always occur is...	1	2	3	4	5
49. Recognizing that my curriculum planning for GPS incorporates the idea of constant change is...	1	2	3	4	5
50. Believing that the curriculum redesign completed for the GPS will probably not be the “final” curriculum change in my educational career is...	1	2	3	4	5
51. Recognizing that the curriculum innovations we make today, like GPS, may be changed in the future is...	1	2	3	4	5

**PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS
RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEORGIA
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (GPS)**

	No Need	Little Need	Moderate Need	Considerable Need	Great Need
52. Knowing that my school and department recognize the importance of models and examples in assisting implementation efforts is...	1	2	3	4	5
53. Knowing that our school's GPS planning efforts will result in the production of classroom usable materials, strategies and resources is...	1	2	3	4	5
54. Believing that there are adequate opportunities for educators to receive specific GPS references and resources for use in the classroom is...	1	2	3	4	5
55. Knowing that our GPS curriculum improvement efforts will be communicated to our community, students and their parents is...	1	2	3	4	5

PART III. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Directions: This part of the survey provides you with an opportunity to personally respond, as you wish, to open-ended questions regarding the implementation of the Georgia Professional Standards (GPS) in your classroom and school.

1. How effective do you feel you are in implementing GPS in your teaching- learning situations?

2. What do you feel needs to be done to make GPS implementation more user friendly for more teachers?

3. What are three (3) factors that facilitated you implementing GPS in your classroom?
 - a)
 - b)
 - c)

4. What are three (3) factors that inhibit your implementation of GPS in your classroom?
 - a)
 - b)
 - c)

5. Any additional comments about your implementation of GPS ?...